The Engaged University




Frank Gaffikin

Malachy McEldowney

Carrie Menendez

David Perry

June 2008

Project part financed by the European Union
Peace and Reconciliation Programme

***C**ontested **C**ities – **U**rban **U**niversities*

THE ENGAGED UNIVERSITY

A study funded by the Belfast Local Strategy Partnership through the Special Support Programme for Peace and Reconciliation, in partnership with Queen's University Belfast.

The findings and recommendations in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of Queen's University Belfast or related partners involved in the research.

This project is part financed by the European Union through the Peace 2 Programme implemented by Belfast Local Strategic Partnership.

This paper is one in a series of resources published as part of the CU2 [Contested Cities – Urban Universities] research project, in partnership with, and funded by, Belfast Local Strategy Partnership. CU2 is located in the School of Planning, Architecture & Civil Engineering at Queen's University Belfast.

For further information:
CU2
Contested Cities – Urban Universities
School of Planning, Architecture & Civil Engineering
David Keir Building
Stranmillis Road
Belfast
BT9 5AG
United Kingdom
Telephone: +44 28 9097 4438 / 4006
Fax: +44 28 9068 7652
E-mail: cu2@qub.ac.uk
Website: www.qub.ac.uk/ep/research/cu2

Designed by Gavan Rafferty
Published by: Queen's University Belfast

Introduction

This report explores the potential of 'the engaged university' to impact positively on its city-region for the mutual benefit of both academy and the city. Few would quarrel with the value of the university to society. Not only is the university a significant source of received knowledge or wisdom and a primary site of change in the intellectual order and revolutions in science and technology, it is also a center of culture, aesthetic direction and the moral forces shaping the "civilized" society. Universities also contribute in important ways to the economic health and physical landscape of cities, serving as a durable fixture of the urban environment.

However, such contributions to social formation have not left the university in an unambiguous position relative to its urban environment. Almost from the beginning, the relationship of academy with its surroundings has been as conflictive as it has been important — captured most commonly in the cliché of "town-gown" relations. In part, this is understandable in that the university, as a site of knowledge, has often seen itself as something of an "enclave", removed enough from the immediacy and demands of modern life to produce the knowledge and discourses with which to better understand society and the scientific and technical invention that ultimately transforms it. For some, this meant that the purpose of the modern research university was to create a community of scholars removed from the "turmoil" of the city and free "from the distractions of modern civilization." (Graham, 1898, as quoted in Bender, 1988: 18). For others, this meant an unresponsive, disconnected and alienated institution, with a decidedly anti-urban bias. Especially in the United States, there has been an impulse to build campus environments (even in cities) with "an affinity with the purified, safe and calm life of the suburbs" (Bender, 1988: 18).

This impulse has been tempered in return by a new and equally historically grounded tradition that views the university, in great part, as a product of its relationship with the city and its urban surroundings, with a strong belief "in a university *of*, not simply *in*, the city. But that does not imply that it ought to be or can be the same thing as a city." (Bender, 1988: 18). This call for a clarified understanding of the university "of the city" takes on a host of meanings. In a very real way, the fundamental intellectual mission of the university cannot be understood outside its context — to subscribe to the view that the university is an "ivory tower" or "wholly self-contained" is both unrealistic and mistaken because the preponderance of knowledge a university concerns itself with, is not of its making. Rather, it is generated from outside the campus — from other institutions and scholars. Moreover, even that knowledge produced by university scholars is "not for their contemplation exclusively…What is essential in a university—knowledge—must be drawn from and offered to students, teachers and investigators in other parts of the world." (Shils, written in Bender, 1988: 210) As Shils comments, even at its intellectual heart, the university cannot be "wholly" self-contained.

From Harkavy (civic engagement) to Perry (engaged research), the goal of the "engaged university" is to reinforce the role of the university as a key urban institution — not an enclave or post of learning that happens to find itself in a city but a key element OF the city. Harkavy and Puckett (1994) claim that for much of its existence the American research university has existed in an environment of "cognitive dissonance", whereby the very way that students will learn about their environment is by removing themselves from it—whereby a university claims its relevance to the city at the same time it asserts that this relevance is best achieved by removing itself to the tower and away from it. Obviously, this is more than institutional dissonance. It goes to the heart of the sociology of rational learning—how best to scientifically achieve understanding of the urban by isolating knowledge-seeking and its object from any untoward relationship with that which we study. Such a tradition is locked in a longstanding linkage from Plato to the present. Recently, a movement to civic engagement—the emergence of the democratic ideal in the practices of the university—has found its way into the rhetoric of the academy (Harkavy and Puckett, 1994). Equally, universities in the U.S. have started to be considered "engaged" institutions—built upon an active and conflicted institutional tradition bound up in the realization of the contextual and political realities of research education, especially in public universities—moving from the twentieth century practices of (i) land grant (ii) service (iii) extension to a new language of "service learning" and "engaged research" (Perry, Gaffikin and Menendez, 2008 as found in this report).

Following from this general thesis, our studies in the CU2 project have created four substantive contributions to the emerging literature about the role of the university in the contemporary urban arena. In the first section of this report, the theme of the university as an anchor urban institution is examined. This is followed, in section two, by an appraisal of how leading US universities are translating key discourses of globalization and neo-liberalism into their strategic thinking and direction, a study that offers one of the first aggregate data assessments of the strategic discourses of institutions of advanced research education. The findings discovered distinct parallels between the corporatist discourses of globalization and the corporatist discourses of the modern research university, suggesting that the academy is beginning to approximate its own version of these key "global discourses," making this pre-eminent form of higher education an increasingly important player in the practices, if not also the forces, of globalization. The third section takes this analysis to the European context. By engaging over an eighteen-month period in field study and interviews with the leadership of the top research universities of Europe, the analysis allows for a comparative study with the US circumstance. Finally, there is a case study offered about the potential of 'the engaged university', addressing the experience of the University of Illinois, Chicago. In this fully internal study of the changing of an American university from "enclave" to "engaged research" institution, it is suggested that the goal of "community development" starts with the study of the redevelopment of institutional practices of the "academic community."

Section 1

Engaging the Academy as an Urban Institution

Frank Gaffikin
The Queen's University Belfast

David C. Perry
University of Illinois Chicago

Engaging the Academy as an Urban Institution

The university has been perceived as an enclave in the city—as an institution more in the city than of it, as Bender has observed. This does not mean that the university is not an urban institution. It simply means that much of what it does with and in the city is not perceived as urban, but rather as academic—the buildings and grounds of the university for example are rarely perceived as urban buildings. Rather, they are part not of the city but of the campus. The campus itself may be located at the heart of downtown, but still be built as if it were a pastoral remove from the city rather than as a part of it. The academic community may all be citizens and residents of the city, but their "community" is organized most often in removal from its context—as if the disciplines and sciences of the academic life only function best when they are independent of what they study. Such sociology of knowledge practice and institution make up the stuff of the modern research university—both historically and in terms of much that makes up its everyday "community" practices.

But the university is, no matter how it is perceived as removed from its urban context by those who work in it or those who live around it, one of the key elements of the urban. Universities are high profile resource-rich institutions, enjoying social status, and benefiting from the institutional continuity that facilitates forward strategic planning. Unlike many other forms of economic investment, they are more 'rooted' to place. To their local urban-regions, they can provide civic leadership, together with significant economic multipliers in terms of their consumption and employment. Moreover, their role in the local property market can be significant. For instance, in Belfast, in terms of real estate value and share of listed buildings, Queen's University ranks high among the top property holders in the city.

Use of their applied research can help to clarify and to redress social problems, while their role in knowledge, skills and technology transfer can support capacity-building and self-help within the community. In the shift to the integrated development of spatial planning, their cross-disciplinary perspectives can penetrate the linked dimensions of sustainable local development. Comparative policy analysis can illustrate on an internationally comparative basis the good practice that has been most transformative. Moreover, academy can support also the urban networking that underpins effective social capital, and, particularly in the case of contested societies, it can provide a safe dialogic space for difficult discourses between protagonists, with university facilitation where appropriate. The scholarship that links teaching to community needs enriches the student learning experience, in the same way that student community service also provides participants with a 'real life' learning arena that connects theory to practice.

At the same time, universities can suffer from the cumbersome bureaucracy and tradition associated with large durable organizations. Their reward system is disinclined to value community engagement highly. As property developers, they can gentrify rather than cooperatively re-make their own

hinterland. Cross-faculty collaboration can be difficult because of the disciplinary panel system that assesses research, while the tradition of staff autonomy means that staff have to be persuaded individually rather than recruited en bloc to any collective project. Indeed, the kind of participative action-research demanded by good processes of community engagement is time-consuming, and thereby involves opportunity costs for researchers in terms of the time they could otherwise spend on the current gold standard of research appraisal, namely refereed journal articles. As explained earlier, the current fiscal stress induces universities to focus on commercially-oriented knowledge transfer rather than on knowledge exchange with poor communities. At the same time, such communities can view the university through a stereotypical lens that depicts it as an elite detached body, given to the abstract and theoretical rather than to practical dividend.

For its own part, at its best, the "community' of the city surrounding the academy can contribute many assets to the partnership, including: local knowledge, credibility and legitimacy; regeneration experience and expertise; the enterprise and inventiveness that can attend adversity; a focused agenda that emphasizes concrete change within clear time schedules; often distinctive and enriching cultural traits; and the voluntary effort and civic leadership, that support social capital and accord local projects vital community ownership and endorsement. Yet, it contains also a set of limitations that curb its capacity. It operates mostly at relatively small neighborhood level, minimizing the scale and scope of its interventions, and sometimes its perspectives. Naturally engaged with the very immediate manifestations of decline and decay, it can either adopt a tactical rather than strategic approach, or concentrate on time-consuming efforts to enhance community infrastructure, a process-driven agenda that may end up valuing outputs over outcomes. Its attempts to cope with the multi-dimensional features of decline can diffuse its efforts to deal coherently with any single aspect of disadvantage. Often, the long haul that is demanded in the redress of deeply rooted problems means that it is difficult for community organizations to hold on to a core membership over time. People come and go with great frequency and this transient character is a debilitating mismatch with the persistent problems that the community sector addresses.

Within the community sector, the imperative to collaborate across localities for mutual support and strength can be compromised by the competitive rivalry to win shares of the limited funds targeted at deprived areas. With respect to funding, the sector's obligation to demonstrate to benefactors relatively quick tangible return on their investment can distract from its strategic approach to long-term regeneration. Moreover, behind the apparent unifying and bonding traits of 'community' lies the reality of internal dissensions and diversity of interest, and the arbitration of such factionalism is problematic. Finally, there is a contemporary debate about the 'eclipse' of community in a globalizing age, whereby old solidarities around shared social space are splintered, partly by the new

segmentations in the labor market, and partly by the many new networks within which people operate, beyond neighborhood.

Moving from Stereotype to Partnership

Such strengths and weaknesses within both the campus and community can prompt each side to stereotype the other, leading to a dialogue of the deaf between 'the remote ivory tower' and 'the ever demanding ever complaining community'. US experience suggests that beyond such misunderstandings, partnerships can be built between the two interests. In a review and evaluation of COPC university-community partnerships, certain conditions for effective collaboration are identified (Wiewel, Gaffikin, and Morrissey, 2000):

- mutual understanding of the respective 'worlds' of community development and academia requires continuous investment and sensitivity;
- differences in interest, culture, class and power need to be openly acknowledged;
- productive division of responsibility between partners that may, for instance, separate roles in academic research and community advocacy, can be helpful. But, this should not deny the integrity of participatory action-research, which involves a total integration of both partners in the process;
- institutional support and 'imprimaturs' from the leadership of both partners are required for a long-term strategic alliance
- progress in the relationship demands patient processes of capacity-building within both partners;
- overall, a written protocol between the two sides is useful —– laying out in clear detail the mutual obligations and supports, so that ambiguities and confusion do not confound the relationship.

Engaged Urban Universities

As indicated earlier, in the 21st century, there are many pressures on universities to rethink their mission. In considering what this new role might be, it is instructive to re-visit the three models of academy that have predominated to date:

1. *the 'ivory tower' model* of detachment from the wider society is no longer tenable. This 'Platonic' concept of elitist and contemplative learning sites the university as 'a place apart'. From this perspective, the university best protects its integrity and currency by removing itself from the demands and problems of its immediate environment. A version of this argument was used during the height of the 'Troubles' in 1977 by a Vice-Chancellor in Queen's University to suggest that if the university was drawn too deeply into the local conflict, it risked being cast as partisan, thereby jeopardizing its autonomy and institutional neutrality;

2. *the 'service' model* sees a modest role for the university in encouraging staff to respond voluntarily to requests from deprived communities for assistance and expertise. In this approach, the power, status and discretion rest exclusively with the institution. Moreover, there is a tendency for this model of knowledge production to generate a class system within the university: the 'higher class' staff devote themselves to recognized and rewarded research, while the 'lower class' staff undertake the time-intensive service work with community, an investment that receives little incentive from the institution;
3. *the 'outreach' model* has the academy as more proactive in extending itself into city and community. Indeed, often it will set up 'offices of extension' to coordinate the delivery of such expertise. But, the 'outreach' perspective risks being paternalistic and restrictive, assuming that the dynamic is between a brimful 'jug' of knowledge and grateful empty 'mugs' of relative ignorance.

The radical alternative to these standard models is that of *the 'engaged' university*, one that seeks an equitable and mutually supportive relationship between academy and wider community. In essence, this model seeks to transform the relationship between the two in the production and application of knowledge. Traditional and simplistic dichotomies between the 'experiential' knowledge of community and 'formal' knowledge of the academy are dissolved, as both parties explore a new synthesis of how collaboratively they can compose, exchange and use knowledge. Indeed, in the complex environments that constitute contemporary city-regions, this process acknowledges the synergy between traditional and non-traditional sites of knowledge. Institutional outreach to the community and city is complemented by civic in-reach to the academy. A protocol between the two enshrines commitment to a long-term strategic partnership, involving not only the minority of staff already attached to such work, but rather *the very core* of the university.

Importantly, this does not transform academics into consultants or community workers. They continue to do what they can contribute best, namely research. But, it is *engaged research*, based on three distinctive metrics that assume, but go beyond, the professional robust research methodologies and ethics (Perry, Gaffikin and Menendez, 2008):

1. it involves **partnership** between academy and civic agency;
2. it is **inter-disciplinary**, reflecting the reality that problems are multi-dimensional;
3. it has **high impact**, both in terms of its public policy and development transferability for cities everywhere, and of its extension of both knowledge boundaries and the linked aspects, such as good quality university teaching.

A starting point involves the systematic examination of the research and teaching resources of universities to determine how these can best be operated in an on-going partnership with deprived communities and city-region development agencies e.g. how can:

- student placements and specialist projects be systematically linked with the regeneration agendas of local partnerships in deprived communities?
- this work, in turn, inform the structure of courses taught at the institutions?
- tailored courses, including on-line courses, be developed to enhance the knowledge and qualification of local development workers in these areas?
- an international network of educational exchange be developed around the regeneration and planning agenda?
- isolated social researchers in the universities be brought together in flexible inter-disciplinary research teams to achieve an economy of scale and scope that can only occur with a critical mass research community?
- How can the research agenda of the local universities be made systematically more relevant to the development needs of these areas?

But, behind these kinds of explorations and arrangements, evidence from practice elsewhere, such as the US experience outlined earlier, suggests that the following platform is needed:

1. the *'imprimatur' from the university authorities* to endorse and support this mission;
2. corresponding systems of *recognition and reward* that give staff incentive to participate;
3. the *appropriate structures* to facilitate inter-disciplinary collaboration –– perhaps, a distinctive Institute charged with clustering staff for periods of assignment for such research projects, and resolving any dilemmas around attributions for the national Research Assessment Exercise;
4. long-term partnerships/memoranda of understanding between the *institution as a whole* and leading community and civic agencies.

Changing Academy in the UK

In the UK, the policy context is making it imperative for universities to re-define their role, due to three key factors. Not only is student intake rising, as third level education moves from being an elite to a more mass experience, but academy is also becoming economically prominent in the context of a shift to a knowledge society. Yet, alongside such positive trends, the sector faces acute financial strain. Public funding has not been commensurate with student demand for at least 15 years, with the consequent drop in resources per student impacting negatively on both staff morale and student learning experience in many institutions. Even allowing for the recent real 6% increase in public spending for higher education over a three-year period, the estimated investment 'gap' in teaching and research facilities stands at £8bn. (DfES White Paper, January 2003). Such a significant shortfall

threatens the global competitiveness of the sector, and is prompting many colleges to radically reappraise their strategic direction.

One outcome of the funding gap is the increased commercialisation in academia, and with it, a renewed question about academic freedom and educational mission. Perhaps, to date, this has been most evident in 'Oxbridge'. For instance, Cambridge has seen corporations like BP, Shell, ICI, Glaxo, Price Waterhouse, and Marks & Spencer all sponsor chairs, while others like Rolls Royce, Microsoft and AT&T have installed research centres. Such corporate largesse can be massive —– £25 million from BP in the case of Cambridge, £20 million from Wafic Said in the case of Oxford, where also Rupert Murdoch endows a chair in English and a visiting professorship in Broadcast Media (Monbiot, 2000). Though it can be argued that the imperatives of world-class research demand the lucrative financing associated with large corporate sponsors, such beneficence poses serious issues about the skewing of research agendas. For instance, five times as much research money is devoted to the oil and gas industry compared to renewable energy, hardly coincidental given the prominence of companies like BP amongst the donors (Muttitt and Grimshaw, 2000). The extent to which such influence compromises the intellectual integrity of Higher Education emerged in the controversy over Nottingham University's acceptance of a substantial sum from the premier Tobacco Company BAT to research and advance business ethics. In more general terms, such sponsorship may tend to privilege utilitarian considerations such as commercial advantage over traditional university commitment to research that is intellectually exacting and socially beneficial. Nevertheless, such patterns comply with the overall attempt to create a new mixed economy of welfare, whereby government funding and responsibility are complemented by wider benefactor partnerships.

Within this more marketized context, public policy prioritises three goals for the university sector that do not always sit comfortably together: raise academic standards; improve equality of access across the social classes; and extend the global reach and reputation of research. This search for both excellence and equity can lead to some contentious resource decisions. For instance, 27 'elite' universities like Oxford and Cambridge are to be offered extra financial inducements —– £18 m over three years—to attract a higher share of state school pupils. It could be argued that this is an inequitable case of the better-endowed institutions being rewarded for their 'under-performance' in this regard to date. In a wider sphere, the increased emphasis attached to the sector's role in advancing the UK's competitiveness in the new globalized economy could demote other potential agendas for the academy, such as working with under-developed communities to promote greater social equity and inclusion.

Universities increasingly attempt to be global in their purpose and profile because they recognise the imperative to be internationally competitive. In essence, they are competing with each other for staff;

resources to attain state-of-the-art facility and technology; research grants; market-based and patented spin-offs; and, finally, international students, particularly post-graduates, who provide the most lucrative fees. But, this keenness to be global in focus has tended to imply that the local is no longer an appropriate arena for world-class research.

This shift in agenda has to be set against the university's typical three main tasks: teaching, research and service to the community. Often the latter has been residualized relative to the core status of the other two, and the three have tended to function separately rather than supportively (Stukel, 1994; Bender, 1988). Certainly, in recent times, there has been a re-awakening about the pertinence and potential of academy for society, and of the reciprocal benefits involved in links between the two (DeMulder and Eby, 1999). Interestingly, the literature around this discourse has been particularly prominent in the US (Bok, 1982).

University-Community Partnerships in the US

In 1994, the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) established the Office of University Partnerships to support the development of partnerships between universities and communities in order to redress urban problems. Designed to link the significant assets of a powerful urban institution — physical, economic, political, technical and intellectual — to the capacities of the poorest neighborhoods, the initiative emphasized the gains to both (COPC, 2001).

Of course, universities in the US had been involved in service and community outreach work for many decades. But, the argument was that the scale and pace of urban change and the challenge to the university as a democratic civic institution both demanded that the contemporary relationship extend beyond the narrowness of the typical 'outreach' model. Certain subjects such as planning and social policy lend themselves most readily to direct association with the community (Zeldin, 1995), and unsurprisingly these are the subject areas that appear most relevant to the regeneration needs of deprived areas. The assistance they can offer lies in areas of: contextual research, technical assistance, data analysis, evaluation, planning, and human and organizational resource development. But, increasingly, it has been recognized that urban challenges are multi-dimensional in character and resolution. Thus, in terms of the academy's intervention, this needs a more extensive transdisciplinary reach across the curriculum to involve most, if not all, faculty in direct community engagement.

In turn, this demands a new mindset among the university's leadership and a new scholarship among the academic staff (Boyer, 1996; Schon, 1995). One aspect of this is to acknowledge the complementarity of the formal knowledge of the academy and the experiential and 'tacit' knowledge of the community. Another is to locate all such activity within a comprehensive vision of the

democratic cosmopolitan civic university (Benson and Harkavy, 2000), and the third is for the two partners to openly recognize their own current strengths and weaknesses.

Reservations to the Engaged Institution and their Resolution

Given the financial and globalising imperatives faced by universities at present, these ideas will probably encounter scepticism and resistance. It may appear that universities face hard choices. For instance, they can take comfort in their traditions or embrace the risks of change. But, given that change is all around — the shift to new economy; the re-invention of governance; the re-alignment of welfare towards mixed funding and provision; and the transformation of community — it would be foolhardy of the university to seek insulation from this general dynamic. So, there is no respite in 'enclave'. Indeed, the apparent choice as to whether to operate behind academic walls, or whether to be open for engagement is, in fact, an illusory choice. Related to this, given the myriad new sites of research, information, and learning, there is no real choice about whether to be involved in exclusive or inclusive forms of knowledge creation and distribution. Only the latter will produce a credible epistemology in the contemporary period. Similarly, other apparent choices on offer —– for instance, between the local and global research agendas —– are not, in fact, so dichotomous. Good local research, rooted in a problem-solving methodology, with appropriate international comparative, has global worth and transferability. In short, an urban institution like a university, does not enhance its global ambitions by abandoning the local 'urban' component, as if it was some kind of virtual campus. Rather, seen from this perspective, the city-region is its major asset, its international recognition and 'calling card'. Yet, academy and city can be both partners and protagonists, and this ambivalence and overarching potential are both evident in the findings that comprise the studies outlined in the CU2 project.

Bibliography

Barnekov, T., Boyle, R., and Rich, D. 1989. *Privatism and Urban Policy in Britain and the United States*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Bender, T. 1988. *The University and the City: From Medieval Origins to the P*resent. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Benson, L. and Harkavy, I. 2000. 'Integrating the American System of Higher, Secondary and Primary Education to Develop Civic Responsibility' in Ehrlich, T., Ed.
Civic Responsibility and Higher Education. Washington, DC: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.

Best, M., December 2000. *The Capabilities and Innovation Perspective: The Way Ahead in Northern Ireland*. Research Monograph 8. Belfast: Northern Ireland Economic Council.

Bok, D. 1982*. Beyond the Ivory Tower: Social Responsibilities of the Modern University*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Boyer, E. 1996. 'The Scholarship of Engagement', *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 1, 11 - 20.

Checkoway, B. 1997. 'Reinventing the Research University for Public Service', *Journal of Planning Literature,* 2 (3), 307-319.

Community Outreach Partnerships Centers (COPC), 2001. *COPC Annual Report 2000*, Washington, DC: US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

DeMulder, E. and Eby, K. 1999. 'Bridging Troubled Waters: Learning Communities for the 21st Century', *American Behavioral Scientist,* 42 (5), 892-901.

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) 2003. *The Future of Higher Education,* White Paper, January 2003. London: HMSO

Feld, M. 1998. 'Community Outreach Partnership Centers: Forging New Relationships Between University and Community', *Journal of Planning Education and Research,* 17, (4), 285-290.

Gaffikin, F. 2001. *Universities in Contested Space*, Unpublished Seminar Paper, Belfast, University Of Ulster.

Gates, R. and Robinson, G. 1998. 'Institutionalizing University-Community Partnerships', *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 17, 4: 312-322.

Harkavy, Ira and Puckett, J.L. 1994. "Lessons from Hull House for the Contemporary Urban University." *Social Service Review,* 68 (3), 299-321.

Harloe, M., Pickvance, C. and Urry, J. 1990. *Place, Policy and Politics: Do Localities Matter?* London: Unwin Hyman.

Sayer, A. 1991. 'Behind the Locality Debate: Deconstructing Geography's Dualisms', *Environment and Planning A*, 23, 283-308.

Squires, G. 1989. *Unequal Partnerships: The Political Economy of Urban Redevelopment in Postwar America.* New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press.

Kennedy, D. 1997. *Academic Duty*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Monbiot, G. 2000. The Captive State, the Corporate Takeover of Britain. London: Macmillan.

Muttitt G. and Grimshaw, C. 2000. *Degrees of Involvement: An Examination of the Relationship Between the Upstream Oil and Gas Industry and UK Higher Education Institutions.* London: CorporateWatch.

Perry, D. 2005. Discussions with Dr Perry, Director of the Great Cities Institute, University of Illinois, Chicago. David offered many insights into 'the engaged university' and these have informed this chapter.

Rubin, V. 1998. 'The Role of Universities in Community-Building Initiatives', *Journal of Planning Education and Research,* 17 (4), 302-311.

Schon, D. 1995. 'The New Scholarship Requires a New Epistemology', *Change,* 27, 26 - 35.

Silka, L. 1999. 'Paradoxes of Partnerships: Reflections on University-Community Collaborations' *Research in Politics and Society,* 7, 335-359.

