DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 861 HE 001 643

AUTHOR	Woffard, Joan W.; And Others
TITLE	Urban Universities: Rhetoric, Reality, and Conflict.
INSTITUTION	Organization for Social and Technical Innovation, Cambridge, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Div. of Higher Education.
REPORT NO	OE-50062
PUB DATE	Jun 70
NOTE	71p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Activism, *Community Service Programs, Community Support, *Higher Education, *Institutional Role, *Social Responsibility, Teacher Militancy, *Urban Universities

ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken to explore the potential role the Office of Education could play in helping urban universities respond more appropriately than they have in the past to urban problems. It was assumed that urban crises have created new imperatives for all urban universities and urban universities face pressures from both acknowledged and unacknowledged constituencies. Chapter 1 describes the selection of 11 urban universities to participate in the study and sketches their efforts to become more involved in urban problems. Chapter 2 examines demands on the university by the surrounding community, militant students, city officials and activist faculty. Chapter 3 examines expectations of urban universities from a historical perspective. Chapter 4 posits a pattern of faculty behavior emerging from the historical conflicts. Chapter 5 returns to the demands in Chapter 2 and tests them against the picture developed in Chapters 3 and 4 on university response. Chapter 6, based on a 3-day conference designed to bring together constituency representatives and others committed to change in urban universities, looks at the problem of building effective coalitions. Communication problems proved so enormous that the task of creating networks of communication in individual cities became the first step. The report ends with a description of one university's attempt to create mechanisms for real communication among diverse viewpoints. (JS)

OE/BHE

OE-50062

URBAN UNIVERSITIES:

RHETORIC, REALITY, AND CONFLICT

by

Organization for Social and Technical Innovation

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Higher Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Superintendent of Documents Catalog No. HE 5.250:50062

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1970

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402 - Price 65 cents

FOREWORD

For more than a century, since the Morrill Act established the land-grant college system in 1862, the Federal Government has played an increasingly supportive role to American higher education. Today, to list only a few activities under a wide array of programs, it provides colleges and universities with financial assistance toward construction of buildings; it helps increase the body of knowledge through fellowships; it assists students with loans, grants, and work-study salaries; and it supports "developing institutions" in their efforts to bring themselves into the mainstream of academic life.

In recent years, however, and more dramatically so with each passing year, it has become apparent that certain colleges and universities, those located in a large city, need help of another kind. The city, or the immediate community, in which a university is located, or both, are turning to it for help in solving what has come to be known as the "urban crisis." Unhappily, few if any universities find themselves prepared to respond to this request. And, unhappily too, the Office of Education has not seen just how to go about helping the universities enhance their responsiveness.

In an effort to find out how it might begin to help meet this new university need, the Office of Education turned to the Organization for Social and Technical Innovation (OSTI), a private nonprofit agency in Cambridge, Massachusetts. After several discussions it was decided the Office could make a good start by sponsoring a study and a conference that would lay bare the reasons behind universities' generally inadequate response to the demands of the urban crisis and suggest ways to overcome this inadequacy.

The Office contracted with OSTI to make the study and conduct the conference. In this publication OSTI reports its findings, which can be summarized in OSTI's own words by saying that, with regard to urban problems, universities "are locked into a set of essential conflicts that are not resolved by tinkering on the periphery, by adding a new program here or borrowing a remedy there."

How each university goes about unlocking its own set of conflicts is of course up to it. For its own part, the Office has already begun to examine intensively how it can redirect certain of its existing programs, or emphasize certain parts of them, how it can work more effectively in concert with other Federal agencies, and whether new programs may be called for in order to help universities meet their growing urban responsibility more effectively.

Preston Valien
Deputy Associate Commissioner
for Higher Education

June 1970

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report and the project which produced it are the work of a number of persons. Among those who contributed most significantly are Dr. Herman Niebuhr, Associate Vice President for Urban Affairs of Temple University and an Associate of the Organization for Scientific and Technical Innovation (OSTI), who helped importantly to frame the project; OSTI member Phyllis E. Jackson, who selected project participants; Bradley Honoroff, also of OSTI; and two OSTI interns, Brenda Lillie of the State University of New York at Old Westbury, and Ronald Perlman of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology City Planning Department.

Planning of the conference was assisted by a steering committee composed of Dr. Francis L. Broderick, Chancellor, University of Massachusetts at Boston; Dr. Donald Henderson, Director of Southern Illinois University's Experiment in Higher Education at East St. Louis, Illinois; Mrs. B. Ann Kleindienst, former Program Director of the St. Louis Model Cities Agency; Howard Thomas, student at St. Louis University; and James B. Williams, Director, Philadelphia Tutorial Program.