Stukel, J. 1994. 'Urban and Metropolitan Universities: Leaders of the 21st Century', *Metropolitan Universities*, 5 (2), 87-92.

US Department of Housing and Urban Development, October 1996. University-Community Partnership: current practices, Volume 2, Washington, HUD.

Walshok, M. 1995. *Knowledge Without Boundaries: what America's universities can do for the economy, the workplace, and the community*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wiewel, W., Gaffikin, F., and Morrissey, M. 2000. 'Community-University Partnerships for Affordable Housing', *Cityscape*, 5 (1), 27-46.

Zeldin, S. 1995. 'Community-University Collaborations for Youth Development: From Theory to Practice', *Journal of Adolescent Research,* 10, 449 - 469.

Section 2

Discourses and Strategic Visions: The U.S. Research University as an Institutional Manifestation of Neo-Liberalism in a Global Era.

Frank Gaffikin
The Queen's University Belfast

David C. Perry
University of Illinois Chicago

This article derives from an international research project, known as Contested Cities and Urban Universities (CU2), involving the Institute of Spatial and Environmental Planning, Queen's University, Belfast and the Great Cities Institute, University of Illinois, Chicago. We are grateful to researchers Jonah Katz, Gavan Rafferty and Jessica Thompson for their work in data generation and organization.

Abstract

It is argued widely that the academy today is in the process of significant change — in the institutional assumptions of what constitutes the university and the construction of knowledge and in its relations with the city and the world. This article addresses the evolution of the modern university in the context of the "discourses" of contemporary globalizing institutions. Further, it empirically assesses the organizational priorities of US research universities in light of the application of these discourses to their objectives and practices, finding that they are playing a key role in the formal representation of institutional direction, goals and values of American higher education.

Introduction

Perhaps the single most popular characterization of the present era is "globalization." While the concept is not totally new (Bender, 2000; Fainstein, 1990), contemporary global relations, at the human, technological, social and economic levels, have been redefined in qualitatively different ways from previous times. One institution where much of this comes to ground is the university, and this article argues that the institutional priorities of the modern research university provide evidence of wider changing societal practices — priorities which are now influenced as much by the exogenous realities of "globalization" as they are by the historical institutional practices of the "academy." In essence, the purpose of this article is to explore how the American research university is institutionally reformulating itself in this global era, as indicated by their public representation of themselves in their strategic plans and statements.

There are varied, often quite separate literatures on the elements of globalization and higher education, with nowhere near the synthetic and critical treatment of this literature that such a topic warrants. The first purpose of this article is to provide such a synthesis of inter-disciplinary literature in order to better understand the larger purposes that globalization is playing in the development of universities and, conversely, the increased importance of universities in their global and urban surroundings. Also, to date, there has been little broad-based empirical study of the university as a "global institution." The literature is generally case-based or experiential, with policy arguments often conflated to the national level. Therefore, the second goal here is to offer an exploratory review of the strategic plans of a select sample of the largest research universities in the United States to find out how deeply the "discourses" or institutional languages of globalization have penetrated into the vision, mission, goals, and practices of the modern research university. The intent here is to treat the university as a fully vested societal institution, at once more localized in its significance for economic development, while more globalized in the virtual and collaborative spaces of research and learning. However, in examining how universities treat these discourses in their key strategic documents, the article does not claim that what they say about themselves is the same as what they actually deliver. Of course, the content of such strategies can contain the posturing of promotional rhetoric, unmerited

claims and post-hoc rationalization. It is not the purpose of the article to decipher and expose these. Rather, its purpose is to identify the extent to which they at least feel obligated to prioritize and embrace globalization and its related agendas as important to their public institutional face.

To meet this objective, the article begins with an exposition of six pre-eminent discourses germane to overall global transformation, with subsequent consideration of how these issues impact on the institutional re-articulation of the academy. The term 'discourse' here is not intended in a detailed post-structural sense of power analysis, linguistic interpretation, multiple meanings and textual deconstruction (Foucault, 1972), but rather in its simpler definition as a disquisitional 'conversation' about the key characteristics of contemporary society. Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that the dominant representations of these issues comprise partial knowledge, legitimated and challenged through power relations. Marked not only by coherence and systematicity, but also by contradiction and contestation, such discourses are also embedded and performative, in that they have penetrated pervasively into the social fabric, and thereby contain substantial social force (Johnston, et al, (eds), 2000).

Following this framework, there is an analysis of the empirical data —– the strategic plans of selected research universities —– interrogating the nature and extent of the academy's engagement with, and internalization of, these discourses. The conclusion offers an appraisal of the wider implications of these trends in academy, as both recipient and agent of globalization.

Globalization and its Discourses

To date, much of the appraisal of academy's reformulation within the context of globalization has been either anecdotal or case-based (Perry & Wiewel, 2005; Van der Wusten, 1998; Breton & Lambert, 2004). But, even if "globalization" is an overarching theme of organizational mission and purpose, it is not a singularly understood concept. In fact, its ubiquity as a feature of modern socio-political and economic order is only matched by the level of disagreement over its definitional worth. For some, this new globalizing order is directed by a "neo liberal" ideology that frees, as it requires, the individual's execution of entrepreneurial powers and "skills in a political economy characterized by strong private property rights, free markets and free trade." (Harvey, 2005: p.2)

If *neoliberalism* is the ideological discourse of globalization, the state best equipped to create and preserve globalization is one characterized as *mixed economy welfare*, that in some places is defined as increasing privatization and in other places as the "Third Way": a state mixture of private opportunity, democratic rights, and a measure of social protection. The structures of both public and private institutions of the state are increasingly "*corporate*" in their practices of management, efficiency and accountability. The order produced by such institutional features of state and market is

balanced by new *civic engagement* or community responsibility along with societal inclusiveness or *diversity*. In sum, the discourse of globalization is in fact many "globalizations," the product of several discourses in late modernity (Giddens, 1990) or *post modernity*: among them are the following six: the overarching concept of globalization itself; neoliberalism; the mixed economy of welfare, with its related issues of corporatism, managerialism and efficiency; living with increasing diversity and difference; community/civic engagement; and post-modernist perspectives on knowledge itself. The following section examines each of these in turn, and how they connect with campus concerns.

Changing Discourses on Campus

(1) **globalization:** As argued by Held and Mc Grew (2003), this is a deeply contested concept that defies simple summation. First, skeptics dispute its very validity, insisting on its weak specificity and explanatory worth; the existence of more 'globalized' periods such as the age of Imperialism; and the persistent autonomy of national sovereignty (Weiss, 1998; Hirst & Thompson, 1999). Indeed, some see in the concept an attempt to legitimate the global diffusion of capitalism as both inevitable and benign (Hoogvelt, 1997). Even among the globalists, distinction prevails. While most agree on its eminent features –– the growing reach of transnational firms; round-the-clock round-the-globe financial markets; the planetary interdependence suggested by global warming and environmental degradation; the spread of common popular culture; new communications such as the world wide web; and such like –– the causal and impact analysis varies markedly. Some emphasize the mounting hegemony of market economics, with its assumed modernism, intensification of social inequity, and erosion of national sovereignty (Sassen, 1996; Greider, 1997). Some focus in on the de-territorialization and 'death of distance' achieved by transformations in global communication, such as wireless technology (Caircross, 1997). Others dismiss such explanations as either partial or reductionist, proposing instead a complex configuration of multiple factors in society, polity and economy, not to mention theology (Castells, 1997).

Within this latter perspective, alongside due dismissal of the exaggerated demise of geography and history, there is recognition of a new era of increasing connectedness and spatial-temporal compression. But, this is seen to produce 'many globalizations' (Berger & Huntington, 2002) that, far from generating uniformity, continue to accommodate diverse cultures and resistance (Jameson & Miyoshi, 1998). In this multi-layered version, complication and ambivalence run counter to stark visions of a bi-polar planet caught between private consumerism and religious fundamentalism, or as expressed by Barber (1995), between 'Mc World and Jihad'. Greater integration also generates varied differentiation and alternative modernities. For instance, particular phenomenon like the increasing evangelization of Pentecostal Protestantism bears distinctive outcome for cultural harmonization around individualism (Berger, 2002); parts of the national state can act as 'protector of

stakeholding communities (while other parts) are direct affiliates of global capital' (Appadurai, 2001, p. 2); close economic ties relate largely to the top OECD countries, rather than to the whole of humanity; and the overall dynamic of a shrinking world contains its own contradictions that invite opposition and renew the relevance of both agency and the local.

Expression of this dynamic in the US takes an acute form. Over the last four decades, its base economy has substantially shifted from industrial/manufacturing to post industrial/service, a structural change that has had significant impact on the relations of production, the space and time of markets and the products around which they are organized. With such restructuring, the institutional character of U.S. society has been transformed by not only a national but also a global shift in the primacy of the individual as the entrepreneurial center of a social order rooted in private property rights and free markets. The state, in turn, serves as site and guarantor of "an institutional framework appropriate to such practices" (Harvey, 2005, p. 2). As such, the state has been equally impacted by changes characterized best by a shift from government to "governance," suggesting that the relations of politics, the geographies of nation-state and city, and the very definition of the units of the state are in flux. But, increasingly this political dimension is also being framed within the related discourse about the ideological ascendancy of neo-liberalism and the attendant discourses of "mixed economy of welfare," corporatism and managerial efficiency, diversity, community engagement and "post modernity."

(2) neo-liberalism: This refers to the virtually ubiquitous political culture since the 1980s that has elided with globalization, and that posits the benign impact of self-regulating markets and the corollary of minimalist government intervention designed to support economic demand management and social protection. This ideological turn, whose genesis is traceable to Hayek (1944) with subsequent intellectual development from Friedman (1962), emphasized retreat not only from command economy socialism, but also from the egalitarian liberalism associated with Keynes, and its underpinning of redistributative welfarism (Rawls, 2005). The visibility of this agenda was raised in the 1970s, and took acute political expression in the 1980s, in the transformative governments of Thatcher in the UK and of Reagan in the US; '…these vanguard regimes took momentous steps to construct, in the name of economic liberalization, a capital-centric order in which the impediments to accelerated finance-oriented accumulation were minimized or removed' (Peck & Tickell, 2007, p.28).

Advocates of neoliberalism extol a combination of a downsized state, free trade, flexible labor markets, enterprising individualism, and the compelling logic of competition. But, how deep these nostrums penetrate into contemporary polity remains contestable. Arguments persist about its uneven application; whether it represents a new 'regime' of accumulation or a transitory disordered phase between the optimism of major government projects such as 'the Great Society' in the 1960s and a

new regulatory era yet to take clear form; or whether its high tide has ebbed in many places in favor of a more socially responsible capitalism, which though endorsing the pre-eminence of the market, accommodates inventive forms of public-private partnership. Nevertheless, its dominance has narrowed the political space for collectivist manifestoes around public value and social equity, and, with specific reference to academy, its influence has helped introduce a corporatist approach. Partly, this is reflected in the appropriation of business language and practice, with the associated elevation of efficiency and cost effectiveness within institutional imperatives (Gumport, 2000). Partly, it can be represented in the reduction of collegial consultation and participation in favor of more managerialist leadership and decision-making (Kerr, 1998); a related rise in central administrative staff; and the importation of an audit culture and ritualistic performance measurement (Bleiklie, 1998; Strathern, 2000). Overall, this shift in university governance is taken by many to be rooted in beliefs about the ascendancy of market principles and the efficacy of imitating business practice (Braun & Merrien, 1999).

Within neo-liberalism, the claims for de-regulated flexible labor markets rank high. Thus, within universities, a new class system is emerging, where not only is research privileged over teaching and service (Fairweather, 1996), but an increasing share of faculty are on restricted temporary contracts assigning them to a Fordist-style teaching of large numbers of under-graduates, while the tenured faculty are ever more dedicated to research and selective post-Fordist graduate teaching. Beyond such downsizing, this creation of a more entrepreneurial professoriate is supported by differential incentives that particularly reward the generation of research income and peer-reviewed journal publication (Baldwin & Krotseng, 1995; Anderson, 2002). In this new marketized environment, students become consumers, encouraged to view their college experience as the route to individual career and acquisitive ambition in an increasingly competitive economy (Leslie & Slaughter, 1995). Courses are more vocationally oriented, pursue a more instrumentalist pedagogy, pitch tuition fees on a more lucrative basis, and are valued in terms of their output of knowledge-intensive human capital. For some, the educational reform over recent times has followed a deliberate neo-liberal agenda in not merely reacting to the market, but rather in proactively lending the ‘hidden hand’ a helping hand (Gordon & Whitty, 1997).

Such a shift holds contradictions for the academy. For instance, the development of a more hierarchical ‘line management’ model is at odds with evidence that flatter, more collegial structures that accommodate more inclusive decision-making, in turn, help promote more creative outcomes (Florida, 2005). Such inventiveness is a premium component of frontier intellectual inquiry, the central purpose of a research university. Moreover, insofar as the primary institutional focus is on its ‘top down’ administrative and fund-raising program, the intellectual energy that generates upwards from its academic staff risks being under-valued or even stifled.

But, the impact of this agenda has not been peculiar to the U.S. Rather, the global spread of these societal changes means that since the 1970s there has "everywhere been an emphatic turn towards …(these)…political economic practices and thinking. Deregulation, privatization and the withdrawal of the state from many areas of social provision have been all too common. (And)…have entailed much 'creative destruction,' not only of prior institutional frameworks and powers but also of divisions of labor, social relations, welfare provisions, technological mixes ways of life and thought…" (Harvey, 2005, p. 3). In this view, the public good will be optimized through the extension of market relations into previously socialized realms, such as education.

However, it is important to acknowledge that this apparent hegemony has been uneven in operation, and contains its own contradictions. As noted by Peck and Tickell (2007, p.33), its actual forms are hybrids of its 'pure' version and leftovers of its antecedents: : 'Only rhetorically does neoliberalism mean 'less state': in reality, it entails a thorough-going reorganization of governmental systems and state-economy relations….this program involves the roll-out of new state forms, new modes of regulation, new regimes of governance, with the aim of consolidating and managing both marketization and its consequences.' Thus, the application of the neoliberal project has been often more pragmatic than its more doctrinaire formulation might suggest. Similarly, the expression of neoliberalism in any particular institution such as the academy is likely to be uneven, and to contain elements of former regimes as well as outcomes of resistance and prefigurative alternative formations.

Whether emphasized as neo-liberalism and/or globalization, this institutional shift is evident at not only local and national levels, but also in the widespread global networks of material and cultural relations. As the geography of political and economic change seems to be shifting outward, it also seems to contain a decidedly urban shift. Humans today live in an "urban world" made up of "global (i.e. increasingly 'diverse') cities" (Clark, 1999). Though this urban and global turn is far from new (Bender, 2000; Fainstein, 1990), what separates contemporary institutional transformations from the past are their scale, pace and international character (Van Ginkel, 2003). Castells (1996) suggests that the time and space of these patterns are caught up in a whole new mode of societal production of information and communication technology -- collapsing old notions of political economy through the erasure of borders and the simultaneous synchronicity of relations. Such compression of time and space render the particular geography of the state, with its control of the territory within its borders and the space of production regulated by such geographic arrangements, secondary to new *networks* of relations — giving form to a "Network Society." (Castells, 1996). Part of this new 'networking' involves the reconfiguration of private and public sectors, and a new mixed economy of social provision.

(3) mixed economy of welfare, has involved processes of privatization and reductions in public funding, and this welfare pluralism has contributed to a falling share of university finances coming from the public purse. The impulses of the 'neoliberal' state – at least rhetorically -- to regressive taxation, fiscal rectitude, and welfare reform such as workfare, impose challenges to the concept of the public university, supported by public funds. In turn, this has induced the sector to broaden its fiscal base by commercializing more of its operations (Newman, Couturier, & Scurry, 2004), including: real estate development; partnerships with urban regeneration initiatives; high technology transfers; incubator services; seeking corporate sponsors; entering equity and licensing arrangements; and concentrating more on that research that yields commercial dividend (Powell & Owen-Smith, 1998; Duryea, 2000). In short, the premium on leading edge discovery and data in the 'knowledge age' invites the academy to commodify its key product: knowledge.

But, such revenue streams have provoked controversy about the extent to which they compromise intellectual integrity, challenge academic freedom, produce conflicts of interest, and deform research agendas away from public concerns and toward private profit (Hollingsworth, 2000; Washburn, 2005). Indeed, writing about the Australian experience of this process, Marginson and Consindine (2001) characterize it as the integration of the university into the capitalist mode of production, a claim echoed in what others refer to as 'academic capitalism' (Slaughter & Leslie, 1998) and the 'privatizing' of academy (Kelsey, 1998). This move to being a business like any other, according to Barnett and Griffin (1997) has led to an 'end of knowledge' in higher education, nothing less than 'a selling out' (Giroux, 2003). A central paradox identified by Meyer (2002) is how this new university can be at once 'soulless' for staff and student alike, and 'contested' around all of the contentious features of the enterprise culture.

Counter to such reservations about this university-industrial complex, there are some who argue for a legitimate collaboration between the two (Giamatti, 1982). Recognizing knowledge-based enterprises as drivers of economic growth, they insist that public universities contribute to a public good when they help to promote economic development in their cities and hinterlands. In particular, they can link with local R& D centers; foster innovation; spin-off start-ups and expansions with their intellectual property; and help to stimulate an entrepreneurial culture and creative milieu (Branscomb et al., 1999; Varga, 2000; Glazer & Grimes, 2004). For some time now, universities have been acknowledged for the multiplier impact they exert on local economies through their role as: major employer, consumer, educator, land developer, researcher, culture provider, and such like. But, more recently, with respect to state and land-grant institutions, state governments are granting certain funds, in expectation that they focus even more closely on their unique contribution, through research, patents, disclosures, licensing, and workforce development, to their state's competitiveness and prosperity (Schmidt,

2000). But, in the view of Washburn, this represents not so much a partnership as a corporate takeover (Washburn, 2005, p. x, xi): "The problem is not university-industry relationship per se; it is the elimination of any clear boundary line separating academia from commerce….The question of who **owns** academic research has grown increasingly contentious, as the openness and sharing that once characterized university life has given way to a new proprietary culture more akin to the business world."

In this move to commercialize, she sees the lure of another Silicon Valley inducing state legislators and college Presidents to invest their hopes in university-led research in growth areas like pharmaceuticals and biotechnology. Yet, "in reality, a mere two dozen universities in the entire country make significant profits from technology licensing. Many others barely break even – or *lose* money" (ibid., p. xii). This circumspect view about the extent to which academia can contribute to state economic development is supported in other literature (Feller, May 2004). Indeed, a wider critique of the intrusion of market ideology into the public realm identifies the difference between price and value and the potential mismatch between market mechanisms and the valid metrics for evaluating effectiveness in public service (Kuttner, 1997).

Universities once were privileged sites of knowledge, and sites of national, often local, identity and accomplishment, to which people physically traveled to learn and collaborate in knowledge production. Today, the transfer and production of knowledge are not limited to particular physical sites or indeed traditional institutions such as academy. For some, this change is monumental, reflecting what one observer calls a "Copernican change" in the structure and practices of societal institutions, most distinctly evident in higher education. (Van Ginkel, 2003, p. 76). For universities, these seismic shifts in institutional context, generated by neo-liberalism and the globalizing relations of the "information society" (Castells, 1997), challenge and perhaps even redefine, to some extent, the essentially 'unique' institutional purpose and practice of the academy (Van Ginkel, 2003).

Since they have forfeited any claim to monopoly in the creation of frontier knowledge, universities no longer command support as ''sanctioned sites for the production of innovations in the arts, the sciences and the professions, and still less support for continuing as places of 'disinterested knowledge' in the quest for a better society'' (Calas & Smircich, 2001, p. 148). Faced with new rivals, they are pressured to be more entrepreneurial and competitive (Clark, 1998). In reaching for wider recognition for their brand, they are tempted to translate complex critical appraisals into digestible media soundbites that catch headlines at the cost of deleting cautionary qualification. While critics like Bok (2003) acknowledge these dynamics, they remain convinced that the move into the marketplace has gone too far, to the deleterious consequence for core educational mission and other objectives such as addressing equity and diversity.

(4) diversity: This goal comprises many dimensions, including: the racial/ethnic composition of student intake (Bowen & Bok, 1998); the efficacy of affirmative action and related policies of discriminatory admissions (Gurin et al., 2004); the implications for enhanced multicultural curriculum (Banks, 2002), and for standards and educational outcomes (Gurin et al., 2002); and the imperative for a less ethno-centric scholarship among faculty (Boyer, 1990). This visceral issue of diversity and inclusiveness has drawn both critic and advocate. While some associate it with a 'political correctness' that augurs both a 'dumbing down' and a disruptive intrusion of 'culture wars' onto the campus, supporters insist that it properly reflects changing demographics and social heterogeneity, with potentially great educational dividend (Orfield & Kurlaender, 2001; Turner et al., 2002). Lasch (1996) complains that greater attention to diversity and pluralism offers little consolation to graduates, who are less literate than ever, and this theme is developed by Black, who sees the American university in freefall, debasing the minds and morals of its students (2004, p. xiv): "The university today is an academic system that rewards novelty, extreme positions, and radical theories, and it favors any intellectual trope that panders to the prevailing anti-American bias of the academy."

It should be acknowledged that such concerns are not new. For instance, the longer standing feminist agenda about gender access to, and power relations within, campus has disturbed, if not dislodged, the patriarchal comfort zone of an institution renowned for valuing tradition (Blackmore, December 2003). However, an indication of the complexities of implementing a campus politics around equality and diversity is found in Cooper (2004), who illustrates the plasticity and ambiguity attached to these concepts. Thus, for instance, the principle of pluralism cannot entail the endorsement of *all* difference, since power relations of discrimination and subordination determine certain forms of social difference and identity. While the campus has been trying to grapple with this thorny issue over recent decades, Cooper argues for a diversity anchored in a broader appreciation of human solidarity that facilitates choices and dissent --- values that would seem to be very consonant with academy. But, in what way is this civic solidarity evident in university priorities?

(5) community engagement: Historically, the relationship between town and gown has operated along a spectrum between involvement and detachment (Bender, 1993). Certainly, recent decades have witnessed a re-awakening of the civic responsibility of academy, most evidently perhaps in the US (Ehrlich, ed., 2000), and of the reciprocities that can bestow mutual benefit (DeMulder & Eby, 1999). Advocates of university-community partnership have noted how the three conventional goals of universities — to teach, research and to serve — can operate in silos rather than in synergy, and indeed, how the service component can be relatively marginalized (Stukel, 1994). The Office of University Partnerships, established by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in 1994 and dismantled in 2004 by the federal government, was designed in large part to link the

significant leverage of universities — physical, economic, political, technical and intellectual — to the assets and capacities of the most vulnerable communities in a blend that works for both partners (COPC, 2001). In this view, the academy is invariably seen as the senior partner, being a resource-rich institution of high social visibility and status, with the permanent presence to permit long term strategic planning. By contrast, community is perceived as largely the recipient poor relation, with more transitional social infrastructure.

But, a more radical engagement is conceivable beyond this standard outreach model (Feld, 1998; Rubin, 1998; Maurrasse, 2001). Rooted in a new scholarship that appreciates how 'community' constitutes an important site of knowledge production (Schon, 1995; Boyer, 1996), it seeks a genuine cross-fertilization between formal and experiential learning as part of an effective social intervention for urban and regional development. But, this 'engaged model' implies that the purpose and character of academy will be transformed in the dynamic of such a more equitable partnership (Walshok, 1995; Silka, 1999). For some, this change actually involves a 'back to the future' rediscovery of the best traditions of the democratic cosmopolitan civic university (Benson & Harkavy, 2000), while for others, such an historic vision no longer suffices in the contemporary global context (Perry, 2005).

The university can contribute to the socio-economic development of its urban hinterland in many ways: its *economic multipliers* in terms of targeted purchasing and employment strategies; use of *applied research* to tackle social problems and to optimize community assets; *knowledge, skills and technology transfer* that equips local people to undertake their own research, evaluation, and development; *inter-disciplinary perspectives* to illuminate cross-cutting and integrating approaches to local development; *comparative policy analysis* that permits the identification of model programs and best practice across the world, and their customized transferability to local situations; *networking* local organizations into a wider regional and international milieu that enhances their social capital; use of *dialogic spaces* — by way of neutral secure locations for open engagement amongst diverse and contesting constituencies, with university facilitation where helpful; *outreach scholarship* that relates teaching to community needs and addresses the issue of educational under-attainment and working class access to post secondary, professional education; *student community service* that also provides participants with 'real life' learning opportunities, and the relation of theory to practice; and *institutional leadership* in the whole realm of public policy.

However, this potential is debilitated by certain exigencies, including: the *bureaucratic* traditions typical of large durable institutions; the *poor status* traditionally accorded to community engagement, as reflected in the university reward structure; the *culture of staff autonomy* that requires patient cajoling rather than instant coercion in order to spur staff co-operation with such an agenda; the tendency for departments to operate in *disciplinary silos*, with few incentives for staff to operate

collegially or to create inter-disciplinary research teams; the *financial pressure* on universities to maximize lucrative knowledge transfer in the new economy rather than to devote resources to less financially enriching activity; and the *stereotypical image of ivory tower institutions*, given over to detached esoteric study and theorization rather than to socially useful scientific investigation. In the US, other negative factors can apply, such as the levy exemptions available to universities that in turn erode the tax base for local social consumption, and the way they can become major property developers, gentrifying rather than sustainably renewing their neighborhood.