Thanks are due also to the constituency members and conference participants who contributed time, energy, and ideas.

George Dawson, Dr. Preston Valien, Paul Delker, and Peter P. Muirhead, of the Office of Education, all helped assure the project's success, and Arthur L. Singer, Jr., of the Sloan Foundation made the conference possible.

Mrs. Joan W. Wofford, Project Director for OSTI, was principal author of the report. She was greatly assisted in the writing by Dr. Richard Freeland, OSTI Associate, Dr. Daniel M. Fox, OSTI consultant, and Dr. Donald A. Schon, President of OSTI.

Organization for Social
and Technical Innovation
264 Third Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Early in 1968 the Office of Education and the Organization for Social and Technical Innovation (OSTI), a nonprofit research and consulting firm, began a series of conversations exploring the potentially greater role the Office could play in helping urban universities respond more appropriately to urban problems. In the end it was decided that one way the Office could begin to realize its potential would be for it to sponsor a study of present university responsiveness to these problems which would begin to help them achieve greater responsiveness.

In February 1969 the Office contracted with OSTI to conduct such a study. Two major assumptions set forth in the contract were:

1. Urban crises have created new imperatives for all urban universities.

2. Universities located in cities face pressures from both acknowledged and unacknowledged constituencies:

   -- students who want an educational experience relevant to contemporary issues, as they see them.

   -- young activist faculty with a new sense of social mission.

   -- minority communities, frequently next to the universities, who want resources, allies, and freedom from invasion and disruption of neighborhoods.

   -- urban institutions, which need skilled manpower and help in problem-solving.

   -- power-structure representatives, who want allies and aid in easing tensions.

It was agreed that OSTI would look at the general university scene and then (1) select several universities in and of the city to participate in the study, (2) work intensively with representatives of constituent groups, and (3) conduct a working conference under Office sponsorship to encourage participating universities to consolidate their efforts to respond to the urban crisis. At the same time, OSTI would formulate a variety of models of university response and solicit ideas of ways in which future Federal programs and legislation might best assist urban universities to deal with urban problems.

Eleven universities were selected to participate in the project, but this study is not an in-depth analysis of them or of urban universities in general. Rather the study provides a framework within which to look at universities which are in and of the city and identifies, rather schematically, a process in which these institutions appear to be trapped.

We suggest that urban universities cannot be more responsive to urban problems unless they can be helped to make some fundamental choices. They are locked into a set of essential conflicts that are not going to be resolved by tinkering on the periphery, by adding a new program here or borrowing a remedy there. In this they may not differ from other universities with more national goals; our analysis suggests that the fundamental conflicts discussed here are shared by all universities.

There are other limitations to the scope of this study. For one thing, we did not deal with the entire spectrum of opinion within any one constituency. For another, we did not deal at all with a number of important constituencies like parents, alumni, or governing boards of either public or private universities.

Two Crises

When we began this project we were talking about the response of urban universities to the urban crisis. By March 1969, just a month later, we were talking about another crisis -- one within the universities.

At many points the demands of some university students coincided with demands made by community groups outside their university. The hurt felt outside the university at its seeming obliviousness to the human problems beyond its walls became mingled with the sense of outrage among students aware of social injustice and seeking a new kind of educational relevance. These students increased their demands for the recruitment, admission, and support of less privileged city youths. They also demanded in some places that the university recruit employees from among the poor who lived next door and that -- instead of restricting housing opportunities by expanding the campus into adjacent neighborhoods -- it build low-cost housing to meet community needs.

A few university administrators and faculty members had long ago articulated the need for university action to meet these demands, and in 1965 David Riesman had noted that students, particularly "the best college students, especially at the most academically prestigeful institutions," were involved in a new mission for the university, "the mission to the less privileged in our own or other societies."[1] For these students, this mission coincided with society's general sense of urgency over the "urban crisis." Many of them perceived the problems of the cities as having that sense of challenge and potential for change earlier recognized by the New Frontier and the Peace Corps. Thus, the university crisis was aggravated by the urban crisis and in turn lent fresh impetus to the city's demands and imposed new imperatives for response upon the university.

Except where the two crises overlapped, we ignored much of the university crisis, avoiding such issues as the university's involvement in the defense industries or its stance on the Vietnam War. We recognized that the climate surrounding universities had changed and felt that the change underscored many of our concerns, but we devoted our energies to the impact of urban problems upon universities situated in the city and to the potential impact of these universities on these problems.