Finally, bringing together many of these themes, as the university is pressured to favor certain kinds of knowledge, to re-think ethno-centric perspectives, to appreciate different sites of knowledge production, and to commercialize knowledge transfer, the very issue of what constitutes valid knowledge is itself subject to contention amid the ferment generated by post-modernism.

(6) post-modernist perspectives: These disavow the certitude of unitary and universalist concepts such as truth and meaning, arguing that they do not exist independent of variant cultural interpretation and social contingency. Such a view cuts to the core of what universities have been about (Bloland, 1995). Indeed, it has been seen by some academics as a threat to the very currency of their profession, offering ambivalence and sophistry in place of 'authentic' epistemology. As expressed by Willard (1994, p. 3) "the heart of the university crisis is, in my view, the simple fact that the institutional structures and processes are no longer organized around knowledge". If all maxims, logic and understanding are, if not delusional or absolutist, then certainly conditional and temporal (Willard, 1994), this relativist position is taken by such critics to render scientific insight as little more than discourse. Moreover, *in extremis*, the related loss of faith in rationality, alongside a greater respect for 'multiple realities' and human emotive and intuitive capacities, is seen to degrade traditional categories like disciplines and standards. Finally, the adherence to relativism seems to warrant the volatility of endless textual analysis, a deconstruction in which denotative language, sublimation and oblique reference are constantly subject to meticulous interrogation and dispute (Rorty, 1982).

In rejoinder, the adherents see such critiques as a vulgar misread of a subtle proposition. For instance, they insist that disavowal of totalistic meta-narratives is not a contrivance for atheoreticism, but rather a recognition that a complex contemporary world is not subject to discoverable social laws that contain prescriptive or predictive capacity. Pursuing knowledge in an age of uncertainty demands a more reflexive approach on the part of the academic, a re-think about the scope of science, and receptivity to the challenging pace and scale of change (Duderstadt, 2003). A 'knowledge society' inevitably invites more dispute about the nature of knowledge itself, an unnerving process for higher education (Delanty, 2001), and in such context, part of the problem can be seen in terms of a more fundamental phenomenon ---- the current feast of information amid a famine of meaning (Baudrillard,

1988). Such intellectual parsing of the state of knowledge has found a very different way into the structure of the academy. The modern organization of the disciplines of the academy has become an object of increasing "re-visioning" in the strategic nostrums of "interdisciplinarity," "multi-disciplinarity" and "transdisciplinary" reach. While the *tenets* of science as characterized by the formal disciplines of the modern academy have not been fully engaged or critically re-written, the academic units that contain them have become objects of strategic university restructuring, auguring a "late modern" if not "post modern" institutional reconsideration of higher education.

Impact of Discourses on US Academy

In summary, the overarching discourse of globalization is the product of several discourses, that, when taken collectively, offer an insight into universities in their global and city/regional contexts. (Rhodes, 2001; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Gieger 2004) As such, universities are viewed at once as important to this new glo-calizing order and yet required to undertake more of their economic and civic functions on their own. The synchronicity of this new order brings new opportunities for collaboration, but new requisites of entrepreneurial independence and competition. (Breton & Lambert, 2004; Shapiro, 2005) For example, the increasing importance of "knowledge- economy-driven" education to human capital development makes the university both more valued and more vulnerable in a new, open, often global quest for students, research funding and private as well as public fiscal support. (Perry & Weiwel, 2007; Gaffikin, 2008). At the same time, many in government and business view universities as "engines" for competitive economic development (CEO's for Cities, ICC, 2002) —a centerpiece of the "knowledge sector." This new sector depends, in turn, on "innovation" and collaboration between scholarship and entrepreneurship and strategic investment on the part of higher education in the local and global development economies of real estate, technology and proprietary enterprise. For many universities, this constitutes new territory – where success will require new definitions of autonomy, collaboration and new institutional measures of achievement not found in traditional academic or even public policy metrics (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Gieger, 2004; Rhodes, 2001).

While the pace, scale, and diffusion of this contemporary makeover can be unnerving for institutions habituated to autonomy and traditional status, universities cannot escape its repercussion (Goddard, 1999). In such a globalized environment, they face greater competition for students, staff and research funding, and consequently, greater 'consumer sovereignty' among students and corporate sponsors. Meanwhile, other providers contest their previous near monopoly in high grade education and research services, and it even can be suggested that globalist information technologies, via interactive video and high speed wireless platforms, can replace the centralist and elitist learning

culture of university with a more accessible and democratic on-line format. Already, universities in the UK are developing the concept of the e-university, and this is also being taken up by the European Union. More recently in the United States, the University of Illinois has floated a proposal to add a fully virtual campus to its system, called the "Global Campus."

Amid such challenge and change, universities, especially public ones, find traditional state support substantially declining relative to their costs, even as their societal importance is being highlighted as never before, since recourse to the national state is constrained by its own reconfiguration and fiscal pressure within globalization (deWit, 2002). Moreover, in an age when intellectual capital is more mobile and transferable, universities have to opt whether to export their contribution via new distance learning technologies or new campus plant overseas, or some collaborative franchising arrangement with other providers, or adopt some permutation of all three. Indeed, the whole concept of 'the university campus' may be subject to a radical re-think, with some arguing that universities risk their competitiveness unless they reduce those production costs associated with expensive ancillary facilities such as sports fields, social centres and libraries. Yet, others will insist that in a competitive environment, students will select the campus that offers the best overall 'College experience', in terms of amenities and ambience.

In short, thriving locally in this international age induces key institutions like universities to strive for 'world class' pedigree (Kanter, 1995). But, this global entrepreneurialism need not necessarily imperil the local dimension (Deem, 2001), and it need not involve a shift from the principle of *knowledge as an end* to the expediency of *the end of knowledge* (Delanty, 1998). Rather, some see a combination of the global, national, and local focus --- or what has been dubbed the 'glonacal' (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002) --- as offering a new synergy for academy. Apart from facilitating certain of its key canons, such as the free flow of ideas, it offers new networks and less ethno-centric perspectives. For instance, it allows for the *collaborative advantage* of international joint ventures among universities rather than an exclusive concern about *competitive advantage*, in ways that do not prelude the local-national axis being both a source and beneficiary of leading-edge knowledge production. The inclusion of higher education in multilateral treaties testifies to this significant dimension, and for American universities, the increasing use of English as an international language offers further scope in this regard. Thus, instead of the predominant academic view of globalization as a fixed, uniformly negative, neo-liberal project at odds with liberal education values, a more reflexive analysis suggests otherwise. In fact, improved global networking holds scope for university consortia to advance transactional learning experience that enriches its participants, extends the boundaries of intellectual discovery, and opens the potential for a real trans-cultural engagement (Perorazio, 2004). On this argument, we need more rather than less globalization —– but, of a kind that enhances mutual learning and understanding, and promotes democratic exchange.

Nevertheless, despite evidence of universities in the US and elsewhere responding to this new world in ways that engender greater convergence in the global patterns in higher education (Scott, ed., 1998) certain practical impediments are seen to persist. For instance, there is no global imprimatur for degree accreditation. Issues about patenting intellectual property, and indeed disseminating knowledge worldwide in the internet age, remain vexed (Atkinson, 2001). Many ideas for a new global scholarship may be sound, but their implementation may not. For instance, while increasing recruitment of overseas students can offer a diversity that extends a still largely ethno-centric curriculum and better informs classroom dialogue, it may be used by university authorities as a means of mass teaching for job-related qualifications, alienating those home students that feel 'crowded out' of college places by the new competition.

It is argued therefore, that the institutional role of universities in this new era will be at once challenging and unsettling, since traditional models of either the ivory tower or old style town – gown collaboration with civic agencies will no longer suffice if the contemporary university is to thrive (Rhodes, 2001). Forced to shake free of old dependencies, they are being pressured to substantially alter both their make-up and agenda to optimize their stimulative role in this new political economy. This is said to require them "to strengthen and diversify their external relations with stakeholders, as well as their sources of financing. Consequently, universities must rethink their modes of governance, their financing, their internal structure and external relations, as well as their modes of operation" (Van Ginkel, 2003, p. 77). But, what causes concern for some is the extent to which these reconfigurations will alter the very nature of the academy and shift its fundamental, if not universalist purposes of learning and knowledge creation into a corporatist institutional agent of the knowledge economy, seeking global reach and research for motives of market and entrepreneurial advantage.

In applying this synthesis of discourses of globalization to the American research university, we see something of the logic of the institutional changes they describe, of the transformations of organizational identity and the reinvigoration and redefinition of mission as they are found in studies of the modern research institution. However, it is not enough to simply offer a fresh synthesis of these composite discourses of globalization as they are played out in American higher education. The second goal is to see if they have any resonance in the formal purposive organizational discourses of university strategic planning.

Institutional Discourses of American Universities in the Era of Globalization

What follows is an exploratory review of the strategic documents of a select sample of the largest research universities in the United States in order to find evidence of how universities are responding to the institutional challenges of late modernity. Conceivably, the most important 'brand' statement of the research university that embraces its full range of institutional/structural initiatives is what has come to be called the "strategic plan." The "strategic" documents studied here are public reports that provide information on a research university's mission, vision, goals, actions and outcomes. We have determined that the commonality of such plans, offer comparable inter-institutional evidence with which to assess the presence of the key institutional discourses of "globalization," discussed previously in this article. The subsequent content analysis of university plans seeks to determine how much these discourses of globalization have come to characterize the purposes and values of the contemporary research academy.

At the same time, we want to learn about how much the university is strategizing campus development within a vision of alternative institutional futures: beyond physical plants that are "enclaves" distant from the turmoil of urban and global life, to institutions that are at once "international" (Lambert & Butler, 2006; Altbach & Umakoshi, 2004) in their student profiles and knowledge clusters, socially "engaged" (Kellogg Commission, 1999) with their local hinterland, and ''entrepreneurial" (CEOs for Cities. 2002; Perry & Wiewel, 2007) in their research directions and their fiscal and developmental activities. Further, in an era when funding for the academy is shifting along with the role of state support for higher education, we also want to assess these planning documents for a strategic turn to proprietary, managerial, bottom line and "corporatist" forms of administration, which appear at odds with traditional precepts of academic autonomy and faculty governance.

Methodology

In terms of methodology, the study is focused on three different constellations of research universities: the top 127 research universities in the United States as measured in terms of $20 million or more in research expenditures the top 50 American research universities, public and private, as measured along nine variables, including research expenditures, endowment, faculty awards and student SAT/GRE ranking. To determine which American research universities to use for our study we consulted a master list of American research universities compiled by the Lombardi Program on Measuring University Performance. They defined major research universities located in

the United States and Canada as those whose total annual research expenditures were at least $20 million. Identifying Schools that exceeded this threshold gave us 127 institutions in our initial analysis and a sample of the 23 of the top public and private universities were chosen randomly from the "top fifty" for more detailed analysis. It was split quite evenly between public (12) and private institutions (11) [1]. Each university in the sample displayed some form of strategic plan or action document on its web site, with a testament to its currency and its relevance to administrative decision-making. For each sampled institution, a ranking system was employed to determine the extent and intensity of the discourses as a measure of the role they play in the university's institutional goals and strategic direction. In gathering the public records and electronic links to available strategic documents of each of the 127 universities, note was taken as to whether each university had a strategic document as earlier defined. Thorough searching was done through the institution's home page and administrative sections to access the most comprehensive and *cross-departmental* overall strategic document. Separate plans and documents outlining strategies for specific schools, departments, or university offices were excluded. Strategic goals and initiatives related to more narrow subdivisions within the university, if included in the overall strategic document, were included in our analysis.

As Table 1 shows, roughly 73% of the major US research universities made formal strategic plans publicly available. Public universities (85.33%) were more likely to have these than were private universities (55.77%). A much smaller number of universities publicly displayed other documents from which could be determined core elements of institutional strategic planning, even though these documents were not formal plans. When the two groups of documents were combined, almost all public universities and a smaller, but still impressive, number of private institutions evidenced recognizable public discussion of key elements of institutional strategic programming [2].

Each public document of each university was then analyzed for the presence of one or all of the following key elements:

- ***Vision*** – Overriding goal or possible landmark achievement that sets the framework for the university's planning future.
- ***Mission*** – The things the university strives for, its ultimate ends and ambitions. The mission is what informs the university's activities to reach towards the stated vision.
- ***Values*** – The principles, ideals, strengths and ideals the institution will exercise as it conducts its activities.
- ***Goals*** – Initiatives and benchmarks that will be met in the achievement of the vision.
- ***Actions*** – Specific programs that will be created, specific research projects that will be undertaken, and specific action steps that will achieve the stated goals.

TABLE 1: Publicy Available Strategic Documents Among American Universities With Annual Research Expenditures of At Least $20 Million*			
	Total Schools	Publicly Available Documents	Percentage
Public Universities	75	64	85.33
Private Universities	52	29	55.77
All Universities	127	93	73.23

*Expenditure data as of December 2004

Of the 93 major American research universities, public and private, with some form of strategic planning document, a substantial percentage, sometimes higher than 90 percent and never lower than forty percent, exhibited some, if not all, key elements of modern organizational planning. (See Tables 2 & 3)

Table 2: Presence of Plan Elements Among American Universities With Annual Research Expenditures of At Least $20 Million*			
	Public Universities total 75	Private Universities total 52	All Univ. total 127
Vision	54	22	76
Mission	70	39	109
Values	52	19	71
Goals	71	28	99
Actions	65	21	86

TABLE 3: Percentage of Schools Evidencing a Plan Element			
	Public Universities	Private Universities	All Universities
Vision	72.00%	42.31%	59.84%
Mission	93.33%	75.00%	85.83%
Values	69.33%	36.54%	55.91%
Goals	94.67%	53.85%	77.95%
Actions	86.67%	40.38%	67.72%

One obvious conclusion for this data is that most universities have generated a purposive public description of their institutional goals, practices and aspirations. On this basis, we studied the public documents of university strategies outlining institutional vision, mission, values goals and action-steps as an exploratory assessment, both quantitative and qualitative, of the role of global discourses in modern higher education.

Universities, their Plans and Globalizing Discourses

Every occurrence of a discourse within the text of the planning documents of each university in the sample was recorded, as were the times each discourse appeared. Because of a wide range in size

for planning documents, a ratio of discourses per page was created. This ratio was developed by first converting all plan text into Word, deleting extended extraneous text (such as bibliographies, acknowledgements, copyrights, etc.) and recreating each document, using the metric of 250 words equaling a single page. The number of discourse appearances was then divided by the number of pages and the resulting ratio of appearances per page is used to give some quantitative rating of the presence of each discourse to overall strategic thinking. Grading the prevalence of a particular discourse in American higher education was then based on the percentage of the sample that scored a "weak," "average," "strong" or "very strong" rate of appearances of each discourse per plan. (See Table 4)

Table 4: Quantitative Measure of the Global Discourses in the Public Plans of U.S. Research Universities

University	Type	Diversity	Postmodernism	Neoliberalism	Mixed Economy	Globalization	Community Engagement
Dartmouth University	private	0.64	0.34	0.59	0.27	0.44	0.34
Duke University	private	0.51	0.47	0.48	0.39	0.43	0.28
Emory University	private	0.83	0.94	0.73	0.57	1.55	1.2
New York University	private	0.19	0.04	0.95	0.34		0.38
Northwestern University	private	0.09	1.28	1.7	0.38	0.17	0.09
Pennsylvania State University-University Park	public	0.85	0.21	1.49	1.49	0.85	1.27
Princeton University	private	0.17	0	0.5	0.2	0.06	0.01
Rice University	private	0.2	0.49	0.88	0.25	0.56	0.58
Stanford University	private	0.12	0.15	0.28	0.38	0.1	0.05
Texas A&M University	public	0.28	0.3	0.74	0.83	0.64	0.46
University of Alabama-Birmingham	public	2.34	0	3.51	2.93	1.76	2.93
University of Arizona	public	1.08	0.26	0.73	0.96	0.64	0.73
University of California-Berkeley	public	0.13	0.39	0.58	0.24	0.25	0.14
University of California-Davis	public	0.98	0.73	1.46	2.32	1.46	1.58
University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign	public	0.29	0.23	0.41	0.7	1.34	0.58
University of Southern California	private	0.17	0.6	0.77	0.38	1.83	0.72
University of Texas-Austin	public	0.14	0.02	0.32	0.19	0.07	0.32
University of Washington-Seattle	public	0.5	1	0.5	0	0.5	1.5
University of Wisconsin-Madison	public	0.9	0.41	1.11	0.58	1.73	1.28
Johns Hopkins University	private	0.26	0.28	1.18	0.33	0.51	0.28
Vanderbilt University	private	0.14	0.24	0.33	0.08	0.03	0.08
Purdue University-West Lafayette	public	0.51	0.61	0.7	0.7	1.4	1.26
University of Maryland-College Park	public	1.05	0.13	0.57	0.75	0.29	1.7
		Diversity	**Postmodernism**	**Neoliberalism**	**Mixed Economy**	**Globalization**	**Community Engagement**
average all public		0.75416667	0.3575	1.01	0.974166667	0.910833333	1.145833333
average all private		0.30181818	0.439090909	0.76272727	0.324545455	0.516363636	0.364545455
average all schools		0.53782609	0.396521739	0.89173913	0.663478261	0.755	0.772173913

While not all discourses are evenly displayed in the purposive institutional discourses of higher education, it is clear that all six discourses are clearly in play in US higher education today, with universities strategically positioning themselves as “engaged” “international/global” and increasingly “efficient” institutions, bent on maintaining and expanding “diversity” among their students and faculty.

But more than this, quantitative measure of discourse appearances in the strategic plans was required to get a fuller indication of the perceived place of these issues in the future of research universities. Here we add a qualitative assessment of the sample institutions’ strategic documents that measures the overall importance of each of the six discourses to a plan by rating its substantive centrality to the institution along a range of 0-3, with:

0- meaning that the discourse is not mentioned at all;

1-meaning that the discourse is mentioned among other ideas, but not emphasized;

2-meaning that the discourse is highly visible in the documents, and elaborated in the documents; and

3-meaning a discourse is a central part of the university’s plan and explicitly mentioned as part of all elements of the plan: mission, vision, etc. (See Table 5 and 6)

TABLE 5: Qualitative Measures of the Globalizing Discourses of Higher Education

University	public/private	Diversity	Postmodernism	Neoliberalism	Mixed Economy	Globalization	Community Engagement
Dartmouth University	private	3	2	3	2	3	2
Duke University	private	3	2	3	3	3	3
Emory University	private	2	3	3	1	2	3
New York University	private	3	1	2	2	3	3
Northwestern University	private	1	3	3	1	2	1
Pennsylvania State University -University Park	public	2	2	3	3	2	3
Princeton University	private	3	0	3	3	1	1
Rice University	private	2	3	3	2	1	3
Stanford University	private	2	3	3	3	2	1
Texas A&M University	public	3	3	3	3	3	3
University of Alabama -Birmingham	public	3	0	2	3	2	3
University of Arizona	public	3	1	2	3	1	3
University of California-Berkeley	public	2	3	3	3	2	2
University of California-Davis	public	3	1	2	3	2	3
University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign	public	3	1	2	3	3	3
University of Southern California	private	2	3	3	2	3	3
University of Texas-Austin	public	2	1	3	3	1	3
University of Washington-Seattle	public	1	2	2	0	2	2
University of Wisconsin-Madison	public	2	2	3	2	3	3
Johns Hopkins University	private	2	3	3	3	3	2
Vanderbilt University	private	3	3	3	2	1	1
Purdue University -West Lafayette	public	3	3	3	2	3	3
University of Maryland-College Park	public	3	3	3	3	3	3
number with quality 3		12	11	17	13	10	15
number with quality 2		9	5	6	7	8	4
number with quality 1		2	5	0	2	5	4
number with quality 0		0	2	0	1	0	0

TABLE 6: Percentage Distribution of Qualitative Measures of the Globalizing Discourses of Higher Education

Quality	Diversity	Post-Modernism	Neoliberalism	Mixed Economy	Globalization	Community Engagement
	%	%	%	%	%	%
3	52	48	74	56	43	65
2	39	22	26	30	34	17
1	9	22	0	9	22	17
0	0	9	0	4	0	0

Findings

With remarkable regularity, each of the discourses registered quite strongly in higher education. Some discourses were qualitatively more important than others, particularly 'neoliberal', 'mixed economy' and 'community engagement' discourses, but all six ranked as either "highly visible" or "central" elements (Tables 5 and 6) of the institutional strategies. Two discourses registered a bit less fully in this assessment. Post modernity may have ranked lower because its position in the academy has shifted: what was before a challenging discourse that went to the heart of the sociology of knowledge has now become "institutionalized" as interdisciplinarity, represented by change in some of the more pervasive disciplinary silos of the institutions. The lower ranking of the globalization discourse, itself, may have a similar explanation in that it is now so intrinsic and pervasive in its institutional influence, that it does not merit too much explicit particular mention. For instance, the New York University Presidential Transition Team (2002) report takes for granted that the global perspective is inescapable in the contemporary world. In similar vein, Duke University's strategic plan (2001, p. 23) states simply: "Internationalization is an important intellectual trend in itself and has been a growing priority for Duke for several years". The University of Southern California, in its Plan For Excellence (2000, p. 2), affirms that it 'will create a significant global presence that will increase international visibility, reach and impact of our research, scholarship, art, education and service….To best serve the interests of Los Angeles and Southern California, our faculty need to understand the region in its global context…The demand for education is increasingly worldwide, and the best students will view higher education as an international market, heightening competition and creating a truly global student body'. And the University of Pennsylvania's "Building on Excellence" plan (2002, p. 7) perhaps puts this notion of the pervasiveness of "globalization" best: **"**All twelve of Penn's schools and virtually every academic program incorporate a global perspective as part of their curricula, and faculty in a wide variety of disciplines view international issues and comparative approaches as integral to

their own research agenda. Indeed, the global dimension of virtually every discipline is becoming increasingly important as technology reduces the natural barriers of time and space, and this trend is likely to continue".

For some universities, the particular imperative is to prepare their students for active involvement in a working and living environment that reflects this increasingly 'networked' reality. For instance, the University of Wisconsin-Madison (2005, p. 5) strategic plan speaks of assisting "students in preparing for citizenship in a diverse and global world". In this shrinking arena, the influence of neoliberal emphasis on the need to compete and to subordinate educational goals to economic ones is apparent in the corporatist agenda emerging in many institutions. For instance, the strategic plan from the Princeton Board of Trustees (2000) affirms its determination to maintain a superior student-faculty ratio to that of competitor institutions, while the University of Wisconsin-Madison's strategic plan (2005a, p.9) states: "We must find ways to better understand the needs of employers, and to identify new and emergent educational interests of potential students, allowing us to remain visible and relevant in all quarters as a source of graduate and professional education". To achieve these objectives, many acknowledge the efficacy of a managerialist culture and efficiency measures for lean mean operation, in imitation of the corporate restructuring experienced in the private economy. As expressed by Rice University in its strategy (1997), cost-cutting and down-sizing measures similar to those practiced by many corporations are demanded. In similar vein, Penn State University (2003) affirms its restructuring to achieve cost efficiency through further consolidation of administrative and academic units.

This focus on institutional restructuring and resource constraint has induced, or at least been paralleled by, the move of the academy to enter into new relationships with business, as evident in the spread of task forces to advance university-business relations. As expressed in Duke's strategy: "We have begun to link our research efforts with those of the private sector and neighboring public universities in ways that should substantially enhance our quality in the next decade" (2005a: p.24). Almost every university finding strategic direction in the mixed economy approach described research entrepreneurship as a key to their future. Penn State University (2003), for example, emphasised its determination to adapt its intellectual property into the commercial arena.

However, universities do not perceive this emphasis on "research entrepreneurialism" as incompatible with civic obligation to their local hinterland: Duke, for example, writes in its strategic plan that "Our signature reflects a combination of place and scale and a relationship between campus and surrounding towns that is especially conducive to community" (p. 10).

Similarly, the search for excellence, efficiency and economic partners has not deflected Duke's (2001a) from a concern about diversity, an issue it has included as a category for school and departmental reviews.

This goal of diversity has become a significant one in over fifty percent of the major research university plans in the sample. For instance, NYU and Princeton emphasize the significance of a diverse faculty and student body, a goal echoed in the strategic plan of Iowa State University (2005, p.4) which seeks in its 2010 plan to "expand the diversity of people, ideas, and cultures, and nurture an environment in which diversity can thrive". Virginia Tech University (2001) acknowledges how, within a leading university, diversity enriches the learning experience.

Though there is no direct reference to 'post-modernism' to be found in these documents, new initiatives in interdisciplinarity, translational and action based research and study of identity have all contributed to the re-thinking of the research process and the nature of knowledge. As indicated by Rice University, effective approaches to problem solving have made the boundaries of traditional disciplines more porous. Northwestern University (2004, p. 3) takes an equally challenging look at the organization of knowledge in the academy in what it calls "Northwestern: The Highest Order of Excellence: A Planning Framework, 2005-2010: "We appreciate the creative tension between strong disciplinary and interdisciplinary pursuits…. At the same time, we expect the boundaries of academic disciplines to change over time as they are influenced by what was once interdisciplinary". The University of Southern California, in its Plan for Excellence (2000, p.2), brings together many of the themes outlined here:
"….some of the distinguishing features of our university, including our urban location, student diversity, breadth of disciplines and fields of study, strong reputation for interdisciplinary research and scholarship, close ties to the local community and the Pacific Rim…"

Conclusion

Patently, the modern university is no longer an "ivory tower" or "enclave" (if it ever was in reality). What we find at the end of this two-part study of literature on modern higher education research units and of their strategic documents, is that analysis of the primarily cased-based and experience-tinged literature of the global university is well displayed in the strategic documents of American research universities. However, as indicated in the analysis, there is no neat symmetry between the discourses and their 'translation' into the institutional reformulation of academy. In particular, the somewhat rarified discussions about post modernist epistemologies in the literature do not find clear resonance in the strategies and plans examined here.

Nevertheless, this article has argued that university strategic planning documents are key sites of institutional discourse, and the substantial presence in them of the global discourses identified here demonstrates that these themes are playing a key role in the institutional direction, goals and values of contemporary American higher education. Whether this means that the "academy" has been truly transformed into a "global" institution is unclear. The "globalness" found in the studies and documents of the modern research university, reviewed here, is, at least, an expanded way to view the modern higher education research unit. But whether it portends a significant change in the direction of higher education of the magnitude of Clark Kerr's assessment of the "great transformation" of the post war research university remains to be seen (Kerr, 1972, p. 86ff). As indicated at the start, this review of university strategic documents does not claim to assess the extent to which these themes are actually translated into actions. However, it does identify that, due to the diffusion of market ideas in the contemporary world, at least academy feels the need to engage with these issues in how they publicly represent themselves via their core strategic statements.

At the same time, this article has emphasized the survival of rival imaginaries to the dominant neoliberal global order. As articulated by Leitner et al. (2007, p. 319), these 'might promote collective rather than individual welfare; collaboration rather than competition; consensual rather than hierarchical decision making; recognition and respect for diversity rather than the promotion and commodification of individual identity; equity, justice, and social welfare rather than efficiency and competitiveness; and care for the environment rather than productivity, growth, and exploitation'. The content analysis of strategic documents undertaken here confirms that 'neoliberal globalization' is a deeply contested concept within academy as elsewhere. Will universities further appropriate the language and culture of business and marketing, and seek to 'brand' themselves globally as adaptive to dominant trends, particularly those that yield lucrative commercial return? Or, whatever the perceived political-economy hegemony, will they remain faithful to a core educational mission, involving challenge to orthodoxy and the independent pursuit of knowledge, while deploying all the positive potential of transnational and inter-sectoral networking in the global age? Thus far, the strategy statements and plans of leading US universities demonstrate that there is no determinist logic influencing such choices. Whatever the *structural* pressures toward a convergent neo-liberal and market-driven framework for institutional decision-making, there remains political space for the *agency* of staff, students, community and state to intervene with an alternative agenda.

Bibliography

Appadurai, A. (2001). Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination. In A. Appadurai (Ed.), *Globalization*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Anderson, E. (2002). *The New Professoriate*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.

Atkinson, R. (May 26, 2001). *The globalization of the university*. Inaugural address delivered at the Nagasaki University of Foreign Affairs, Japan. The text is to be found at: http://www.oap.ucsb.edu/diversity/docs/mitsuta.html

Altbach, P.G., & Umakoshi, T. (Eds.) (2004). *Asian universities: Historical perspectives and contemporary challenges.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Baldwin, R., & Krotseng, M. (1995). *Incentives in the Academy: Issues and Options, New Directions for Higher Education*, No 51. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Banks, J. (2002). Multicultural Education: Historical Developments, Dimensions and Practice. In C. Turner, A.L. Antonio, M. Garcia, B.V. Laden, A. Nora & C.L. Presley (Eds.), *Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education,* (2nd edition, pp. 427-457). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Barber, B. (1995). *Jihad vs. McWorld*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Barnett, R. & Griffin, A. (Eds.). (1997). *The End of Knowledge in Higher Education*. London: Cassell.

Baudrillard, J. (1988). *Selected Writings*. Edited by M. Poster. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bender, T, (1993). *Intellect and Public Life: Essays on the social history of academic intellectuals in the United States*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Bender, T, (2000). Lecture. Chicago Humanities Festival, November, 2000.

Benson, L. and Harkarky, I. (2000). Integrating the American system of higher, secondary, and primary education to develop civic responsibility. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic responsibility in higher education* (pp. 174-196). Phoenix: Oryx Press.

Berger, P. (2002). The Cultural Dynamics of Globalization. In Berger, P. & Huntington, S. (Eds.), *Many Globalizations: Cultural diversity in the contemporary world*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Berger, P. & Huntington, S. (Eds.). (2002). *Many Globalizations: Cultural diversity in the contemporary world*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Black, J.N. (2004). *The Freefall of the American University: How our colleges are corrupting the minds and morals of the next generation*. Nashville: WND Books.

Blackmore, J. (December 2003). Tracking the nomadic life of the educational researcher: What future for feminist public intellectuals and the performative university? *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 1-24.

Bleiklie, I. (1998). Justifying the evaluative state: New public management ideals in higher education. *European Journal of Education*, 33(3), 299-316.

Bloland, H. (1995). Postmodernism and Higher Education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 66(5), 521-570.

Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bowen, W.G. & Bok, D. (1998). *The Shape of the River: Long-term Consequences of Considering Race in College and University Admissions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer, E. (1996). The Scholarship of Engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach, 1,*11 - 20.

Branscomb, M., Kodama, F. & Florida, R. (Eds.). (1999). *Industrializing Knowledge: University-Industry Linkages in Japan and in the United States*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Braun, D. & Merrien, F-X. (Eds.). (1999). *Towards a new model of governance for universities? A comparative view*. Higher Education Policy Series, London: Jessica Kingsley.

Brenner, N. (1999). Globalisation as reterritorialisation: The re-scaling of urban governance in the European Union. *Urban Studies,* 36(3), 431-51.

Breton, G., & Lambert, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Universities and globalization: Private linkages, public trust.* Paris: UNESCO.

Caircross, F. (1997). *The Death of Distance. How the communications revolution is changing our lives*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Calas, M. & Smircich, L. (2001). Introduction: Does the house of knowledge have a future? *Organisation*, 8(2), 147-149.

Castells, M. (1996). *The rise of the network society.* Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.

Castells, M. (1997). *The Information Age: Economy, society and culture. Vol. 11: The power of identity*. 2nd edition. Malden MA; Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

CEOs for Cities. (2002). *Leveraging colleges and universities for urban economic revitalization*. Boston: CEOs for Cities.

Clark, B. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizing Pathway of Transformation*. London: Pergamon.

Clark, D. (1999) Urban World/Global City. Routledge.

Cooper, C. (2004). *Challenging Diversity: Rethinking equality & the value of difference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

COPC (Community Outreach Partnerships Centers), (2001). *COPC Annual Report 2000*, Washington, DC: US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

Deem, R. (2001). Globalization, new managerialism, academic capitalism, and entrepreneurialism in universities. Is the local dimension still important? *Comparative Education*, 37(1), 7-20.

Delanty, G. (1998). The idea of a university in the global era. From knowledge as an end to the end of knowledge? *Social Epistemology*, 12(1), 3-25.

Delanty, G. (2001). *Challenging Knowledge: The university in the knowledge society*. Buckingham: Open University Press and Society for Research in Higher Education.

DeMulder, E. & Eby, K. (1999). Bridging Troubled Waters: Learning Communities for the 21st Century, *American Behavioral Scientist,* 42(5), 892-901.

deWit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.

Dill, D. & Sporn, B. (Eds.), (1995). *Emerging patterns of social demand and university reform: Through a glass darkly*. New York: Pergamon.

Domestic Policy Council. (2006). *American Competitiveness Initiative: "Leading the World in Innovation."* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Science and Technology Policy.

Duderstadt, J.J. (2003). *A University for the 21st Century*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Duryea, E. (2000). *The Academic Corporation*, New York: Falmer Press.

Ehrlich, T. (ed.) (2000). *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*. Phoenix: Oryx Press.

Fainstein, S. (1990). Changing World Economy and Urban Restructuring. In D. Judd and M. Parkinson (Eds.), *Leadership and Urban Regeneration*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Fairweather, J. (1996). *Faculty Work and the Public Trust: Rethinking the Value of Teaching and Public Service in American Academic Life* (pp. 31-47). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Feld, M. (1998). Community Outreach Partnership Centers: Forging New Relationships Between University and Community, *Journal of Planning Education and Research,* 17(4), 285-290.

Feller, I. (May 2004). Virtuous and Vicious Cycles in the Contribution of Public Research Universities to State Economic Development Objectives. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 18(2), 138-150.

Florida, R. (2005). Cities and the Creative Class. London and New York: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archeology of Knowledge* (A.M. Sheridan-Smith trans.) London: Tavistock.

Friedman, M. (1962) *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago. University of Chicago Press.

Friedman, T. (2000). *The lexus and the olive tree: Understanding globalization*. New York: Anchor Books.

Gaffikin F. (2008). *Interface Between Academy and Community in Contested Space: the difficult dialogue* in Wiewel, W. and Perry, D. (eds) Global Universities and Urban Development. Case Studies and Analysis. London and New York. M.E.Sharpe.

Geiger, R.L. (2004). *Knowledge and money: Research universities and the paradox of the marketplace*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Giamatti, A. (1982). The University, Industry, and Cooperative Research. *Science*, 218 (4579), 1278-1280.

Giddens, A. (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gills, B. (2002). Democratizing globalization and globalizing democracy. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 581, 158-171.

Giroux, H. (2003). Selling out higher education. *Policy Futures in Education*, 1(1), 179-200.

Glazer, L., & Grimes, D. (2004). *A New Path to Prosperity? Manufacturing and Knowledge-based Industries as Drivers of Economic Growth*. Michigan Future Inc. and the University of Michigan.

Goddard, J. (1999). How universities can thrive locally in a global economy. In H. Gray (Ed.), *Universities and the creation of wealth*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Gordon, L., & Whitty, G. (1997). Giving the 'hidden hand' a 'helping hand': The rhetoric and reality of neo-liberal education reform in England and New Zealand. *Comparative Education*, 33(3), 453-467.

Greider, W. (1997). *One World, Ready or Not: The manic logic of global capitalism*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Gumport, P. (2000). Academic Restructuring: Organizational Change and Institutional Imperatives. *Higher Education*, 39, 67-91.

Gurin, P., Dey, E., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and Higher Education: Theory and Impact on Educational Outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(3), 330-366.

Gurin, P., Lehman, J., Lewis, E., Dey, E., Gurin, G., & Hurtado, S. (2004). *Defending Diversity: Affirmative Action at the University of Michigan*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Held, D. & McGrew, A. (Eds.). (2003). *The Global Transformation Reader: An introduction to the globalization debate*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Polity.

Harkavy, I., & Puckett, J. L. (1994). Lessons from Hull House for the contemporary urban university. *Social Service Review,* 68(3), 299-321.

Harvey, D. (2005) A Brief History of Neo Liberalism. Oxford University Press.

Hayek, F. (1944). The Road to Serfdom. London. Routledge.

Hersh, R., & Merrow, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Declining by Degrees: Higher Education at Risk*. New York: Palgrave.

Hirst, P., & Thompson, G. (1999). *Globalization in Question*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hollingsworth, P. (Ed.). (2000). *Unfettered Expression*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hoogvelt, A. (1997). *Globalization and the Postcolonial World: The new political economy of development*. London: Macmillan.

Initiatives for a Competitive Inner City. (2002). *Leveraging colleges and cities for urban economic development: An action agenda.* Boston: CEOs for Cities.

Jameson, F. & Miyoshi, M. (Eds.). (1998). *Cultures of Globalization*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.

Jameson, F. (1998). *Preface* in Jameson, F. and Miyoshi, M. (Eds), (1998). *Cultures of Globalization*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.

Johnston R.J., Gregory, D., Pratt, G., & Watts, M. (2000) *The Dictionary of Human Geography*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Kanter, R. (1995). *World class: Thriving locally in the global economy*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kellogg Commission (1999). *Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution.* Washington: NASULGC.

Kelsey, J. (1998). Privatising the universities. *Journal of Law and Society*, 25(1), 51-70.

Kerr, C. (1972). *The uses of the university. With a postscript 1972.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Kerr, C. (1998). *Troubled Times for American Higher Education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Kuttner, R. (1997). *Everything For Sale: The Virtues and Limits of Markets*. New York: Knopf.

Lambert, R., & Butler, N. (2006). *The future of European universities: Renaissance or decay?* London: Center for European Reform.

Lasch, C. (1996). *The Revolt of the Elites*. New York: WW Norton.

Leitner, H., Peck, J., & Sheppard, E. (2007). Squaring Up to Neoliberalism. In Leitner, H., Peck, J., and Sheppard, E. (eds.) Contesting Neoliberalism: urban frontiers. New York and London: The Guilford Press.

Leslie, L. & Slaughter, S. (1995). 'The Development and Current Status of Market Mechanisms in United States Postsecondary Education'. *Higher Education Policy*, 10 (3/4), 239-252.

Lombardi Program on Measuring University Performance (2004). The Top American Universities: *A Report*. Gainseville Fla: The Center.

Marginson, S. & Consindine, M. (2001). *The Enterprise University: Power, governance and reinvention in Australia*. Melborne: Cambridge University Press.

Marginson, S. & Rhoades, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets, and the systems of higher education: a glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher Education*, 43, 281-309.

Maurrasse, D. (2001). *Beyond the Campus: How Colleges and Universities Form Partnerships with their Communities*. NY: Routledge.

Meyer, H (2002). Universal, entrepreneurial and soulless? The new university as a contested institution. *Comparative Education Review*, 46(3), 339-347.

Neave, G. (2000). Universities' responsibility to society: An historical exploration of an enduring issue. In G.Neave (Ed.), *The Universities' responsibilities to society: International perspectives*. Amsterdam: Pergamon.

Newman, F., Couturier, L., & Scurry, J. (2004). *The Future of Higher Education: Rhetoric, Reality and the Risks of the Market*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Orfield, G., & Kurlaender, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.

Peck, J. & Tickell, A. (2007). Conceptualizing Neoliberalism, Thinking Thatcherism. In Leitner, H., Peck, J. and Sheppard, E. (eds.) Contesting Neoliberalism: urban frontiers. New York and London: The Guilford Press.

Perorazio, T. (November 2004). *Moving forward: Refocusing the debate on globalization*. Paper given at the Association for the Study of Higher Education, International Forum, Kansas City: USA.

Perry, D. (2005). *The Engaged University*, Unpublished Paper. The Great Cities Institute, Chicago. University of Illinois.

Perry, D.C., & Wiewel, W. (Eds.). (2005). *The university as urban developer: Case studies and analysis*. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe.

Perry, D.C., & Wiewel, W. (2007). "The University, the City and Land: Context and Introduction". In W. Wiewel and D.C. Perry (Eds.), *The University, the City and the State.* Armonk, N. Y.: M.E. Sharpe.

Powell, W., & Owen-Smith, J. (1998). Universities and the Market for Intellectual Property in the Life Sciences. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 17(2), 253-277.

Rawls, J. (2005). *Political Liberalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Rorty, R. (1982). *Consequences of Pragmatism.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rhodes, F. (2001). *The creation of the future: The role of the American university.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Rubin, V. (1998). The Role of Universities in Community-Building Initiatives, *Journal of Planning Education and Research,* 17(4), 302-311.

Sassen, S. (1996). *Losing Control? Sovereignty in an age of globalization*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Schmidt, P. (2000, June 30). States Set a Course for Higher Education Systems. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 46, A27.

Schon, D. (1995). The New Scholarship Requires a New Epistemology. *Change,* 27, 26 - 35.

Scott, P. (1997). The Crisis of Knowledge and the Massification of Higher Education. In R. Barnett & A. Griffin (Eds.), *op. cit.*

Scott, P. (Ed.). (1998). *The globalization of higher education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Shapiro, H.T. (2005). *A larger sense of purpose: Higher education and society.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Silka, L. (1999). Paradoxes of Partnerships: Reflections on University-Community Collaborations. *Research in Politics and Society,* 7, 335-359.

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, J. (1998). *Academic Capitalism: Politics, policy and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Strathern, M. (Ed.). (2000). *Audit cultures Anthropological studies in accountability ethics and the academy*. London: Routledge.

Stukel, J., (1994). Urban and Metropolitan Universities: Leaders of the 21st Century. *Metropolitan Universities*, 5(2), 87-92.

Turner, C., Antonio, M., Garcia, M., Laden, B.V., Nora, A., & Presley, C.L. (Eds.). (2002). *Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education.* 2nd edition. Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Varga, A. (2000). Local Academic Knowledge: Transfers and the Concentration of Economic Activity. *Journal of Regional Science*, 40 (2), 289-309.

Van der Wusten, H. (1998). *The urban university and its identity: Roots, locations, roles*. Boston: Kluwer Academic.

Van Ginkel, H. (2003). What does globalization mean for higher education? In G. Breton & M. Lambert (Eds.), *Universities and globalization: Private linkages, public trust*. Paris: UNESCO.

Walshok, M. (1995). *Knowledge Without Boundaries: what America's universities can do for the economy, the workplace, and the community*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Washburn, J. (2005). *University Inc.: The Corporate Corruption of American Higher Education*. New York: Basic Books.

Weiss, L. (1998). *State Capacity: Governing the economy in a global era*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Wiewel, W., & Perry, D.C. (2005). Ivory towers no more: Academic bricks and sticks. In D.C. Perry & W. Wiewel (Eds.), *The university as urban developer: Case studies and analysis*. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe.

Wiewel, W., & Perry, D.C. (Eds.). (forthcoming). *The University, the City and the State.* Armonk, N. Y.: M.E. Sharpe.

Willard, D. (1994), The Unhinging of the American Mind: Derrida as Pretext. In B. Smith (Ed.), *European Philosophy and the American Academy*. Chicago: The Hegeler Institute, Monist Library of Philosophy, Las Salle, Illinois.

Endnotes

[1] The top research universities among this master list of institutions were determined by their rank in the top 25 nationally in each of the following 9 key criteria: 1) Total Research Expenditures; 2) Federal Research Expenditures; 3) Endowment Assets; 4) Annual Giving; 5) National Academy Members; 6) Faculty Awards; 7) Doctorates Awarded; 8) Postdoctoral Appointees; 9) SAT/ACT Range. 53 total institutions appeared in the top 25 of university rankings based on their place in the ranking in of the above 9 criteria. Because the institutions were ranked based on their presence in a "top 25" of just one of the nine criteria many institutions tied with each other, creating a list of 53 universities that the report suggests represents the best in American research universities. Of these 53 schools, 26 are private research universities and 27 are public universities.

On this basis, the following Schools were selected for the intensive discourse analysis:

Stanford University
Johns Hopkins University
Duke University
University of Southern California
University of California - Berkeley
University of Washington - Seattle
University of Wisconsin - Madison
Princeton University
Northwestern University
Emory University
University of Texas - Austin
Pennsylvania State University - University Park
University of Illinois - Urbana-Champaign
Texas A&M University
New York University
Dartmouth College
Rice University
Vanderbilt University
University of Arizona
University of California - Davis
Purdue University - West Lafayette
University of Maryland - College Park
University of Alabama - Birmingham

[2] Here a strategic plan is defined as a single document or series of webpages formally describing future university plans. Other planning-type documents were not formally designated as a strategic plan but still contained official university reports discussing the institution's future. (For example, some strategic elements were found in physical Master plans and Board of Trustee reports.) These were also included in our analysis if other planning documents were unavailable. Noticeably, public and private universities did not fall evenly along the spectrum. To illustrate, four out of the top five schools with plans are private, while four out of the bottom with plans are public. The challenge was to find an even number of public and private plans that were (somewhat) evenly distributed throughout the ranking, enabling fair comparisons between both types. (For example, if all of the chosen private plans were in the top half of the list, and all of the chosen public plans in the bottom half, correct comparison could not be drawn because any differences could be due to their place in the list.) Thus, the list of 53 universities was divided into thirds, each with similar ratio of public and private plans. These divisions were demarcated by the number of measures in the top 25: the first group had 1-2 measures in the top 25, the second group had 3-6, and the third, 7-9. Four private and four public universities were randomly chosen from those with plans in group one, three private and four public universities from those with plans in group two, and four private and three public universities from those with plans in group three. This brought us to 23 plans—11 private and 12 public. This proportion of private universities to public universities was less than 5 percent different between the total proportion between private and public universities in the top 53.

Section 3

Discourses of the Contemporary Urban Campus in Europe: Intimations of Americanisation or Globalization?

Malachy Mc Eldowney
The Queen's University Belfast

Frank Gaffikin
The Queen's University Belfast

David C. Perry
University of Illinois Chicago

This article derives from an international research project, known as Contested Cities and Urban Universities (CU2), housed at the Institute of Spatial and Environmental Planning, Queen's University, Belfast, where colleagues, Ken Sterrett and Gavan Rafferty have contributed to this work.

Abstract

This article studies major structural changes within European universities, in both their urban and global context. Specifically, it assesses the extent and implications of any shift to the US model by examining the resonance in European universities of four main discourses that have dominated US academy in recent times. It argues that substantial evidence exists to suggest that the discourses are not simply US, but rather European as well, portending an institutional shift in the structure, management and contextual levels of engagement of the modern university with its contemporary global context. At the same time, it would be wrong to assert that the European university has been "Americanised," in that we find, even in these changing times, the critical voice of the academy remains a significant element of the overall civic compact of pluralistic deliberative democracy.

Introduction

Across Europe, universities face the challenge of re-conceptualisation. While they enjoy expanded student demand and an elevated role in their city-region economy as significant creators and repositories of knowledge, they simultaneously confront a funding gap in accommodating these higher student access rates, controversies in the definition and delivery of their wider urban obligation, and the task of harmonisation in tertiary provision, as outlined in the 1999 Bologna Declaration (European Commission, 2007). In such a context, it has been suggested that they imitate the model of US Higher Education, to which is attributed American universities' top ranking among the elite of global academy (Lambert & Butler, 2006). Specifically, it is argued that the European institutions should adopt the supposedly distinctive features of the US system — a diversified portfolio of funding, sourced not only from the state, but also from private corporations, alumni, philanthropists and substantial student fees; increased competition for students, staff and research support; and a managerialist structure that privileges strategic institutional goals and corporate efficiency over other traditions such as academic autonomy (Wooldridge, 2005). This article explores the extent and implication of any shift to the US model by examining the resonance in European universities of four main discourses that have dominated US academy in recent times (Gaffikin & Perry, 2007).

Selected after an extensive policy and research literature review within the theme of US higher education, the four main discourses are as follows: (1) multiculturalism and diversity; (2) impact of neo-liberal politics and the shift to a new mixed economy of welfare; (3) knowledge and post-modernism; and (4) globalization. After outlining each in turn, the article proceeds to the description and analysis of the empirical data, exploring the relevance of these discourses to contemporary debate and change within European universities. These data are based on site study visits and semi-structured interviews with leading personnel in twelve case study universities in Salzburg,

Innsbruck, Lausanne, Toulouse, Barcelona, Leuven, Rotterdam, Malmo, Gothenburg, Morebor, Olomouc, and Gdansk. Chosen to give a distribution of large and medium in *size*; old and new in *age*; and North/South/Middle and East/West in *geography*, these institutions were considered sufficient in scope and type to offer insight into the core research question. Following this analysis, the article concludes with an appraisal of the potential impact of the identified changes on the role of the European urban university.

The Four US Discourses

Over recent decades in the US, change on the university campus has centred on contested decisions about a set of issues that, while reflective of a wider social discourse, come to ground in a particular form within Higher Education.

(a) **The imperative to demonstrate diversity**

This debate has raised controversy about the proper proportionate mix in the racial/ethnic composition of student intake (Bowen & Bok, 1998); the value of affirmative action to proactively favour admissions from under-represented groups, and the implications for equity (Gurin *et al*., 2004); the repercussions of a more diverse studentship for multicultural curriculum (Banks, 2002), and for educational standards (Gurin, *et al*., 2002), and a new scholarship among staff that facilitates changes in teaching content and method (Boyer, 1990; Milem, 2001). Creating the sympathetic campus climate for inter-racial interaction and dialogue is critical (Hurtado, *et al*., 1998; Tatum, 2000), including commitment to active learning and racial awareness among the whole scholar community, while benchmarking progress is essential to ensure long term strategic institutional authority for these objectives (Bender & Schuh, 2002).

But, this issue of inclusive diversity has attracted both ardent critic and advocate. While some see it as part of the move to ‘political correctness’ that challenges academic freedom of expression and corrodes the social cohesiveness of campus with its attendant ‘culture wars’ (Wood, 2003), supporters argue its efficacy in terms of fairly reflecting wider social heterogeneity, and thereby providing an enriching educational experience for all students (Orfield & Kurlaender, 2001; Turner *et al*., 2002). Inter-culturalism within diverse campuses is judged to enhance student cognitive development and to prepare them for participation in a pluralist world (Oliver & Johnson, 1988; King & Shuford, 1996).

Though this issue has been pressing since the 1960s and the Civil Rights Movement, recent migration patterns in the US, and the growth of certain populations like the Hispanics, have renewed its salience. It echoes the durable feminist case about gender access to, and power relations within, an institution that extols tradition (Blackmore, December 2003). However, concepts of equality and diversity contain their own ambivalence (Cooper, 2004). Do they encourage the amplification of identity politics to the detriment of solidarity? Do they infer a libertarian 'anything goes' or a pluralism that is so relative that it eschews universalist principles? Are they to be value-free about all aspects of all cultures? Can they mainly legislate for a structure of toleration rather than promote a culture that celebrates difference? Can they protect agonist debate and dissent, processes intrinsic to the pursuit of intellectual honesty? Such questions indicate the complexity of arbitration and prioritisation in this contentious arena, and these debates are relevant to the increasingly diverse campus community.

(b) **The shift to a more neo-liberal politics**

In society at large, this ideological turn has involved advocacy for a minimalist state, entrepreneurial individualism, and the primacy of the self-regulating market over a bloated and inefficient public sector that has crowded out scope and incentive for private enterprise. As summarised by Harvey (2005, 3) this neo-liberal ascendancy posits that 'the social good will be maximized by maximizing the reach and frequency of market transactions, and it seeks to bring all human action into the domain of the market'. This ambition for a pervasive privatism has seen the neo-liberal political culture intrude into many areas of the public realm, including academy (Olssen & Peters, 2005). As noted by Newman *et al.* (2004, 1), amid the myriad transformations experienced by universities, 'the main force for change flows from a new level of competition and market-orientation among higher education institutions…' Not only has this been evident in conventional marketing concerns such as 'branding' and differentiation. It has also witnessed a more corporatist approach to strategy and management, based on business imperatives for efficiency and cost-effectiveness (Braun & Merrien, 1999; Gumport, 2000). One impact of this has been the erosion of collegial engagement in favour of more top-down decision-making and line-manager supervision (Kerr, 1998); a related growth in central administrative staff; and the adoption of performance evaluation whose metrics owe more to an audit culture rather than to academic values (Bleiklie, 1998; Strathern, 2000). Indeed, some insist that the increasing influence of market ideology in the public arena has confused concepts of price and value, assuming conventional market mechanisms can be appropriated for evaluating effectiveness in public intervention (Kuttner, 1997).

Just as within neo-liberalism, the virtues of de-regulation and flexible labour markets are applauded for economic modernisation, the restructuring within universities has seen the formation of a new class system (Perry, 2006). Ranked highest are those who are research-active, with the bulk of under-graduate teaching and the residualised contribution to public service being allocated to the rest (Fairweather, 1996). Indeed, an increasing share of new staff operate on restricted temporary contracts, and are mainly devoted to a Fordist-style teaching of large numbers of under-graduates, leaving the tenured professoriate more scope for research and selective graduate tuition. In this more marketised arena, differential incentives motivate research active staff to become more entrepreneurial in generating research income, publishing in top peer-reviewed journals, and where applicable, in commodifying the knowledge they produce (Baldwin & Krotseng, 1995; Anderson, 2002). At the same time, fee-paying students assume the perspective of consumers, taking an increasingly instrumentalist view of their learning experience, and assessing its worth for personal curriculum vitae in an increasingly competitive labour market (Leslie & Slaughter, 1995). In turn, this consumerism feeds into the increasing commercialisation of higher education. As noted by Zemsky, Wegner and Massy (2005, 6): 'As more people have viewed universities as providing principally personal advantages, institutions have been able to charge even higher prices to provide those advantages'. Thus, compared to the culture that extolled the intrinsic value of learning, and the role model of the polymath, many courses are now more narrow in focus, vocational in content, pursue a more didactic pedagogy, impose more commercial rates for tuition fees, and are appreciated in terms of their relevance for a more knowledge-intensive economy (Gordon & Whitty, 1997). As noted by Newman *et al*., 2004, 4): 'the growing influence of the market in higher education means that the search for truth is rivalled by a search for revenues', a shift that has become particularly acute in the context of a reshaped welfarism and reduced public funding.

Higher education within the new mixed economy of social welfare

In the US, the public welfare system, always more modest than its European counterpart, has been experiencing curbs in funding and eligibility, alongside various forms of privatisation. Within higher education, this has been reflected in a reduced proportion of university budgets deriving from the state (Callan et al, 1997), and has been part of the dissolution of the old social contract with academy. As commented by Altbach, Berdahl, and Gumport (eds., 1999, 15):

The unwritten pact between society and higher education that provided expanding resources in return for greater access for students as well as research and service to society has broken down, with significant implications for both higher education and society.

Accordingly, the sector has been under greater pressure to extend its portfolio of funding, and in part, this has involved commercializing more of its operations (Newman *et al*., 2004), including: property development; partnerships with urban regeneration schemes; knowledge transfers; incubator services; winning corporate sponsors; contracting into equity and licensing deals; and, in general, focussing more on research that yields lucrative commercial returns (Powell & Owen-Smith, 1998; Duryea, 2000). As institutions that increasingly see themselves in business terms, in a competitive environment for creativity, intelligence and design, research universities have been prone to commodify their main output: knowledge (Barnett & Griffin, 1997; Giroux, 2003).

However, this emphasis has provoked some rebuke from those who regard it as threatening to intellectual honesty and academic freedom, and likely to distort research priorities from public to corporate concerns (Hollingsworth, 2000). What Washburn (2005) describes as this new proprietary culture is not without contest within academy (Meyer, 2002). Nor, indeed, is it peculiar to the US. Marginson & Consindine (2001), addressing the Australian pattern, refer to it as the merging of the university into the capitalist production mode, what others have labelled 'academic capitalism' (Slaughter & Leslie, 1998) and the 'privatising' of academy (Kelsey, 1998). Paradoxically, while the university sector is becoming massified and thereby more publicly accessible and visible, it is turning more private to the extent that some suggest that its 'traditional intellectual structures have been dismantled and allowed to decay' (Scott, 1997, 15). Such critiques have prompted prominent US academics like Bok (2003) to denounce the extent of this shift to the marketplace as inimical to core educational mission.

Nevertheless, not everyone deplores this evolution of the university-industrial complex. Rather, for some time, it has been argued that it is part of the university's public duty to engage productively with its local economy (Giamatti, 1982). Regeneration strategies for city-regions increasingly place a premium on new business start-ups, rooted in more knowledge-intensive production. As a key urban institution, academy is well positioned to collaborate with local Research Parks and Technopoles, to nurture innovative and creative design, establish patents, and to network incubated enterprises into international opportunities (Branscomb, Kodama, & Florida, 1999; Varga, 2000; Glazer & Grimes, 2004). Such deliberate engagements extend the university's existing multiplier impact on its economic hinterland, given that it is a leading employer, consumer, educator, land developer, researcher, and culture provider. In the US, state governments, in pursuit of regional competitive advantage, are pressing state and land grant universities to further develop such roles (Schmidt, 2000), and though some are more sceptical about how effective this university- local economy relationship works in practice (Feller, May 2004), it has become a common feature in university corporate plans in the US. As public resources shift from the wealth distribution of welfare

to the wealth creation of economy, then universities feel increasingly obliged to focus more on innovation and discovery in the techno -sciences, and to present their outputs in the vernacular of economic dividend. But, this subordination of educational values to economic imperatives (Apple, 2000) is occurring in an environment, where the issue of knowledge itself is contested.

(c) Addressing the post-modernist challenge to epistemology

Universities are centrally about the production and distribution of knowledge (Bloland, 1995). But, strands of post-modernism challenge orthodoxies in both the product and process of knowledge generation. Renouncing conviction in absolutist and unitary concepts such as truth and meaning, they insist that these are contingent on cultural mediation. From this perspective for instance, there are no discoverable social laws that can be prescriptive and predictive in all social circumstance. For some, this abandonment of the scientific rational model in favour of contested multiple realities challenges the very rationale of academy and validity of expertise. As expressed by Willard (1994, 3) '*the heart of the university crisis is, in my view, the simple fact that the institutional structures and processes are no longer organized around knowledge'*.

Advocates dismiss this assessment as alarmist, arguing that a sophisticated read of post-modernism does not interpret its dismissal of totalistic metanarratives as a forsaking of all theoretical framework. Rather, all those with an interest in phenomenology and ethnographic insight have long shared its scepticism about traditional research methodology, rooted in approaches such as positivism. Challenges to that part of the modernist project that has been premised on linear progress in knowing and controlling the universe simply acknowledge the complexities and uncertainties of the contemporary world. This demands recognition that there are different sites of knowledge production other than conventional institutes of learning, including the tacit and experiential knowledge found in community. It demands also a mutual engagement among these sites in a partnership of knowledge production, and reflexivity in optimising the cross-fertilisation so generated (Welch, 1998; Mourad, 1997; Nowotny, et al., 2001). The shift to the 'weightless' knowledge society at once provides a new social platform for the university, while at the same time invoking contention about the formation and constitution of knowledge itself (Delanty, 2001). A related paradox is that the proliferation of information in the internet age is often confused with 'knowledge' and can give rise to a 'law of diminishing returns' in terms of meaning and application (Baudrillard, 1988). But, a recent critique of the impact of postmodernism on academy goes beyond these standard epistemological concerns, depicting postmodernism as largely regressive and reactionary, and flawed with a hollow relativism that induces conformism. Calling for 'a return to reason', the authors argue for an intellectualism based on critical open inquiry that is politically challenging and socially emancipating (Taylor, Barr and Steele, 2002).

(d) The impact of globalization

While this ubiquitous concept is subject to deep dispute, particularly with regard to its historical uniqueness and contemporary extensiveness (Weiss, 1998; Hirst & Thompson, 1999; Held & Mc Graw, 2003), its common meaning refers to increasing transnational integration in terms of goods, labour, capital, culture and ideas, though within a system of unequal exchange. Economic features of this transformation include the shift to knowledge-based post industrialism in the mature economies, and a new international division of labour associated with the re-location of production to the developing ones; the dominant role of multinationals aligned with liberalised trade and round-the-clock round-the-globe financial markets; a concomitant attrition of national sovereignty; and a digital divide attended by a deepening social cleavage (Sassen, 1996; Greider, 1997). Technology innovation that advances global communications such as wireless technology (Caircross, 1997), and amplifies the strategic significance of information, has facilitated greater global mobility of people in both actual and virtual forms. In the more extravagant interpretations, this diminutive 'village' world has experienced a de-territorialization amounting to the 'death of distance'. But, while some see scope for a new interdependent awareness around common threats of global warming and environmental degradation, there is much in the shrinking planet that still invites discord. Instead of the New World Order expected after communism's collapse, a fractious polity prevails, with a hyper-power US, an emerging rival axis in India and China, an Africa bereft, and a proliferation of ethnic contests well beyond the Middle East. Similarly, alongside the homogenisation fashioned through the wide embrace of uniform popular culture, fundamentalist collisions around identity and theology abound (Jameson & Miyoshi, 1998; Berger, 2002).

Thus, for some, globalization does not augur any new unity of humanity. Rather, it is a partisan political project, designed to commend and legitimate global capitalist hegemony (Hoogvelt, 1997). But, while there are 'many globalizations' (Berger & Huntington, 2002) and alternative modernities (Barber, 1995), that produce their own advocacy and resistance, even some critics credit the new era with an increasing connectedness and networking within a spatial-temporal compression (Castells, 1997). In this more borderless arena, the national state also may have become 'compressed'. But, it retains significant power (deWit, 2002), expressed through differentiated means, some acting as 'protector of stakeholding communities (while others) are direct affiliates of global capital' (Appadurai, 2001, 2).

However devoted to its autonomy and traditions, the university cannot elude the ramifications of this global change (Goddard, 1999). Though its dynamics are likely to ensure booming demand for the

tertiary sector and consequent massification, greater competition for students, staff and research funding will enhance 'consumer sovereignty', particularly for lucrative graduate students and beneficent corporate donors. Moreover, the integration and streamlining of broadcasting, telephone and computer technologies, embryonically reflected in interactive video and high-speed wireless platforms, will improve potential for virtual campuses and distance electronic learning. In pursuit of global reach and reputation (Kanter, 1995), some universities will also seek some international permutation of branch campuses, twinning, franchising, and joint ventures. But, in this world of mobile intellectual capital, new providers will compete, denying universities exclusive franchise as knowledge centres. Undoubtedly, convergence in the global patterns of higher education is increasingly apparent (Scott, 1998). Yet, vexatious issues impede further integration and transferability, including the need for an international regulatory framework for quality assurance (Harman, 1998), recognition, and accreditation (Van Damme, 2001; Atkinson, 2001).

Much of the academic literature emphasises the risk that the entrepreneurial university may marginalize its educational mission (Yang, 2003), seeing a switch from *knowledge as an end* to *the end of knowledge* (Delanty, 1998). Also, it queries whether the rush for global status and presence may marginalize the university's civic relationship with its local hinterland (Deem, 2001). An alternative perspective is that the right mix of global, national, and local networking --- what some have called the 'glonacal' (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002) --- complies with the best traditions of academy: universal links; free international exchange of ideas; inter-cultural lenses; and mutual connection between local and global (Perorazio, 2004). As with the wider arguments opposing determinist views about global trends, there remains the capacity of agency to challenge (Friedman, 2000) and to democratize (Gills, 2002), rather than retreat. In the case of the university, Neave speaks of its need to be *of*, and not merely *in*, the world, since its achievements are best realised (2000, 24): 'not in its detachment from society so much as in its close, if not symbiotic, engagement. There is much to be gained by the lowering of academia's drawbridge'.

Having outlined key arguments within these dominant discourses (Gaffikin & Perry, 2007), the next section addresses the empirical data to assess the extent to which they resonate in the contemporary debates within the tertiary sector in Europe. Taking each discourse in turn, the analysis explores the manner in which they are articulated.

European Academy and the Four Discourses: Relevance and Resonance

Multiculturalism and Diversity

The discussion of these issues in the European university context must inevitably reflect a longer and more complex history of integration and assimilation than is the case in the US, although diversity in racial and ethnic terms is probably a more significant feature of the modern North American campus than.is the case in many traditional European universities. Cultural diversity - based, inter alia, on religion, language, ethnicity and political ideology – is nevertheless an established feature, and, indeed, a policy objective of the new Europe. The fact that European universities, with their countries' traditional colonial linkages allied to their contemporary global networks, also attract staff and students from well beyond Europe accentuates the scale and significance of this discourse in many of the case studies below. Multiculturism and diversity, particularly in relation to language and culture, are long-established and well-accepted 'facts of life' in the European academy, although there is a wide spectrum of experience in relation to these concepts.

At one end of the spectrum, for example, is the experience of the Austrian universities of Innsbruck and Salzburg, which have traditionally had an essentially parochial responsibility in providing higher-level education for students from Tyrol, Salzburg and South Austria. Interestingly, even these local students experience a rather distant 'town-gown' relationship with conservative townspeople who place more commercial reliance on prosperous foreign tourists. However, the introduction of separate, private, Medical universities in both cities to exploit a huge market in Bavarian, and other German, students, has caused additional resentment amongst locals, as well as new pressures on the accommodation market. The substantially increased scale of change, however, is the crucial element here, as both universities have traditionally welcomed limited numbers of foreign students - Innsbruck has many African students in Theology and Asian students in Informatics, while Salzburg has a world-wide student market for its famous Music Faculty.

Universities in former- Communist parts of Europe are also undergoing a fairly rapid transition from local to international student markets, although the case study universities in Slovenia, Poland and the Czech Republic still take most new foreign students from other former Eastern-bloc countries.

For example, the University of Olomouc in the Czech Republic now caters for a huge influx of students from neighbouring Slovakia and from Russia. Similar 'near-neighbour' influxes to the University of Krakow mean that there are no perceived integration problems with new migrants and minorities, although the university is now trying to actively recruit students from around the world.

Similar ambitions exist in the University of Gdansk, although language is a problem – most courses are still taught in Polish, which inhibits expansion into foreign student markets, so English is increasingly used in research communication and may be adopted soon in teaching programmes.

The importance of language is best illustrated, however, in what is probably the most international of the case study universities – the Catholic University of Louvain (KUL) in Belgium. Founded originally in 1425, it was one of the first universities in Europe. Though its original language was Latin, it has since had Spanish, Dutch and French as its official language, until 1970 when Louvain became the capital of Flemish-speaking Brabant and the University adopted the Flemish language. (The new University of Louvain-le-Neuve was founded at the same time to preserve the academic tradition of French-language teaching.) For many key postgraduate courses, however, the academic language is English, which accounts for the fact that the largest foreign –student group in Louvain is American, with a fast-growing Chinese student group in second place. Some 15% of the total student body is foreign, with the Faculties of Theology and Philosophy attracting students from all over the world. Relations between 'town and gown' in Louvain are generally good (reflecting the university's significant contribution to the local economy), although this is said to be less true of Louvain-le-Neuve, which has many African students.

Language is also an issue in the University of Barcelona, where 70% of courses are taught in Catalan (30% in Castilian), as sustaining the Catalan language and developing Catalan cultural autonomy are key institutional objectives. Now, however the university has strong internationalist aspirations, fuelled by the city's success as an international tourist attraction and its successful staging of the 1992 Olympic Games, and is now in the initial stages of developing English-language postgraduate courses. English-language teaching is well-developed in Erasmus University of Rotterdam, where only the first two undergraduate years are taught in Dutch, with everything subsequently taught in English. Rotterdam regards itself as a multi-cultural city par excellence, but recent strains in relations with ethnic minorities have caused a reinforcement of the notion of a dominant Dutch culture to which immigrants should accommodate rather that the previous liberal preoccupation with multicultural inclusivity.

The issue of social exclusion – the relationship between a university and a socially and economically deprived host community - is well-illustrated by the Toulouse case study. The University of Toulouse has three campuses, of which the Languages and Social Science campus is located in the socially-deprived district of Le Mirail, from which it draws large numbers of students, and within which it carries out student projects. While the original planning concept saw the university as a catalyst for the improvement of the area, in recent years it has tended to draw back

from the growing social problems and has been seen to adopt an 'ivory tower' attitude. To counter this, individual academics have established joint projects with local communities, including a very successful 'Maison de Quartier' which is a social centre and meeting place for community/university debate and discussion. These initiatives have received financial backing from the university and from the Municipality, although the general perception is that individual voluntary effort rather than institutional or political will has been the main driving force.

It would be a mistake, however, to be complacent about the current acceptance of multiculturism in Europe. Post 'nine-eleven' attitudes, particularly towards students from Muslim countries, have changed perceptibly in some situations. In Toulouse, the growing isolation of the le Mirail campus from a neighbourhood with many North African immigrant residents is symptomatic, as was a recent controversy about women students wearing veils –interestingly, the university permits this, whereas it is forbidden by law in all French second-level schools. In Belgium and in Holland, the recent growth of far-right political parties reflects growing societal intolerance of minorities, and this is mirrored by the experience of African students in Louvain-le-Neuve, the questioning of liberal multiculturism in Rotterdam and the move towards local religious and language-based segregation in the evolution of KUL. Even in Swedish universities, which have a proud tradition of welcome for persecuted minorities from all across the globe, there is recent evidence from the Universities of Gothenburg and Malmo of a dilution of this approach, although this is linked to reduced public subsidy in the funding of universities generally (see below).

Neo-Liberal Political Shift/Mixed Economy of Welfare

The move towards a more neo-liberal politics is an international phenomenon, and while the experience in mainland Europe is in general less pronounced than that of the UK, and, to a further degree, that of the USA, the case-study universities again illustrate an interesting spectrum of change in this direction.

Several university leaders voiced a concern made, perhaps most emphatically,if not also a bit wistfully by the former Provost of the University of Maribor, Slovenia (who was also the former Minister of Education) that the transformation from state-subsidised to market-driven third-level education has led to the loss of positive values from the old system – team-work, collegiality, civic responsibility – without necessarily gaining the perceived benefits of the new – economic dynamism and entrepreneurial culture. In any case, the principle of public funding for university education is still strongly established in Slovenia, as in Czechoslovakia and in Poland, where the Rector of Krakow makes it clear that 'constitutionally, we can not even whisper that tuition will not be paid out

of public funds.' Only in Slovenia are student fees being contemplated – and here they would only be token charges, with 400 euro per annum regarded as an absolute maximum.

In Austria, the University of Innsbruck has introduced slightly higher student fees (around 1000 euro per annum), and its new rector is in the process of 'liberalising' some of the management structures – funded research linked to staff evaluation and the establishment of a Public Service Office to promote research links between the university and the business community. Amongst its functions is the Centre for Academic Spin-Off (CAST) which helps develop research ideas and patents into start-up companies. This follows on from the Austrian Universities Act 2002 that makes all universities into independent companies, with financial autonomy within a public sector safety net, and consequent incentive to earn money from research and consultancy. The University of Salzburg has responded to this new political climate by introducing both teaching and research evaluation and a central data bank to record publications and funded research projects. Its Vice – Rector for Research regards the university as a good test case for the neo-liberal approach as its new Council of Trustees is dominated by business interests; it attracts sponsorship from multi-national companies like Sony, Nestle, ski –manufacturers and banks; it promotes 'university meets business' events; and its cultural programmes (especially music) are pivotal contributions to the city's thriving tourist economy.

The contribution of large universities to relatively-small host cities is also exemplified by KUL, which claims to provide at least 25% of total employment in the city, as well as adding some 30,000 students to its residential population. In physical terms, the university's 400 buildings dominate the area within the city's original walls, and large expansion projects like the University Hospital and Biomedical Sciences Faculty have moved to edge-of –city sites. Partnerships between the university, the municipality and the state in terms of land-supply and infrastructural finance have resulted in spin-off projects such as IMEC (Inter-University Micro-Electronics Centre), the Louvain Science Park (now employing 5000 people) and an expanding Science Corridor between the city and Brussels. Until recently, Belgian universities received 80 % of their funding from the state, but the examples above are illustrative of a government-supported move towards greater financial self-sufficiency.

Financial self-sufficiency demands increased and sustainable student populations as well as expanding sources of research income, requiring, in turn, university involvement in promotion and 'outreach' initiatives. A good example of this is the University of Lausanne's Office for the Social Study of Science, which has the twofold function of attracting hitherto-reluctant school students to science courses in the university, and promoting the marketability of scientific research within the

wider community. This requires a combination of activities such as 'science and the city' travelling exhibitions, open day events and well-publicised participation in national referenda on genetic engineering and stem-cell research.

Another, more practical, example of 'outreach' is the University of Gothenburg's Conservation and Built Heritage campus in the lakeside town of Mariestadt, some two hundred kilometres inland from the city of Gothenburg. This small community (24,000 population) had suffered the loss of its main industrial employer – Electrolux Refrigerators – in the mid-90s and the University, in collaboration with the local authority and with funding support from the ERDF, established a series of short courses in traditional building crafts and craft education in a parkland campus on the edge of the settlement. This provides re-training for unemployed craftsmen as well as academic courses for building construction and landscape undergraduates. More importantly, it provides a cultural and economic focus for the local community, and its success is reflected in its recent acquisition of a former school complex in the town centre for further academic expansion and physical regeneration. This is a small-scale, rural version of the sort of urban regeneration that new universities, like the University of Malmo, have promoted in derelict, former-shipbuilding, land on the Malmo waterfront.

The shift to a neo-liberal economy and a globalised society is accepted as a fact of life by the new Rector of the Erasmus University of Rotterdam who places a high priority on the University's contribution to the 'quality of life' of its host city, as 'quality of life' is now a key determinant of success in the global competition between cities. Competition demands talent in research and innovation, which places universities at the centre of economic development and urban place marketing. Success in these arenas reflects back on the University's success in attracting international research and foreign students – Rotterdam at present has 30% foreign students, 70% local students, but in a globalised future these proportions could be transformed.

In general, comparison with the situation in the USA, it is fair to say that the mainland European universities are still largely in the public-funded, service-model tradition, with well-established tenured academic staff and large numbers of subsidised students. However, it is also true to say that many of the senior academic managers interviewed for this project are more neo-liberal in political attitude and keener to promote more private-sector sponsorship of academic programmes and research initiatives than has been typical in Europe to date. The internal implications of this - for academic independence, for teaching/research balance, for collegiality and competitiveness etc. - have yet to be seriously experienced, but there is little doubt that the trend is in this direction. The external effects, on the other hand, of the 'opening out' of university activities and development

programmes into the wider community, in terms of community outreach initiatives and environmental regeneration projects, are generally seen in a very positive light.

The Post- Modernist Challenge to Epistemology

'Renouncing conviction in absolutist and unitary concepts such as truth and meaning' and the 'abandonment of the scientific rational model in favour of contested multiple realities' are hallmarks of the post-modernist challenge to conventional attitudes to knowledge production and distribution. To examine the validity and relevance of such arguments, it is interesting to trace the evolution of academic attitudes in two different sets of case study universities: the challenge to 'absolutist and unitary concepts' may be best observed in those formerly- Catholic countries now embracing contemporary secularism and the 'abandonment of the scientific-rational model' should be discernible in those in former-communist states emerging from an ethos of collectivist orthodoxy. The Catholic University of Louvain (KUL) is a prime example of the former, while the University of Maribor is an excellent example of the latter.

The Catholic University of Louvain was founded by Papal Bull from Pope Martin V in the fifteenth century as the University of the Netherlands under Spanish rule – part of the first wave of Catholic European universities which grew in numbers from 13 in 1300 to over 70 by 1500. The official language was Latin and the Rector of the university, and all professors, had to be practicing Catholics –originally paid out of church funds –from the university's foundation until 1960, when it was formally secularised and the Rectorship opened up to election by students and staff. Interestingly, Jesuits, as well as Protestants, were excluded from office in the university until 1970 – when the world-renowned Jesuit Library was handed over to the university's Faculty of Theology.

A turning point in its history was the student riots of 1968 which overturned KUL's bi-lingual status, as French was seen to represent the dominant culture and to reinforce an orthodox, traditional, bourgeois, approach to education, allied to an elitist and distant relationship with the local Flemish community. KUL became a secular, Flemish university with some enthusiasm (K now stands for 'Kwalite', not 'Katholic) with more democratic structures, more community outreach and partnership (see above) and successful expansion of its science and technology faculties. However, it still retains a support network of Catholic High Schools for student recruitment (in competition with the Universities of Ghent and Brussels which have Protestant High School networks) and promotes its traditional undergraduate subjects –Philosophy, Theology, Religious Studies and Canon Law – by teaching them in English. KUL's 'sixties' modernist revolution, is challenged, perhaps, more by residual Catholic attitudes and affiliations than by any obviously significant postmodern influences.

The University of Maribor in Slovenia, in contrast to above, is a relatively young institution – it was established in 1971 as a 'self-management' university (Yugoslavia at time promoting 'self-management' as a first step out of traditionally rigid state control) by a group of Slovenian intellectuals, inspired by the 'spirit of the sixties'. Their initial vision was to complement and compete with the range of new neighbouring European universities – in Austria, Germany, Italy and Hungary – which were being established around the same time. It was also, idealistically, to promote a new model of epistemology in which 'ways of thinking' would be emphasised as much as traditional academic disciplines. An additional objective, promoted by the Yugoslav State more than by the founding fathers, was to provide practical research and training programmes for local industry – during the Communist era, Maribor had thriving, albeit State-protected, car-manufacturing, machine-tools and textile industries.

Political realities, however, took precedence over rational strategy, and the university emerged as a series of fairly autonomous Faculties, based pragmatically on existing Technical High Schools, and lacking the integrated ethos that its founders desired. These, effectively, became separate fiefdoms, the Deans of Faculties developing their own links with industrial, commercial and political institutions. With the fall of Communism in the early nineties, the protected manufacturing base of the region collapsed, and the expanding university became a major player in the local economy, but was criticised for not playing a more interventionist role in helping declining industries. Ironically, in view of the country's political traditions, lack of 'teamwork' mentality, fear of being associated with 'losers' and poorly-developed social capital are said to be problems in modern Slovenia, and the evolution of the university as a series of self-interested academic units may be a reflection of this point.

In their own fields, the Faculties are developing strongly – with the strong engineering tradition of most Communist countries now supplemented by Architecture, Robotics and Informatics, Telecommunications, Natural Sciences, Economics, Maths, Humanities and Philosophy. All courses operate at the three levels necessary for compatibility with the Bologna Agreement, and all staff are encouraged to undertake research and consultancy. Maribor is now well-established as the second university in Slovenia, with a strong regional identity and a reputation for sound, practical education which produces competent and employable graduates.

These qualities, however, could be seen to reinforce rather than develop existing epistemological approaches – they affirm the dominance of traditional academic categorisations; they would seem to emphasise established scientific method; and they lack the integrated vision of the university's founders. More crucially, there was some evidence of a lack of engagement with 'different sites of

knowledge production' in the local economy and, particularly, in the community. The experience of the university's relative detachment from declining local industries in the 'nineties and the criticisms about the current lack of social capital (above) suggest a less than 'engaged' university, although there was some impressive evidence of individual academic voluntary effort in the field of local environmental planning.

The Impact of Globalisation

As indicated earlier, European universities have traditionally established international networks from their countries' colonial past – the British with East Africa, India and the Far East, the French with North Africa and the Pacific, for example. Unsurprisingly the case study universities reflect this on a smaller and more diverse scale –Louvain has a global Catholic network and a strong American connection; Slovenia, Poland and the Czech Republic a growing Eastern European student market; Sweden, a worthy tradition of accepting refugee students and their families from around the world. In one sense, therefore, European universities were some of the initial 'globalisers' and much of their current academic character is derived from this internationalist outlook.

In contrast to this, however, what was interesting in many cases was a strong 'parochialism' in the university's perceived duty to provide educational services to a local 'catchment area'. The Universities of Innsbruck and Salzburg, for example, had specified Austrian provinces to provide for, and the University of Lausanne looked to a limited number of Swiss Cantons. Louvain now sees itself as the University for Flemish Brabandt, and Maribor as the academic hub for Eastern Slovenia. Some of this is a consequence of devolved systems of government, particularly in Alpine Europe, where strong provincial, cantonal, and municipal authorities provide substantial public funding and demand services in return. Some of it is a consequence, also, of the slow evolution of some universities from the 'high school' tradition, with its concomitant local responsibilities.

There is no doubt, however, that the impacts of economic globalisation on local economies are beginning to have their effect on the perceived role of the universities. The dramatic collapse of Maribor's vehicle manufacturing industry in the early 'nineties pushed the university into a (not particularly successful) economic development role; the closure and re-location (to Malaysia) of Mariestadt's refrigeration plant prompted the local authority to invest in the establishment of the University of Gothenburg's outreach campus in the town; the demise of the major Swedish shipyards (because of cheaper labour-costs in Taiwan and Korea) provided the strategic waterfront sites for the development of the new University of Malmo. On a more positive note, the success of Toulouse as an international headquarters for aviation, space and science-based industries

provides the economic support for the expansion of the university from one campus to three – particularly UT2, the Science University, in the south-east of the city.

The all but universal acquiescence to policies that reinforce the purported shift to a knowledge economy has prompted demands for expansion of all third-level education establishments, and all of the case study universities are evidencing dramatic growth in numbers of students: Toulouse's expansion to three campuses now accommodates over 100,000 students, Barcelona has 60,000 students, Louvain and Gdansk have over 30,000 each, and even small cities like Innsbruck accommodate over 25000 students. Moreover, all of these universities have experienced this growth in just the past ten years – Olomouc in Czechoslovakia has tripled its numbers since 1990 to 18000, and Gdansk now annually rejects five times as many students as the 7000 that it accepts. Such 'massification' brings its own problems, although, unlike the UK and USA, some parts of mainland Europe, particularly Italy, Spain and France, have long traditions of accepting very large student numbers in their early years. This growth, however, reflects the demographic boom of the past two decades, and may not be sustainable in the longer term – in which case European universities will be more dependant on external sources and will increasingly join the international competition for students that makes up part of their growth and learning strategies as well as part of their diverse funding portfolio.

Some universities also have a long tradition of international franchising, while others have more recently developed global networks based on shared research interests. With regard to the former, Louvain, for example, is a partner in 20 bilateral international inter-university agreements, imports and exports around 600 students annually on ERASMUS programmes, and has an international development programme with 22 ongoing projects in Africa, 14 in Asia, 15 in Central and South America. An example of the latter is the Innsbruck's 'University of the Mountains' initiative which links European Alpine institutions with South American mountain cities like Quito, Santiago, Mexico and Bogota on the basis of shared interests in mountain geology, climate, water-supply and infrastructure. Its Director believes that international 'families' of universities – of similar scale, location, context and research opportunities – make more sense that 'vague globalisation'.

On the issue of 'global capitalist hegemony' (Hoogvelt, 1997, above) there is some evidence of academics from the former-Communist countries being able to adapt readily to the new competitive climate. The University of Krakow claims to have been 'globalising' since its foundation in the 15th century, as was the University of Olomouc since the 16th century, although both admit to current financial constraints on international travel. The Rector of Gdansk University is sceptical of the prospects of significant research support from multinational companies in Europe – he believes that

the large multinationals still favour USA and Japan for sponsored research. Multinational links with other universities were limited to participation in science park initiatives, as in Louvain and Innsbruck, and some sponsorship of town/gown events, as in Salzburg.

In general, the 'globalisation' issue in European universities manifests itself indirectly rather than overtly – in their role as agents of regeneration and economic growth poles to compensate for displaced traditional manufacturing employment; in their acceptance of student 'massification to take advantage of the burgeoning knowledge economy; and in their participation in global academic research and student exchange networks. Many would claim to be currently 'global' in their influence and aspiration, particularly established universities like Louvain, and new science-based institutions like Toulouse 2, while some, particularly from Eastern Europe, would claim to have been global since their foundation in the 15th and 16th century. The overtly negative effects of a 'globalised culture' and its concomitant inequalities are still largely resisted by social democratic and former-socialist governance systems, and there is some evidence of counter-balancing 'localism' –even 'parochialism' – in academic catchment areas with strong regional identities.

Conclusions

Topic-specific conclusions have been drawn at the end of each of the four sections above, and more general conclusions are presented below, but, initially, it is useful to reflect on the categorisation of the case-study universities. As indicated above, they were chosen to reflect a range of sizes, a geographical spread, and a disparity in age of institution. More specifically, there was an attempt to cover such contrasts as the 'university town' (e.g. Louvain) and the large city context (e.g. Barcelona); the post-communist situation (e.g Maribor) and the established, conservative institution (e.g. Innsbruck); the northern social democratic model (e.g. Gothenburg) and the large-scale Mediterranean example (e.g Toulouse). Other categorisations are possible, of course, and there are no examples here of 'offshore Europe' (UK and Ireland), as the intention was to focus on direct comparisons between what were perceived as the more extreme models presented by mainland Europe and the USA. The most useful categorisation, however, is offered by the four discourses (above), so some general conclusions are initially drawn under these headings.

In relation to the *diversity* issue, European universities' experience of linguistic and cultural diversity, sometimes over centuries, contrasts with the more recent racial and ethnic diversity of universities in the USA. Moreover, the increasing popularity in Europe of English-language teaching, particularly at postgraduate level, points to some convergence between the two systems at least in relation to international research communication and participation in the global networks of knowledge.

Public funding of undergraduate education in Europe, allied to recent massification of intake, continues to promote social inclusion, although the advent of fee-paying, still slow in mainland Europe as compared even with UK, may also encourage the convergence trend. Recent evidence of some strains in multicultural relationships, primarily in relation to students from Muslim countries, may be temporary reflections of current global politics, or a salutary warning against European complacency about an issue that is addressed more conscientiously in USA.

As regards *the shift towards neo-liberal politics,* there is clear evidence of European aspirations in this direction, particularly from university management that identifies itself increasingly within a competitive student and research market. However, strong counter-influences continue to exist within most European governance systems – both social democratic and former-communist traditions. These still tend to prioritise the 'service-model' for local student catchments, albeit with rapidly-expanding student numbers (and the gradual introduction of still-minimal fees). Commissioned research and 'spin-off' company development in Europe still have stronger local linkages than in the USA, although the potential for the knowledge economy to contribute to urban regeneration is being increasingly recognised and implemented. Here the development partnerships include strong municipal representation, as in Louvain and Gothenburg, contributing necessary land-assembly and infrastructure provision powers for some impressive regeneration schemes.

In terms of the *post-modernist challenge to epistemology*, the evidence from European universities points towards evolution rather than revolution. Attitudes towards knowledge production and distribution underwent significant change firstly during the 'sixties' (in western Europe) and secondly during the 'nineties' (in eastern Europe). The first period was characterised by modernist utopianism and expansion in the western university sector, the second period by post-communist adaptation to a capitalist education market in eastern Europe. In both areas currently, however, any postmodern flows are challenged by strong, countervailing conservative currents. Central-European universities such as Louvain, Innsbruck and Salzburg have modernised, expanded and 'opened up' to their communities, but still retain strong elements of their Catholic culture and networks, while the post – communist universities in Slovenia, Poland and the Czech Republic still reflect the scientific rationalism of their technical high school traditions. Post modernist approaches in European universities generally are most evident in the growing diversity of university functions, outreach activities and joint ventures with local businesses and municipalities.

On the question of *globalisation*, some of the older European universities regard themselves as the original 'globalisers', with transnational networks, established over centuries, based on imperial links, trade relations and common languages. Eastern European universities such as Krakow and

Olomouc emphasise their internationalisation since the sixteenth century, interrupted briefly by twentieth century communist isolationism. All are consequently keen to compete in the burgeoning international postgraduate student market – although the dominance of English as the international language obviously favours UK and USA institutions. Southern European universities, nevertheless, have long experience of student 'massification', and most established institutions like Gothenburg, Louvain and Toulouse have excellent international research and business networks. European universities are now in the forefront of providing knowledge economy substitutions for 'globalised' manufacturing's vacated urban sites, where their partnerships with strong municipalities is a positive development benefit.

In all of the universities investigated, beyond the obvious drive to recruit more international students and staff, there was a keen awareness of the need to 'internationalise' the curriculum in an age of growing global citizenship. This implies not only an intercultural learning, but also an engagement with related issues such as diversity and the generation of knowledge beyond ethnocentric perspectives.

Stark contrasts exist between the mainly public-funded European higher education sector and its mixed-funded US counterpart, particularly its pre-eminent, elite, privately endowed institutions such as Harvard. Similarly, Europe's long embedded social democratic political culture is quite alien to a liberal capitalist US. Given those diverse traditions, a significantly different trajectory for their respective universities might be expected. Yet, the four discourses that have dominated American academy in recent decades clearly resonate a great deal with the great majority of the European universities in this case study. They share quite similar challenges, including how to:

1. defend diversity and equity, and extend access for under-represented groups, while upholding standards of excellence, free expression, and campus solidarity;
2. respond to the market and fiscal orthodoxies that have emerged from neo-liberal credos, while upholding public values about education and knowledge;
3. engage with post-modernist ideas that challenge the rational-scientific project, while pursuing social progress through research partnerships that validate multiple sites of knowledge production, including local communities;
4. protect open academic inquiry that the public can use and trust, and a collegial culture for inter-disciplinary collaboration, while operating under a new managerialism that is prone to respond to pressures from the new polity and economy to commodify knowledge, and finally;
5. how to be a good neighbour to its local communities and city-region, while not neglecting the imperative to be more *global* in its scope, sourcing and status.

In essence, the evidence from this investigation of the strategic priorities in the contemporary European university suggests that academy is confronted with the tensions involved in these challenges, which are patently not exclusive to the American context (Gaffikin & Perry, 2007). Given the significant change in the world in recent decades, at the social, economic, political, and cultural levels --- and the central role of *knowledge* in these changes --- it would be surprising if universities everywhere were not keen to reform themselves (Perry & Wiewel, forthcoming), however dimly the impact of some of these societal transformations still appear. Moreover, within globalizing trends, there is a pervasive orthodoxy about the need to turn from a redistributive politics of welfare transfers to growth strategies for wealth creation rooted in free enterprise and trade. But, while amble evidence exists of the academy being seduced into these 'logics', this neo-liberal ascendancy is not so over-whelming and immutable that it exhausts the capacity of agency to interact and democratise, and the residual social-democratic traditions in Europe still offer considerable scope in this regard. But, such response implies a different kind of university. As expressed by Neave, in an argument for academy to be *of*, and not merely *in*, the world, its obligations are best articulated (2000, 24): 'not in its detachment from society so much as in its close, if not symbiotic, engagement. There is much to be gained by the lowering of academia's drawbridge'.

In this respect, it would be mistaken to assume that any 'americanisation' of European universities automatically entails importation of corporatist agendas of de-regulation, privatisation, commercialisation and individualism. Alongside the extension of the marketplace and priorities around revenue generation within US academy, there are notable examples of 'engaged institutions' that remain socially obligated through partnerships with other civic stakeholders. Forsaking the 'ivory tower' model of the detached campus has not necessarily involved the alternative of subservience to private business interests. Rather, there remains a vibrant tradition of social charter between higher education and the wider society for mutual benefit, expressed in varied forms of transactional collaboration between scholarship and citizenry. Unquestionably, the erosion of the public sphere has portended a more vexed relationship between campus and community. However, the critical voice of academy remains a significant component of the overall civic compact to create a pluralistic deliberative democracy.

Bibliography

Appadurai, A. (2001) *Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination* in Appadurai, A. (ed.), (2001). *Globalization*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Apple, M. (2000), 'Between Neoliberalism and NeoConservatism: Education and Conservatism in a Global Context' in Burbules, N. and Torres, C. (eds.), *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives,* London: Routledge, pp. 57-78.

Anderson, E. (2002). *The New Professoriate*, Washington DC: American Council on Education.

Atkinson, R. (May 26, 2001). *The globalization of the university*. Inaugural address delivered at the Nagasaki University of Foreign Affairs, Japan. The text is to be found at: http://www.oap.ucsb.edu/diversity/docs/mitsuta.html

Baldwin, R. and Krotseng, M. (1995). *Incentives in the Academy: Issues and Options, New Directions for Higher Education*, No 51, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Banks, J. (2002). Multicultural Education: Historical Developments, Dimensions and Practice. In C. Turner, A.L. Antonio, M. Garcia, B.V. Laden, A. Nora & C.L. Presley (eds.), *Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education* (2nd edition, pp. 427-457), Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Barber, B. (1995). *Jihad vs. McWorld*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Barnett, R. and Griffin, A. (Eds.), (1997). *The End of Knowledge in Higher Education*, London: Cassell.

Baudrillard, J. (1988). *Selected Writings*. Edited by M. Poster. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Berger, P. (2002). *The Cultural Dynamics of Globalization* in Berger, P. and Huntington, S. (2002). *Many Globalizations: Cultural diversity in the contemporary world*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Berger, P. and Huntington, S. (2002). *Many Globalizations: Cultural diversity in the contemporary world*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Black, J.N. (2004). *The Freefall of the American University: How our colleges are corrupting th minds and morals of the next generation*. Nashville: WND Books.

Blackmore, J. (December 2003). Tracking the nomadic life of the educational researcher: What future for feminist public intellectuals and the performative university? *The Australian Educational Researcher*. 30(3), 1-24.

Bleiklie, I. (1998). Justifying the evaluative state: New public management ideals in higher education. *European Journal of Education*. 33(3), 299-316.

Bloland, H. (1995). Postmodernism and Higher Education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 66(5), 521-570.

Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bowen, W.G. and Bok, D. (1998). *The Shape of the River: Long-term Consequences of Considering Race in College and University Admissions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Branscomb, M., Kodama, F. and Florida, R. (Eds.), (1999). *Industrializing Knowledge: University-Industry Linkages in Japan and in the United States*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Braun, D. and Merrien, F-X. (Eds.), (1999). *Towards a new model of governance for universities? A comparative view*, Higher Education Policy Series, London: Jessica Kingsley.

Caircross, F. (1997). *The Death of Distance. How the communications revolution is changing our lives*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Calas, M. and Smircich, L. (2001). Introduction: Does the house of knowledge have a future? *Organisation*, 8(2), 147-149.

Castells, M. (1997). *The Information Age: Economy, society and culture. Vol. 11: The power of identity*. 2nd edition. Malden MA; Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Clark, B. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizing Pathway of Transformation*. London: Pergamon.

Cooper, C. (2004). *Challenging Diversity: Rethinking equality & the value of difference*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Deem, R. (2001). Globalization, new managerialism, academic capitalism, and entrepreneurialism in universities. Is the local dimension still important? *Comparative Education*, 37(1), 7-20.

Delanty, G. (1998). The idea of a university in the global era. From knowledge as an end to the end of knowledge? *Social Epistemology*, 12(1), 3-25.

Delanty, G. (2001). *Challenging Knowledge: The university in the knowledge society*. Buckingham: Open University Press and Society for Research in Higher Education.

deWit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.

Dill, D. and Sporn, B. (Eds.), (1995). *Emerging patterns of social demand and university reform: Through a glass darkly*, New York: Pergamon.

Duryea, E. (2000). *The Academic Corporation*, New York: Falmer Press.

European Commission (2007). *The Bologna Process,* Available on http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/educ/bologna/bologna_en.html

Fairweather, J. (1996). *Faculty Work and the Public Trust: Rethinking the Value of Teaching and Public Service in American Academic Life*, Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Feller, I. (May 2004). Virtuous and Vicious Cycles in the Contribution of Public Research Universities to State Economic Development Objectives, *Economic Development Quarterly*, 18(2), 138-150.

Friedman, T. (2000). *The lexus and the olive tree: Understanding globalization*, New York: Anchor Books.

Gaffikin, F and Perry, D. (2007). Discourses and Strategic Visions: The U.S. Research University as an Institutional Manifestation of Neo-Liberalism in a Global Era. *AESOP Annual Meeting*, Naples Italy.

Giamatti, A. (1982). The University, Industry, and Cooperative Research, *Science*, 218 (4579), 1278-1280.

Gills, B. (2002). Democratizing globalization and globalizing democracy, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 581, 158-171.

Giroux, H. (2003). Selling out higher education, *Policy Futures in Education*, 1(1), 179-200.

Glazer, L. and Grimes, D. (2004). *A New Path to Prosperity? Manufacturing and Knowledge-based Industries as Drivers of Economic Growth*, Michigan Future Inc. and the University of Michigan.

Goddard, J. (1999). How universities can thrive locally in a global economy, in H. Gray (Ed.), *Universities and the creation of wealth*, Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Gordon, L and Whitty, G. (1997). Giving the 'hidden hand' a 'helping hand': The rhetoric and reality of neo-liberal education reform in England and New Zealand. *Comparative Education*, 33(3), 453-467.

Greider, W. (1997). *One World, Ready or Not: The manic logic of global capitalism*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Gumport, P. (2000). Academic Restructuring: Organizational Change and Institutional Imperatives, *Higher Education*, 39, 67-91.

Gurin, P., Dey, E., Hurtado, S., and Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and Higher Education: Theory and Impact on Educational Outcomes, *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(3), 330-366.

Gurin, P., Lehman, J., Lewis, E., Dey, E., Gurin, G., and Hurtado, S. (2004). *Defending Diversity: Affirmative Action at the University of Michigan*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Harman, G. (1998), The Management of Quality Assurance: A Review of International Practice, *Higher Education Quarterly*, 52 (4), 345-364.

Harvey, D. (2005), *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Held, D. and McGrew, A. (Eds.), (2003). *The Global Transformation Reader: An introduction to the globalization debate*, 2nd edition. Cambridge: Polity.

Hersh, R. and Merrow, J. (Eds.) (2005). *Declining by Degrees: Higher Education at Risk*, New York: Palgrave.

Hirst, P and Thompson, G. (1999). *Globalization in Question*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hollingsworth, P. (Ed.), (2000). *Unfettered Expression*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hoogvelt, A. (1997). *Globalization and the Postcolonial World: The new political economy of development*. London: Macmillan.

Hurtado, Milem, J.F., Clayton-Pederson, A. and Allen, W.A. (1998), Enhancing Campus Climates for Racial/Ethnic Diversity: Educational Policy and Practice, *Review of Higher Education*, 21 (3), 279-302.

Jameson, F. and Miyoshi, M. (Eds.), (1998). *Cultures of Globalization*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.

Jameson, F. (1998). *Preface* in Jameson, F. and Miyoshi, M. (Eds.), (1998). *Cultures of Globalization*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.

Kanter, R. (1995). *World class: Thriving locally in the global economy*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kelsey, J. (1998). Privatising the universities, *Journal of Law and Society*, 25(1), 51-70.

Kerr, C. (1998). *Troubled Times for American Higher Education*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

King, P.M. and Shuford, B.C. (1996), A Multicultural View is a more Cognitively Complex View, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40, 153-164.

Kuttner, R. (1997). *Everything For Sale: The Virtues and Limits of Markets*, New York: Knopf.

Lambert, Richard, and Nick Butler. (2006). *The future of European universities: Renaissance or decay?* London: Center for European Reform.

Lasch, C. (1996). *The Revolt of the Elites*. New York: WW Norton.

Leslie, L. and Slaughter, S. (1995). 'The Development and Current Status of Market Mechanisms in United States Postsecondary Education', *Higher Education Policy*, 10 (3/4), 239-252.

Lynch, K. (2006), Neo-Liberalism and Marketisation: the Implications for Higher Education, *European Educational Research Journal*, 5 (1), 1-17.

Marginson, S. and Consindine, M. (2001). *The Enterprise University: Power, governance and reinvention in Australia*. Melborne: Cambridge University Press.

Marginson, S. and Rhoades, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets, and the systems of higher education: a glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher Education*, 43, 281-309.

Meyer, H (2002). Universal, entrepreneurial and soulless? The new university as a contested institution, *Comparative Education Review*, 46(3), 339-347.

Milem, J. (2001) *Increasing Diversity Benefits: How Campus Climate and Teaching Methods Affect Student Outcomes*, in Orfield, G. and Kurlaender, M. (ed.) Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action, Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.

Neave, G. (2000). Universities' responsibility to society: An historical exploration of an enduring issue, in G.Neave (Ed.), *The Universities' responsibilities to society: International perspectives*, Amsterdam: Pergamon.

Newman, F., Couturier, L. and Scurry, J. (2004). *The Future of Higher Education: Rhetoric, Reality and the Risks of the Market*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Oliver,M. and Johnson, J. (September 1988) The Challenges of Diversity in Higher Education, *The Urban Review*, 20(3), 139-145.

Olssen, M. and Peters, M. (May 2005), Neoliberalism, Higher Education and the Knowledge Economy: From the Free Market to Knowledge Capitalism, *Journal of Education Policy*, 20 (3), 313-345.

Orfield, G. and Kurlaender, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.

Perorazio, T. (November 2004). *Moving forward: Refocusing the debate on globalization*, Paper given at the Association for the Study of Higher Education, International Forum, Kansas City: USA.

Perry D. and Weiwel, W. (forthcoming) The University, the City and Land: An Introduction in Wiewel, W and Perry, D (eds.) *The University, the City and Land.* M.E. Sharpe

Powell, W. and Owen-Smith, J. (1998). Universities and the Market for Intellectual Property in the Life Sciences, *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 17(2), 253-277.

Rorty, R. (1982). *Consequences of Pragmatism*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Sassen, S. (1996). *Losing Control? Sovereignty in an age of globalization*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Schmidt, P. (2000, June 30). States Set a Course for Higher Education Systems, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 46, A27.

Scott, P. (Ed.), (1998). *The globalization of higher education*. Buckingham: Open university Press.

Scott, P. (1999). *The Crisis of Knowledge and the Massification of Higher Education* in R. Barnett and A. Griffin (Eds.), op. cit.

Slaughter, S. and Leslie, J. (1998). *Academic Capitalism: Politics, policy and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Strathern, M. (Ed.), (2000). *Audit cultures Anthropological studies in accountability ethics and the academy*. London: Routledge.

Taylor, R., Barr, J., and Steele, T. (2002), *For a Radical Higher Education: After Postmodernism*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Tatum, B.D. (2000, Fall). The ABC Approach to Creating Climates of Engagement on Diverse Campuses, *Liberal Education*, 86(4), 22-29.

Turner, C., Antonio, M., Garcia, M., Laden, B.V., Nora, A., and Presley, C.L. (Eds.). (2002). Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education (2nd edition) Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Van Damme, D. (2001). *Higher Education in an Age of Globalisation: The Need for a New Regulatory Framework for Recognition, Quality Assurance and Accreditation*. Introductory Paper for the UNESCO Meeting, Paris, 10-11 September, 2001.

Varga, A. (2000). Local Academic Knowledge: Transfers and the Concentration of Economic Activity, *Journal of Regional Science*, 40 (2), 289-309.

Washburn, J. (2005). *University Inc.: The Corporate Corruption of American Higher Education*, New York: Basic Books.

Weiss, L. (1998). *State Capacity: Governing the economy in a global era*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Wiewel, W and Perry, D (Forthcoming) *The University, the City and Land.* M.E. Sharpe.

Wooldridge, A. (2005). *The Class of 2006: Why American Universities Will Lead the World*, The World in 2006, London: The Economist.

Wood, P. (2003). *Diversity: The Invention of a Concept*, San Francisco, Encounter Books.

Yang, R. (2003). Globalisation and Higher Education Development: A Critical Analysis, *International Review of Education*, 49 (3/4), 269-291.

Section 4

Chicago and the Engaged University: Institutional Practices of an Urban Anchor Institution of Higher Education in the United States

David C. Perry

Frank Gaffikin

Carrie Menendez

"When deciding what the proper relationship between a university and its surrounding community should be, one must begin by recognizing that the university's primary contribution to the betterment of the human condition comes through education and the creation of new knowledge. That is what it is organized to do, and that is what it does best."

Sheldon Hackney
ANNALS AAPSS, November, 1986

"Just as universities make great cities, a great city makes a great university."

Mayor Richard J. Daley
Upon laying the cornerstone for UIC,
1963

"As a researcher, scientist and member of the faculty of UIC, I am not in principle opposed to the notion of the "engaged university," or even to the notion of a "scholarship" of engagement. It is the terms of engagement that must be clearly spelled out so that there is no confusion for faculty or community over the role of research and its beneficial relationship with those external to the academy."

Donald Chambers
Remarks at the Conference on the Engaged University, Spring,
2002

Introduction: Conflicting Missions and Engaged Research

In a well-argued essay on the relationship of the university to the community, Sheldon Hackney begins where we should all begin, with the fact that universities are first and foremost centers of learning. They are intellectual institutions that take as their sources of knowledge and sites of discovery everything. To do otherwise would limit the very nature of their existence. Each institution charts its own course in the pursuit of its intellectual mission, calculating its goals for its students, faculty and the generation of new knowledge. But, as Hackney, among others,[1] has noted universities are not simply academic institutions, they are also *social* institutions—not simply located *in* a particular city and nation, but major units *of* society. This is apparent in many ways. In their daily institutional practices universities have very real impacts on society—they employ people, their buildings change the character of the landscape and transform neighborhoods, and they are major consumers of goods and services. Their students and programs directly impact the quality of those inhabiting other key institutions. For example, one out of every ten college graduates in the Chicagoland area is a University of Illinois at Chicago graduate, one out of every six doctors was trained at UIC, one out of every three dentists in Illinois graduated from UIC and UIC is the single most important source of school teachers in Chicago. These latter features of university-community "relations"—the importance of community to the university as a source of professional opportunity for its students and the importance of the university as a center of learning for the community's citizens—speaks to a larger point of parity needs and opportunities between the university and its community, alluded to by Mayor Richard J. Daley. Put more generally, this parity is evidence of the real and academic embeddedness of the university in its community, of its *engagement* with its surroundings both as an institution and in the relations that advance education and the creation of knowledge.[2]

However, such parity is not always recognized—quite often universities are perceived less as urban institutions and more as distant, unresponsive "ivory towers," (Hackney 1986, Kellogg, 1999, McDowell, 2001) and their surrounding communities are often viewed by academics, if recognized at all, as sites for experimentation or application not as centers of knowledge themselves or places of partnership in the education process and the creation of new knowledge. It is not uncommon to hear communities angrily critique universities for their imperious, unresponsive policies and intrusive impacts. It is also not uncommon to find the value of the community or the city to the university

[1] See Walshok, PaulYlvisaker, the Ford Foundation and setting up the Urban Observatories, Charles MerriamJ. Martin Klotsche, National League of Cities, Joint City-University Research, Earnest Boyer and folk, Bender, McDowell, , AUU, Kellogg, Carnegie.

[2] In his book "the University and the City," historian Thomas Bender describes the persistent, if fortunately constrained swing in the life of the city and the university between coherence and fragility. At times the university in crisis has been rescued by the urban dynamic surrounding it; though at other times urban developments have threatened to undermine the stability of the academy. Conversely, the university has at times successfully provided a focus and a principle of coherence for the cultural life of a city, though at others it has withdrawn from the city and undermined urban culture." (1988: 4)

registered in the phrase—"the city is a good laboratory for study." The history of universities and their communities is replete with community critique and academic arrogance—much of it well placed.

This has certainly been the case of the University of Illinois at Chicago. At the same time UIC is the site of one of the more comprehensive attempts by a research university to consciously reflect its role as an urban institution in its primary mission of "education and the creation of new knowledge." This paper is a case study of the institutional strategy employed by UIC in this effort. Differently called the "Great Cities Initiative" or "Great Cities Commitment," the effort did not eschew the "service" projects of faculty or the vast array of clinical programs and "applied research." Rather, it confronted the question: how is a core activity of the research university, "research," carried out in partnership with its community? This is at once a narrower and more ambitious topic. It is here that the "engaged university" becomes especially important. The notion of engagement, as used in the "engaged university," is certainly of the willing variety, with university faculty and community, however defined, joining together to produce mutually agreeable results, even though the purposes of each might be very different. For example, engineering and planning faculties from the university might join with the city and metropolitan planning agencies to design the protocols, models and tests of new transportation alternatives in the metropolis. Without the university, the resultant regional transit plan is far less informed and without the community the university would not have the same ability to attract federally-sponsored research and advance the state of published knowledge on transportation technologies and their impact on commuting patterns, sprawl and public transit. In this case the university actively seeks to be a center of "engaged research"—research, that from the beginning of the protocol, if you will, is a product of partnerships between traditional and nontraditional sites of knowledge and where the outcomes have an impact not only the creation of knowledge and education but on the city or community of which the university is a part.

Case studies have their limits—to apply too much detail would stultify and to include too little gives the story an order that was really never there when the process originally unfolded. The authors hope neither outcome happens here. In this telling the authors hope to balance the need to be accurate, without being overly anecdotal, with the goal of presenting basic elements of institutional strategy that must be in place for a research university to be an "engaged" one. The authors have chosen three such elements: (i) leadership, (ii) resources and (iii) individual rewards.

Top level leadership matters when establishing a university's approach to engagement, especially in the research university, where decentralization at the disciplinary, college or academic unit level is the norm. Clark Kerr is reported to have described the organization of the research university as a group

of faculty members with a parking problem. Others describe such decentralization as "organized anarchy" where, if "left to their own devices, most faculty members (and their departments) will bend to the daily preoccupations of research teaching and satisfying "service" requirements with a campus or faculty committee" (Kellogg, 2000: 43) assignment. Academic work produced through partnerships with the community will not become a key form of pursuing disciplinary scholarship; it will be shunted off to the extension divisions, or centers of service learning.

When it comes to the university's reward system, this "anarchy" does produce an order of two varieties. First, is a disciplinary order. A scholar's reputation is "substantially influenced by the disciplinary community at large, through the control of access to the communication network of the discipline—journals, presented papers, award and other such anointing form the community." (40) Second, when it comes to rewards, this anarchy produces a clear class system: those who do choose to partner with communities or participate in public service and make their disciplinary discourse a local one rather than a national or international one, are in danger of becoming second class citizens of the academy, when compared to the researchers of the "first class."

The third element is resources or funding, programs of engagement, especially those that seek to expand to sites of creative knowledge, need stable recurring funding—so that the efforts are clearly embedded in the long-term future of the research university. A disappearing start-up account is not enough, if the university seeks status as an engaged university, then this must be registered in the institutions fiscal and structural investment in the process.

UIC: An Institution with an Identity Problem

In 1991, James Stukel was appointed Chancellor of the University of Illinois at Chicago. His appointment was not universally accepted as the best one. Many among the faculty thought he was not "academic" enough. They knew him well because he was one of their own, and yet he did not appear to possess the intellectual élan to give exciting new direction to a somewhat nascent Class 1 Research University. The political leadership of the state and the city seemed equally disheartened by the appointment. To the governor and the mayor of Chicago, Stukel appeared "too academic" and removed from the realities of cities and as well as the broader, vexing public issues such realities created.

In a way the new Chancellor's predicament mirrored that of UIC as an institution. Neither he nor the institution he had been chosen to lead appeared to have a clear identity, much less a strategy or focus. UIC, in 1991, appeared torn between two key challenges: how to maintain a responsive relationship with its urban environment and how to build its new base as a research university (Final Report of the Great Cities Advisory Committee (GCAC), 1994: 3).

UIC had begun as an undergraduate commuter campus after the Second World War and, from the start, it was supposed to have an "urban mission." (Wiewel and Broski, 1999). What was supposed to be a temporary two year campus meant to accommodate the postwar overflow of Chicago veterans wanting to attend the University of Illinois continued to attract a sustained number of students, transforming it into the largest university in the city. With a student base made up of a substantial number of first generation college students, often coming from immigrant families, UIC appeared tailored to meet the challenge raised by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education: in its 1972 report on *The Campus and the City*: "improving higher education in the nation's urban areas and improving… capabilities of… colleges and universities to serve urban needs…" The combination of rapid growth and the 1983 merger with the University of Illinois Medical Center quickly earned UIC Class I research university status. And just as quickly the campus began to downgrade its urban mission. In fact, the goals of such a mission were frequently seen as being antithetical to the new research goals of the university.

The similar conflicts facing UIC and its new Chancellor in 1991 were evidence of larger trends challenging research universities, especially those in cities. On the one hand, the conditions of society, especially those conditions in the immediate urban region and the political climate demanded the attention of the university, if for no other reason than UIC origins were tied to educating the students of Chicago and its urban mission demanded a response to the urban conditions that confronted many of these students. On the other hand, the university was committed to furthering its status as one of the nation's fastest growing, recognized centers of basic research.

This paper focuses on the ways in which UIC has sought to resolve the institutional tensions between these conflicting institutional requirements and, in the process, establish a distinctive identity or what the Kellogg Commission (1999: 9) would later call a "thematic structure" upon which to build an institution-wide approach to urban engagement. Put more simply, UIC's Great Cities Initiative was designed to be more than a "program" of "outreach" or a "center" of "extension," it was meant to be a fully-realized manifestation of the research university as an "engaged university."

For those familiar with the history of university-community relations over the past century, UIC's Great Cities program is one version of what Sheldon Hackney once described as the recurring attempts[3] at "reaching accommodation between the mission of the major research universities have grown up in urban locations…and the demands increasingly placed on them by residents of their immediate neighborhoods…a process in which periods of optimism and innovative action inevitably seem to be followed by disillusionment,"[4] (Hackney, 1986: 137). While the description that follows is certainly not one of unbounded success, it is still a story in which the measures of optimism seem to outweigh the case for disillusionment.

Leadership: Great Cities Initiative—Recasting the Identity of an Urban/Research University

From its inception, under the leadership of the new Chancellor, the Great Cities Initiative was a product of a new approach to academic planning—substantive programming by a broad participatory collaboration of faculty and community leaders. The title of the initiative itself ("Great Cities") came from outside the academy, a result of the Chancellor's consultation with his corporate advisory board. Rather than reflecting the requirements of disciplines and the order of the academy, it represented the requirements of city-building and the objectives of such a process that could be met by an active and responsive urban university. The result was a process of institutional planning and implementation carried out by a combination of new and traditional university units and fully funded through a blend of recurring state dollars and sponsored research grants.

From the beginning, UIC's Great Cities concept was meant to resolve the conflict, (for some, the institutional contradiction) between a university's attempts to be a research institution and meet its "urban mission." Perhaps "resolve" is not the right word here. At UIC the conflict was less "resolved" than lived out in different ways by different faculties and units of the university.[5] The theme of "great cities" was not an intellectual or institutional referent with which any college or discipline was familiar.

[3] Thomas Kaluzynski, An Historical View of the Concept of the Urban University, 1975, Unpublished Dissertation, University Microfilms International, James b. Crooks, "The AUU and the Mission of the Urban University," Urbanism Past and Present, Volume 7, Number 2, 34-39, George Nash, et. Al. The University and the City, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973, McGraw Hill, The Association of Urban Universities, the work of John Dewey citation later, Paul Ylvisaker, the Ford Foundation and setting up the Urban Observatories, Charles Merriam, J. Martin Klotsche, National League of Cities, Joint City-University Research, Earnest Boyer and folk

[4] See Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1972, The Association of Urban Universities, the work of John Dewey citation later, Clark Kerr, John Gardner, David Henry, Robert Wood, Paul Ylvisaker, the Ford Foundation and setting up the Urban Observatories, Charles Merriam, J. Martin Klotsche, National League of Cities, Joint City-University Research, Earnest Boyer and folk

[5] Lauri Alpern, Senior Staff to the Chancellor.

The more institutionally accepted titles, even interdisciplinary ones such “community health” or “public policy” or “service learning” or “urban policy” or “urban study” or “extension,” or “community service” all came with institutional baggage. Some created disciplinary exclusions and others generated “service” vs. “research” hierarchies. And for the Chancellor’s external advisors they represented an academic way of categorizing things that did not reflect the urban world they sought to engage. Therefore, while the theme “great cities initiative” was an unknown way of characterizing a research university, it was also one that did not come with as many pre-established institutional barriers—internally or externally. It spoke to the outside world of a direction for urban change and it offered the opportunity for various members of the academy to buy-in in new ways. For some it was, and indeed remains, an umbrella which includes service and clinical activity, applied research and technical assistance and foundational research born out of partnerships with urban groups external to the campus. Others found in “Great Cities,” the very embodiment of the tension between the research mission and urban mission, and therefore the generative dynamics of an expanded notion of a research university that went “beyond outreach and service to what the Kellogg Commission defined as ‘engagement.’” (Kellogg Commission, 1999: 9).

Those who saw Great Cities as an umbrella argued that UIC needed to get beyond the traditional land grant model of the University of Illinois to an “urban land grant mission” – where “teaching, research and service programs (are) designed to improve the quality of life in metropolitan Chicago and other urban areas.” (GCAC, 1994: 1). While others would move well beyond the land grant metaphors of “outreach” and “service” (Chancellor James Stukel, first Winter Forum, December, 1993) to a new concept of “engagement” referring to a long term “great cities commitment” wherein partnerships form the basis for an interdisciplinary research that at once contributes to education and the construction of knowledge and to meeting the issues of the great cities of the world of which Chicago is one (Chancellor Sylvia Manning, September 24, 2002, address to the City Club of Chicago) .

Over time, a new language of two-way engagement is replacing the land grant language of one-way extension of knowledge into the community. Similarly, the old language of privilege and power separating who, among the faculty, does research and who does service is part of a new campus-wide discussion of the parity (Wiewel and Broski, 2000) that characterizes the relationships among true partners—both university community-partners and interdisciplinary ones. None of these changes in the thematic structure of UIC or the language used to describe them could have occurred if they were the products of a particular dean, research center or faculty group. They are first and foremost the product of leadership—at the top of the institution.

The lack of clarity over the identity of UIC in 1991 extended two directions—into the university among the faculty and externally to Chicago and beyond to the state and the nation. At the time, this was not an uncommon theme. One of Chancellor Stukel's advisory committees counseled: "throughout the country, many public universities are wrestling with questions of identity and purpose. The challenges we face are numerous: demographic changes reflected in …a college cohort and a greatly diversified student body, a decline in research funding because of the end of the Cold War, severe reductions in public funding due to budget shortfalls at the state level, and harsh critiques of universities' integrity and commitment to teaching." (GCAC, 1994: 2) His fellow university heads (Kellogg Commission) appeared equally convinced that the best way to meet these challenges was through a new, redefined commitment to societal needs. Such a commitment did not mean, as one fellow university president argued, that we need to stop doing our research and start doing something else; we just need to direct more of our expertise toward publicly oriented purposes." (Rawlings, 1992: 2,3, citied in Great Cities Initiative Operational Documents, 1991-1994)

For Stukel and his strategic team, one of the most important conceptual ways of looking at this integration of research and society, was Mary Walshok's notion of "knowledge linkages"—whereby the societal needs of technology transfer and economic development, cross-disciplinary professional education and civic education, for example, were met in new relationships between faculty and off campus publics who together produce the knowledge necessary to meet such urban needs.

What Rawlings, Walshok and others were arguing for was not simply a new program, clinic or service center in the city, but a new way of thinking about the research university and its role in the city. Chancellor Stukel used the external corporate leadership of his Chancellor's Advisory Board to help him arrive at this new way of capturing UIC's mission—the result was the "Great Cities Initiative." For Stukel, Great Cities was to be more than a label or service theme. It was to be "a focal point for UIC's activities." (GCAC, 1994:2) In its earliest stages, Chancellor Stukel housed the initiative in his office, establishing an office of Special Assistant to the Chancellor and setting in motion a broad participatory collaboration of faculty and community leaders charged with designing a university-wide program.

Just as the theme of "great cities" had broken the mold of what constituted the research university, so too did the planning and implementation process. In March 1993, the Chancellor appointed the Great Cities Advisory Committee to develop the Great Cities concept: twenty-eight faculty from every college in the university were charged with refining the Great Cities concept ("to use its teaching, research and service programs to improve the quality of life in metropolitan Chicago and other urban

areas") into real programs. Substantively, the Advisory Committee eschewed traditional academic topic areas and organized itself into interdisciplinary subcommittees focusing particular academic strengths of UIC on topics of clear importance to metropolitan areas: Health in the City, Urban Education, Urban and Public Affairs, Economic Development, Public Safety and Justice, Culture and Arts in the City and International Urban Conditions. The subcommittees added another 140 faculty members to the process and the groups worked for nine months, each committee meeting at least seven times, conducting public hearings and ending with a report to over 400 representatives of the university, the city, all levels of government, private sector and community leaders. Externally, the Chancellor initiated a parallel process of interviews with key community leaders, focus groups and corporate advisory meetings.

Overall, this represented the largest, most complex and detailed interdisciplinary academic programming exercise in the history of the university. The result was an action benefiting from an unprecedented level of participation by off campus leaders and public and equally unprecedented levels of participation by the faculty and colleges. It offered new interdisciplinary programs—a new College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs, a new Great Cities Institute, a new Center for Literacy and a new City Design Center. It also provided new ways of "thinking" (Wiewel and Broski, 1997, 3) about what the university was already doing:

> *UIC comprises thousands of faculty and staff members and hundreds of units such as colleges, departments, clinics, institutes and centers. The Great Cities concept values all of their activities strengthens them and is nurtured by their rich variety. The Great Cities concept provides a focus and organizing principle for what many UIC faculty and staff are already doing, and it expresses an institutional commitment to others.* (GCAC, 1994:2)

The GCAC and its subcommittees identified 212 such "Great Cities-type" programs at work in the University, providing added focus to these programs and legitimacy for Great Cities among the faculty. By casting Great Cities in terms of programs UIC was already engaged in, rather than shaping it exclusively around new programs that would require new resources, the Chancellor gained support among the Deans of the thirteen colleges. This provided early recognition for 200 programs—naming them as part of "great cities" gave both faculty and their external community partners ways of understanding what this new direction at UIC could mean.

As a result, the GCAC was able to report to the Chancellor, "The Great Cities concept reaffirms that the creation, dissemination and application of knowledge are the fundamental functions of UIC. It signals a broadened responsibility to bring these functions to bear on addressing the needs and enhancing the strengths of the Chicago metropolitan area." (GCAC, 1994: 4)

A few years later, Stukel's successor, David Broski, saw the inclusion of external governmental, private and civic leadership in initiating UIC's Great Cities program as the most important step in building the essential "close relationship between research and the issues faced by people and institutions in the metropolitan area. The metropolitan area poses questions and issues that actually represent opportunities for first class research, and interaction with eternal audiences is an essential component in conducting this research." (Wiewel and Broski, 1997, 3) For Broski, these partnerships between off campus publics and the researchers were the central element of Great Cities—the whole concept of Great Cities as "engaged research" rested on the construction of knowledge produced in such *partnerships*.

But recasting what the university was already doing—giving it new meaning—was only half the story of founding of UIC's Great Cities Initiative. While this program was established by the Chancellor and his staff, it would not be implemented by an administrative office—a new approach to the research university required new academic units and the resources to make them succeed. In short, if Chancellor Stukel had simply announced a new approach to university-community partnerships and repackaged current programs to meet the program goals, Great Cities would have quickly been perceived as another weak, rhetorical and institutionally under-sourced effort. But Great Cities was proposed to be much more. It was to set a new tone, a new identity for UIC and to do this the University would have to add some signature elements to Great Cities—places within the UIC academic structure that could serve as "knowledge linkages," to borrow from Mary Walshok.

With the advice of the GCAC, the Chancellor established several new, interdisciplinary academic units and research centers; among them: (i) a new College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs that could increase UIC's profile in urban and public affairs, with two new, redefined academic programs in Public Administration and Urban Planning and Policy; (ii) the Great Cities Institute, a new interdisciplinary research center with university-wide peer reviewed programs supporting a Great Cities Faculty Scholars and a Great Cities Faculty Seed Fund for multidisciplinary research in the Great Cities priority areas; (iii) the UIC Neighborhoods Initiative, creating a permanently funded, comprehensive collaboration between UIC, neighborhood institutions and other partners; (iv) a new City Design Center for multidisciplinary work on urban design and physical planning; and, (v) a new Literacy Center to establish new levels of knowledge in K-12 education.

These, along with a new initiative in Community Health, were key action steps introduced by Chancellor Stukel to over 400 members of the university community and the external leadership of Chicago and other urban centers. (Great Cities Winter Forum: 1993) By December 1993, each of the

new GC academic units and research centers were in proposal stage and by 1995, they had all become permanently funded elements of university structure.

By the mid 1990s, UIC's Great Cities Initiative was in place. With the top leadership of the university strongly behind it, it also benefited from internal buy-in from a substantial number of an overall skeptical faculty, with external support from the corporate, civic, and philanthropic sectors along with support from key community groups in the neighborhoods bordering the university, and with new permanent funding to support the development of the new academic units and research centers that would form signature "knowledge linkages" of the Great Cities Initiative. Each new element of Great Cities contributed to the interdisciplinary growth and development of UIC: the new College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs combined programs of public administration and planning; the new City Design Center brought together faculty from the new college of urban planning and the college of art and architecture; the new Literacy Center combined education policy, social science and teacher training; and, the Great Cities Institute(GCI) was designed to be the academic hub of the concept, charged with bringing together the faculty from throughout the university in the service of the Great Cities mission.

Even the physical site of the building chosen to house the new college and the GCI was emblematic of this attempt to build a new identity for the urban/research university. A century-old, six storey industrial building was chosen to be retrofitted to house these new units. Located at the edge of campus—partially "on" campus and partially "in" the community—the building's site seemed to embody university-city engagement and its physical renewal served as an indication of development and change.

Several features of the Great Cities Initiative at UIC set it apart from similar approaches at other universities. First, with the new college in place and the Great Cities Institute established (along with other new interdisciplinary centers), the office of the Great Cities Special Assistant to the Chancellor was disbanded with day to day implementation of Great Cities being effectively seeded over to interdisciplinary centers and the colleges. The obvious thinking here was that if Great Cities was to work, it would have to be implemented by the faculty in the colleges and not remain the distant order of the university administration. By 1996, this proved to be an important strategic decision because Chancellor Stukel left his position to become President of the University of Illinois system. The new chancellor, David Broski, although he claimed to be as strongly in favor of the Great Cities, quickly proved to be far less interested in substantively and structurally advancing an initiative of his predecessor. While he kept GCI on his list of campus priorities, he seemed more interested in setting his own mark and this meant readjusting priorities to more closely reflect traditional adherence to the

research mission and bringing about a new $500 million development project on university land just south of the campus. However, midway into this latter project, with controversy swirling around a series of development decisions, Chancellor Broski resigned. When she was not named to succeed Broski, then Provost Elizabeth Hoffman also left UIC to become President of the University of Colorado.

With the unanimous support of the President and the Board of Trustees, Sylvia Manning, a Vice President of the University of Illinois, assumed the post of Chancellor in 2000. It was not until July of 2002 that a new provost took office, Michael Tanner, previously Associate Chancellor of the University of California at Santa Cruz. Both Chancellor Manning and Provost Tanner expressed their support for UIC's Great Cities program. In the case of Chancellor Manning, she went so far as to suggest that the nine year "great cities initiative" needed to be reconstituted both in title and in the message it sent to both faculty and community. "How long can Great Cities be an 'initiative'?" she asked "at some point we either take Great Cities beyond the 'initiative stage' or we stop it." For Manning, the decision was clear, the Great Cities program was to continue to be a signature element of UIC—part of its long term relationships with its city. In late 2001, the Great Cities Institute became the" Great Cities Commitment." By this, Chancellor Manning meant that:

> *Through the Great Cities Commitment, the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) directs its teaching, research and service to address human needs in Chicago and in metropolitan areas worldwide by becoming a partner with government and public agencies, corporations and philanthropic and civic organizations.*

Where past chancellors had described Great Cities as essentially a one-way street—touting the benefits of an urban land-grant mission of applying basic research to urban issues of government, public and private agencies and civic leaders, Manning made a subtle but important shift in her description of the mission of the project—making the outcomes of Great Cities the product of two-way partnerships with external constituencies. By turning Great Cities into a commitment to such partnerships, Manning sent the message that Great Cities is part of the identity and long-term mission of the research university.

This shift in emphasis carried additional weight because it reinforced the visible, active place of Great Cities in the academic structure of the university. By embedding adequately funded Great Cities programs and units in the academic colleges, rather than centralizing them an off-line administrative unit, the program was finding a place in the core academic fabric of UIC. Each college and dean was allowed his or her own version of Great Cities—recognizing faculty and programs that are built upon partnerships with external communities, thereby contributing research engaged in the issues of urban change.

By implementing Great Cities in such a manner, two things were accomplished. First, the various programs of great cities were kept close to the faculty. They had better potential to be woven into the daily disciplinary practices of the colleges, than they would have had, had they been put in an office of extension or under a vice chancellor of external affairs. Second, the shift in leadership discussed above brought with it shifts in priorities and, if Great Cities had remained in Chancellor's office, the potential was there for Great Cities to have been downgraded. And while Chancellor Manning was willing to recast the mission of Great Cities in a new language of "commitment," the current budget crisis at UIC has caused significant staff and program cuts at the chancellor level and it is hard to tell, realistically, how secure Great Cities would have been if it had not been housed in an t academic unit of the University. While a case can be made that proximity to top administrative leadership can contribute to the success of programs of engagement, the chancellor's office is far more subject to the vicissitudes of politics—state, budgetary, and local politics—than the academic units. If Great Cities is to continue to evolve into a program of engaged research, built upon partnerships between faculty, students and off campus urban sectors, it must maintain its independence from such pressures, as real and necessary to institutional relations as they are.

Indeed, at one point early on in her new tenure as Chancellor, Professor Manning investigated the possibility of bringing the Great Cities Institute from its academic home in College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs (CUPPA) and into the Provost's office. David Perry, as director, made the argument that the Institute is far too vulnerable as a research institution in the administrative and political environment of upper administration. Chancellor Manning heard the argument and established instead a new Executive Vice Chancellor for External Affairs with oversight over public and press relations, physical plant, labor unions, student services and alumni affairs, thereby reinforcing the Great Cities Commitment's academic path —one leading, among other places, to the Great Cities Institute. Later on she appointed the director of GCI to the post of associate chancellor to take better advantage of the emerging success of the institute and the Chancellor's "commitment" to engaged research.

Resources: Great Cities Institute and Engaged Research

The Great Cities Institute (GCI) is a focal point of UIC's Great Cities Commitment. It is a university-wide, interdisciplinary research center academically housed in the College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs and committed to *engaged research* in and for the "great cities" of the world with a clear and particular emphasis on Chicago. The Institute is the umbrella for two urban policy and development research centers, a new, advanced, community-university partnership initiative, a university-wide annual program of appointed faculty scholars, an equally broad faculty research seed

fund and a series of research divisions and education divisions chaired by resident research fellows. What distinguishes each of these programs from similar efforts at other universities is the fact that, through GCI, they are, in part, underwritten with permanent funds from the University of Illinois, adding stability to UIC's Great Cities approach to the engaged university. Of equal importance is the increasingly clear test that each of these efforts must meet to produce what UIC calls its mission of what we earlier called "engaged research." It is through its attempts to produce such "engaged research" that the Great Cities Institute meets the challenge set forth by the Kellogg Commission to "go beyond outreach and service to what the commission defines as "engagement." Kellogg defines engagement as "institutions that have redesigned their teaching, research and extension and service functions to become even more sympathetically and productively involved with their communities, however community may be defined." Frankly this definition, by itself, would not cut it at UIC—it is at once too amorphous, lacking academic direction—"sympathy" is not enough, even with a nod to "productivity"—and it also does not give balanced recognition to the contributions of external or community partners. In short, it is good rhetoric, but lacks the substance necessary to direct the efforts of the research members of the academy—at least it would not be enough at UIC.

The UIC approach to "engagement" described throughout this paper has been an evolutionary one, benefiting from top-level leadership and program development, redefinition and resource allocation at the academic unit level. The Great Cities Institute is an especially good example of incremental ways in which university-community research can be integrated into reward structure of the academy.

Two of the programs of GCI listed above are the Great Cities Seed Fund and the Faculty Scholars program. Both programs require applicants to submit written research proposals. The Great Cities Seed Fund is a program designed to provide seed grants for faculty to conduct research project over the course of a year and the Great Cities Faculty Scholars program provides awardees with a year in residence at the Institute, with no other obligation than to conduct a prescribed program of research and interact with other scholars and external partners.

In many ways, the programs adhere to traditional academic evaluation procedures. Proposals are read by peer review panels comprised of representatives of the senior research leadership at GCI, past Great Cities Scholars, Great Cities Fellows and distinguished faculty selected from throughout the campus. Each proposal is evaluated against three criteria or dimensions of "engaged research:"

(i) **Partnership**: To what extent does the work benefit, from the protocol forward, from a partnership between the faculty member and an external, non-traditional site(s) of knowledge? In short how much is the design of the research project a product of university-community partnerships, where both the academic and urban goals and outcomes play a clear role in the project. It is our experience that the most successful partnerships are established relationships that have produced as much trust between the partners as research products. Therefore, the most successful proposals are those that are the product of a secured partnership, not proposals to begin one. What is especially new about this criterion is the recognition of non-traditional site of knowledge, or local partners, in the creation of the research project, from the protocol stage forward.

(ii) **Interdisciplinary**: To what extent is the project interdisciplinary? If not in its production, then in its reach. That is, does the project benefit from cross-disciplinary collaboration? If not are the outcomes of the project likely to have interdisciplinary implications: i.e. how and by whom will the results be 'read', taught, or implemented? For example, how do proposals fit with the long-term research programs of GCI? Or would a proposal attract support from other interdisciplinary centers such as UIC's Humanities Institute or Environmental Policy Institute in the form of a jointly sponsored Faculty Scholar position.

(iii) **Impact**: A scholar should be able to demonstrate the proposed impact the research on education and the construction of knowledge and the on the "great cities" of the world, of which Chicago is one. For example, in the past two years scholars have contributed to affordable housing policy in Chicago, the developmental costs and benefits of Tax Increment Financing, new models of pediatric mental health in public schools, and new models of neighborhood economic development, documentary film on Rio de Janeiro and public sculpture, while winning prestigious research awards (Guggenhiem), foundation awards (Russell Sage, Mac Arthur) and federal grants (HUD, NIH and NSF). The combination of journal articles, books, creative projects and substantive reports is further evidence of the viability of the engaged research focus.

These three criteria are markers—comprising an "ideal type" of engaged research—against which peer review evaluation can begin. No proposal ranks high on all three variables. In fact, the

conversation about how engaged research fits into the traditional research practices of the university is an important element in building the visibility of the Great Cities Commitment. In some departments and even a bit at the college level, it is becoming evident to faculty, their department heads and deans that considering how to propose such research is a good preface to success. As a result, over the past eleven years, both the seed grant and scholars programs have become very visible and increasingly competitive. Today, up to eight scholar awards and five seed grants are made annually, and the competitions attract proposals from anywhere from forty to fifty faculty members, from almost all the colleges at UIC.

The process of application is more than an individual decision. The project and its parameters of "engaged research" must also be the subject of conversation with the department chair; because the department will need to release the scholar for a full year and will need to continue to pay the salary of the faculty member. The proposal also requires the approval of the dean of the faculty member's college. The result is a yearly college-by-college discussion of engaged research, including where it fits in a faculty member's career and in the curricular plan of the departments. Over the past eleven years, 103 faculty scholars from 35 different disciplines and 12 colleges have conducted some form of this engaged research and almost sixty-five seed grants have been awarded to faculty in 19 disciplines. The send funds have been exceedingly productive, generating 14 dollars in sponsored research support for every seed dollar. As many as forty graduate students from as many as twelve departments work with these faculties and other Great Cities fellows on a yearly basis. The resulting seminars, community meetings, forums and lecture series at Great Cities give new definition interdisciplinary urban scholarship.

Each year, the director of the Institute visits each dean on campus – from Art, Architecture and Liberal Arts and Sciences to Engineering and Medicine. When the director is with each dean, the dean "the director's dean" and the GCI is "their institute." The dean and director review the research initiatives in each college, and determine how the resources and activities of GIC can best be deployed in the college. Faculty Scholars at GCI are encouraged to make presentations about the Institute and their work to their colleagues in their home disciplinary unit. GCI contributes funding to the home unit to defray the replacement costs for courses that are not offered during the absence of Faculty Scholar appointees.

GCI also maintains fully research programs in: metropolitan sustainability, international policy in contested cities, workforce development, professional education, housing and community

development, community technology and community health and epidemiological studies, and urban violence and gang research. Each program is headed by a resident GCI Fellow. The fellows are either faculty scholars with sponsored research programs that have allowed them the resources to remain at GCI on a fulltime basis or nationally or locally recognized researchers who have chosen to locate their sponsored research at GCI. Each of the fellows' research programs are representative of various facets of engaged research: they are interdisciplinary efforts grounded in partnerships between the Institute and external sources of expertise or organizations. All of them contribute to the urban well being of those living in Chicago and in other urban centers around the world, while they also add to the creation of knowledge about cities. At present there are nine fellows in residence at GCI and each of them comes from a different academic discipline, and they are supported through a broad array of foundation and governmental support, including NIH, NSF, HUD, MacArthur, Ford, Russell Sage, Guggenhiem foundations and an equally robust array of state and local agencies and philanthropics.

One of the key programs of the Great Cities Institute is the UIC Neighborhoods Initiative (UICNI). UICNI is a signature example of UIC's approach to engagement, built, as it is, on long term partnerships between community institutions and UIC faculty, research staff and students that seek to improve and enhance the quality of life in adjacent an underserved neighborhoods. UICNI's mission is "to develop a culture of partnerships that benefits both community and university. It serves as a clearinghouse of information and analysis, a broker for potential research, a provider of technical assistance and an administrator of collaborative projects."

From its inception in 1995, the Neighborhoods Initiative evolved almost "organically" (Wiewel and Broski, 1997) from previous community-based research efforts, some going back several years, even decades, including university-run health clinics, school and curricular reform efforts, and community and economic development planning initiatives. These efforts were scattered throughout the university, the product of individual faculty and a number of research centers. While these efforts gained support as a product of early partnerships with community institutions, the bulk of neighborhood residents and leaders expressed distrust and hostility towards a university that had been built as part of an urban renewal effort viewed by most as having effectively destroyed their community.

The beginning of the Neighborhoods Initiative combined these past collaborations with focus groups and community meetings to build a range of new programs along with ongoing ones. The Initiative was also one of the very first US Department of Housing and Urban Development Community

Outreach Partnership Centers, or COPC, and one of five university-community collaborations to be awarded a multi-million dollar Joint Community Development grant. At the same time UIC committed a recurring line item of $250,000 to UICNI. Within two years the NI had grown to 40 programs, with over sixty faculty and over 100 community groups involved in a combination of engaged research, technical assistance and service learning efforts. While activity at UICNI has shifted to a full state-wide capacity building strategy and the partnerships are far more "far flung" making the partners' council less appealing and new "distance learning networks more amenable to present needs of striking resource collaborations, assessing the viability of sponsored research proposals and administering the evaluation and oversight of the effectiveness of university-community neighborhood strategies, the UICNI remains a model of such reciprocally based collaborations. New electronic as well as face-to-face training and service collaboratives concern the present UICNI Council model—made up now of statewide community representatives, UIC faculty and GCI researchers. If the Faculty Scholar and Seed Fund peer review panels are key to overseeing and sustaining "engaged research" throughout the campus, the UICNI Council has been an equally important site of "engagement," meeting regularly, at times every month, and now in different focus and distance learning modalities under the co-chairmanship of the director of UICNI and a community leader. Faculty researchers work with the council and its task groups on projects. Long standing university-community partnerships are nurtured and sustained by the council. These partnerships and the council provide continuity for scholars and researchers to move into and out of projects: the oversight and review of the partners on the council are key to the success of the research, technical assistants and student training programs. At the moment over one hundred faculty and academic units work in partnership with over 200 neighborhood organizations, schools, clinics and other public and private agencies.

Rewards: the Engaged University

In many ways, the UIC's Great Cities Commitment as it has been described here has been a success. Over a decade of committed leadership, considerable resource allocation and the development of a university-wide set of academic and research programs has made Great Cities a visible and well-integrated feature of UIC's mission, and, in turn, made the university a recognized example of the "engaged university." If imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, then the decision of the national organization of urban universities known previously as the "Urban Thirteen" to recast itself for most of the 1990's as the "Great Cities Consortium," with a new national mission of "engagement" and a new national office in Washington D.C would certainly appear to be evidence of UIC's success in securing that clearer identity Chancellor Stukel sought in 1991. Today this organization has changed again and is now the Urban Serving Universities spearheading the larger Committee on the Urban Agenda of the

National Association of State University and Land Grant Colleges. The "engaged university" is now a mission element of all great research universities—public and private.

But, in at least one important way, the leadership and commitment of UIC's top administrators and the deployment of resources to create the "thematic structure" called for by the Kellogg Commission has not been enough. Here again, UIC has led to way in its failures as well in recent initiative that may portend a new model of success for the "engaged research university." While the Great Cities concept has become a visible part of many of UIC's colleges and even more departments and research units, there is little evidence of Great Cities having had a similar clarifying impact on either unit or university-wide promotion and tenure guidelines. Indeed, for all the activity of an increasing number of faculty in programs of Great Cities, the confusion over whether and how to reward such activities seems as rife among the faculty today as when Great Cities began. For over eight years "UIC faculty have been examining the issue of what, in our promotion and tenure documents, constitutes 'public service?'" (Provost's Task Force on the Scholarship of Engagement (TFSE), January, 2001). The Faculty Senate Public Service issued a report "Evaluating and Rewarding Public Service" in 1994, that concluded "that it was time to better reward public service activities by the faculty, that the public would be responsive and supportive of greater public service by UIC and that the faculty would support such an effort." While the committee determined that the faculty was ready to include stronger language in their promotion and tenure documents, the larger Faculty Senate remained unconvinced, or as one faculty leader put it, "service requirements for tenure and promotion, especially when applied to the careers of junior faculty unfairly raise another, institutionally problematic, hurdle to advancement." (Faculty Senate Meeting, May 2001).

In early 1998, with little movement in the Faculty Senate on rewards for public service, a group of faculty scholars at the Great Cities Institute drafted a new "White Paper on the 'Scholarship of Application:' Evaluating and Rewarding Public Service in the Research University." The White Paper reviewed the key literature and practices on rewarding service and argued, somewhat differently than the Faculty Senate committee, that a "scholarship of application" rather than "service" offered a clearer description of activities that could properly be rewarded in the research university. The White Paper focused "more narrowly on the expansion of traditional notions of research into the scholarship of engagement and application in partnership with entities in the Chicago area." (TGSE, 2001: 3). The parsing of the differences in what constituted "service" or "application," was not as important to Provost Betsy Hoffman as was the growing interest among the faculty in the topic, stimulated by ongoing Faculty Senate debate and the rising interest in university-community engagement brought on by the

Great Cities programs. In 2000, the Provost formed a Task Force on the Scholarship of Engagement. Borrowing from the Great Cities language of "engagement," the Task Force attempted to resolve the terminology debate by saying that the "scholarship of engagement is used to highlight a way of thinking of what is often called public service: a focus on partnerships, not one sided-research; the co-creation of knowledge (between faculty and community and interdisciplinary); involvement in real-world problems that can enrich research and teaching rather than be separate from them." (TFSE, 2001: 1). In a way the "scholarship of engagement" was a compromise term for the Task Force—as it tried to create a category that could recognize the definitive elements of research and scholarship that best embodied the UIC Great Cities Commitment and also would be understandable to the majority of faculty who considered the work of the Great Cities Commitment "public service."

The final report to the Provost waffled—using both a Boyeresque language of the "scholarship of application and service and, therefore doing as much to muddy the process as advance it. Ironically, by conflating the notion of "engaged research" from Great Cities with "service" in order to attract the broadest number of faculty to the discussion, the Task Group actually made it even more difficult for education and creative knowledge produced through university-community partnerships to be considered as other than "service," thereby placing such work at a decided disadvantage in the promotion and tenure debate. Still others among the faculty argued against the notion of the engaged university more broadly. For them, interdisciplinary and partnered research could be construed as "political" (Fish, 2002) rather than "scholarly;" –that is the value of research that is measured in terms of its usefulness to communities, is not a value that should be measured as part of a faculty member's contribution to his or her discipline, and cannot therefore be academically valorized and rewarded.

But in spite of all these arguments, the Task Force pushed ahead and recommended that the Provost "instruct units to establish norms for the amount and kinds of scholarship of engagement that faculty members in specific tenure levels are expected to achieve and the method of evaluation. These norms should be appropriate to the mission of the unit and will be approved by the campus Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Provost's office." The Task Force went on in some detail to describe ways to implement this process.

The new interim Provost accepted the report and recommended that it be sent to the Faculty Senate, which reviewed the document only after reverting to its original language of public service. In early summer, both the Provost and the Senate agreed to take the Task Force to the full faculty in the form of a *Conference on the Engaged University*. The conference was held in the Spring 2002 and it

represented the second largest interdisciplinary event of its kind, after the Great Cities forum in 1994. The conference attracted hundreds of faculty members and most of the deans and senior administrators. The discussion turned on another term—"engaged research." While more faculties at the meeting seemed to favor this term as more immanently susceptible to promotion and tenure evaluation in the research university; sizable sectors of the faculty argued for retention of "public service,' while still others described a "scholarship of application" as the more understandable category.

A new Provost considered the results of the Conference. Among the sixteen recommendations of the meeting are the naming of a new committee to plan and oversee the implementation of the TFSE proposals, including the initiation of a process of unit-specific discussions of norms guiding the 'scholarship of engagement," and the use of funds in the TFSE budget to invite experienced faculty from the National Review Board or UIUC, or Portland State University to help with the next steps. But these steps remained, until 2005, essentially premature, because, in a way, UIC was, perhaps even still is, struggling to establish an identity—not so much with the outside world, but with its own faculty.

Access to Excellence

To kindle such an identity in the faculty, the new Provost felt that an even larger institution-wide process was required and after tabling the Task Force recommendations set about, in late 2003, the first fully faculty-based strategic thinking and planning process in the history of the university—beginning first with a college-by-college, even discipline-by-discipline (where debate warranted) set of conversations over what to *think* about when strategically revalorizing the university. After eighteen months a certain "mantra" of institutional identity emerged. For a university in a twenty first century global America to be a fully "engaged urban anchor" institution, it would, in the eyes of the faculty of UIC, need to adhere to a goal of "access to excellence." Such a statement was as contradictory as it was visionary—it required that a university be at once "accessible" to all and "excellent"—that the full diversity of access would be an ultimate source of "excellence" not a barrier—access for faculty and university <u>to</u> all of the city and access for all of the city to the full reaches of the campus. The statement best addressed the goals and concerns of the vast majority of the faculty: for them, agreeing and not, "access to excellence" could serve as a central feature of a fully engaged, rigorously outstanding institution of higher learning and research. Access was the trump card in the excellence goal. And excellence was the most attractive feature in securing local, national and international excellence. In sum, after eighteen months of literally scores of debates, meetings and draft discussion the faculty, as a whole, saw this as the new action statement and vision of UIC and made the statement the center piece of the Strategic Thinking document, in February 2005.

Put another way, for many universities "excellence" is the goal and for many others "access" is the goal, but for very few is "access *to* excellence" the goal: a statement at once operationalizes the dynamics and tensions of full institutional engagement with the urban—local and global, student and faculty, activists and political leaders. As such, as the Provost hoped that a good part UIC's struggle for identity was owned at last by the faculty as they redefined the direction of the university in two publications: (i) Strategic Thinking (2005); and (ii) the 2006 Strategic Plan. In both documents, the notion of the *engaged research university* reached new levels of prominence and endorsement: first as one of the five key elements of the university's vision in the Strategic Thinking Document (2005) and more importantly as part of both the university's next ten year operational plan as one of the 6 institutional goals of the Strategic Plan 2012.

In both these documents, "Great Cities"—the UIC "brand" of global/urban engagement –in all university aspects— became more central to the university institutional mission, goals, and action steps. Equally important to the institution's final realization of its "identity" were the ways in which such

an “engaged mission” found its way into the university’s developmental mission. As of this writing UIC is engaged in a seven year capital campaign—with one of the five key development goals being the Great Cities Commitment so eloquently recast by Chancellor Sylvia Manning and operationalized by the new Provost, Michael Tanner, first in his consideration of the Task Force findings and then in the refinement and institutionalization of these findings in the Strategic Thinking, Strategic Planning and more recently Capital Campaign objectives. The struggle for identity—as both great research university and great urban institution—is still conflicted; perhaps even necessarily so, but the university has moved mightily to make the language of engagement, especially as detailed in the Great Cities Commitment, key to the mission, goals and operations of the full agency of higher education.

Bibliography: Partial for this Report

Bender, T. 1988. *The University and the City: From Medieval Origins to the Present*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Brentano, C. 1995. 'The Two Berkeleys: City and University Through 125 Years', Minerva (Great Britain) 33 (4), 361-371.

Cisneros, H. 1995. *The University and the Urban Challenge*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development: Rockville, MD : HUD USER

Crooks, J. 1982. 'The AUU and The Mission of the Urban University', *Urbanism Past and Present*, 7 (2), 34-39.

Daley, Richard J. 1963. Speech. UIC, September.

Dober, Richard P. 1991. *Campus Design.* New York: John Wiley and sons, Inc.

Dober, Richard P. 1963. *Campus Planning*. New York: Society of College and University Planners.

Dober, Richard P. 2000. *Campus Landscape: Functions, Forms, Features*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Gibbs, Melanie F. 1994. 'Sale, Re-Use Turn IBM Facility Into University Site', *National Real Estate Investor*, 36 (11), 12.

Grobman, Arnold B. 1988. *Urban State Universities: An Unfinished National Agenda*. New York, Praeger, 1988.

Hackney, S. 1986. 'Introduction to Special Issue', *ANNALS AAPSS*, November.

Harkavy, I. and Puckett, J.L. 1994.'Lessons from Hull House for the Contemporary Urban University', *Social Service Review,* 68 (3), 299-321.

Initiative for a Competitive Inner City. Leveraging Colleges and Universities for Urban Economic Development: An Action Agenda. Boston: CEOs for Cities, 2002.

Kellogg Commission 1999. *Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution*. Washington: NASULGC.

Klotsche, J. M. 1996. *The Urban University and the Future of Our Cities.* New York: Harper & Row.

Maurrasse, D. J. 2001. *Beyond the Campus: How Colleges and Universities Form Partnerships with Their Communities.* New York: Routledge.

McDowell, G. R. 2001. *Land-Grant Universities and Extension Into the 21st Century: Renegotiating or Abandoning a Social Contract*. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press.

Muthesius, S. 2000. *The Postwar University: Utopianist Campus and College*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Nash, G. 1973. *The University and the City: Eight Cases of Involvement*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Pinck, D. 1993. '(Re)Emerging Roles for Developers: Universities as Partners', *Real Estate Finance* 10 (2) (Summer 1993), 62-64.

Turner, P. V. 1984. *Campus: An American Planning Tradition*. New York: Architectural History Foundation.

Wusten, H. van der 1998. *The Urban University and Its Identity: Roots, Locations, Roles*. Dordrecht, Netherlands; and Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

UIC Strategic Documents:

- Great Cities Initiative Operational Documents, 1991-1994, including citations to Wolshok and Rawlings and Kellop Commission Report.
- Task Force on Scholarship of Engagement and transcripts of the Conference on the
- The Engaged University and Faculty Senate fall meeting, 2002.
- UIC Strategic Thinking 2010
- UIC Strategic Plan, 2012

U.S. Congress. House. 1992. Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs. Subcommittee on Policy Research and Insurance. The Role of Urban Universities in Economic and Community Development: Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Policy Research and Insurance of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, House of Representatives, One Hundred Second Congress, First Session, October 28, 1991. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1992.

U.S. Congress. House. 1979. Committee on Education and Labor. Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education. The Urban Grant University Act of 1977: Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-Fifth Congress, Second Session, on H.R. 7328. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979.

VerMeulen, M. 1980. 'The University as Landlord', *Institutional Investor,* 14 (5) (May 1980), 119-122.

Wiewel, W. and Broski, D. 1997. *University involvement in the community: Developing a Partnership Model*, A Great Cities Institute Working Paper, Chicago: University of Illinois, Chicago

Wiewel, W. and Broski. D. 1999. 'The Great Cities Institute: Dilemmas of Implementing the Urban Land Grant Mission', *Metropolitan Universities*, 10 (1), 29-38.

Wolfe, R.J. 1986. 'When a University Becomes a Developer', *Real Estate Finance Journal,* 2 (1) (Summer 1986), 56-61.