That the two crises converged at points does not imply, however, that the problems of the city and the problems of the university can be solved together. Indeed, we are more impressed by the negative impact of each upon the other than by great hope for mutually positive interaction. Our basic rather pessimistic conclusion is that universities are unable to respond centrally to the demands of urban constituencies or to the urban crisis.

Summary of Contents

Chapter I (University Selection) describes the process of choosing 11 urban universities and briefly sketches the efforts of these institutions to become involved in urban problems.

Chapter II (The Demands of Urban Constituencies) examines demands on the university by four constituencies: (1) community, which generally means poor black neighborhoods bordering the universities, (2) militant students, (3) city officials, and (4) activist faculty. We also look at demands which cut across constituency lines. Two questions emerge: Why are there such diverse demands? How will the university respond?

Chapter III (Universities in Historical Perspective) places urban universities in their historical context to answer the question of why people expect so much of them. The dominant themes in this

---

1 David Riesman, "Alterations in Institutional Attitudes and Behavior," in Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, edited by Logan Wilson. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965. p. 70.

historical development are still embedded in universities in some form and produce conflicts. The rhetoric of universities attempts to reconcile these conflicts in all-encompassing missions but only gives rise to greater expectations.

Chapter IV (The Realities of University Structure) posits a pattern of faculty behavior emerging from the historical conflicts. This pattern (the "faculty mode"), and faculty power, constitute realities beneath university rhetoric and explain -- as the rhetoric does not -- why universities respond to new demands as they do.

Chapter V (Strategies of Change) returns to the clusters of demand in chapter II and tests them against the picture developed in chapters III and IV of university response. From this emerges a sense of which reforms look possible for the university and which do not. That analysis is then recast into the perspective of each of the constituencies, enabling us to suggest some of the options open to each group working toward change.

Chapter VI (The Urban University Conference) looks at the problem of building effective coalitions for change out of disorganized constituencies. The 3-day conference in June 1969 was designed to bring together constituency representatives and others committed to change in urban universities, but problems in communication and conflicts between constituency groups proved so enormous that the tasks of creating networks of communication and effective coalitions in individual cities became the obvious necessary first steps.

We end the report with a description of one university's open-ended attempt to create mechanisms for real communication among diverse viewpoints.

CHAPTER I: UNIVERSITY SELECTION

Criteria for selecting the institutions to assist in seeking answers to the question of how urban universities can become more responsive to urban problems were determined jointly by the Office of Education and OSTI.

Those criteria included:

- -- location in a large city
- -- proximity to a ghetto or poor community
- -- a local or regional constituency, as contrasted to the national constituency of a university like Harvard
- -- a university administration attempting to respond to urban pressure and restructure itself
- -- a president interested in the subject and eager to participate
- -- the presence of pressure groups in the community or the student body pushing the university into new activity
- -- a variety of models in the total group of universities

In addition, we established two negative criteria. We decided (1) to avoid New York City and Chicago as unmanageable and (2) not to involve any universities which were in an obvious state of crisis. That is to say, we felt that schools like San Francisco State College were at the time too involved in their own problems to be able either to make a positive contribution to other institutions or to get very much from others.

Office of Education and OSTI staff members developed a preliminary list of 20 universities. By means of telephone conversations with informed people, both within and outside these universities, and some site visits, OSTI arrived at a final selection of 11 universities. These institutions then were visited by either a single OSTI staff member or a team of OSTI staff to select representatives of the 6 constituent groups: faculty, students, presidents, community groups, public sector, and private sector.

The 11 universities to whose members we extended invitations to participate both in small pre-conference, constituent group meetings at OSTI headquarters in Cambridge and to attend the mid-June national conference at Martha's Vineyard were:

- Atlanta (Ga.) University
- University of Massachusetts at Boston
- State University of New York at Buffalo
- Cleveland (Ohio) State University
- Southern Methodist University, Dallas
- Wayne State University, Detroit
- University of Southern California, Los Angeles
- University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee
- Temple University, Philadelphia
- Southern Illinois University, East St. Louis branch
- St. Louis (Mo.) University

Following are descriptions of each and its setting:

Atlanta University

A coalition of six black institutions of higher learning in Atlanta, this university represents one of the more interesting examples of institutional involvement in urban problems in the South. Because it is a consortium, we had to decide which of the six institutions to focus upon as representative of the university. Largely because of the vital leadership being offered the Atlanta community by the president of Clark College, Dr. Vivian Henderson, we selected this college. Like most of the other institutions which make up Atlanta University, Clark is very closely linked to Atlanta's black community.

University of Massachusetts at Boston

While Northeastern University in many ways represents the typical urban university, we felt that the University of Massachusetts' decision to open a branch in a major urban area, and its having to attune itself to that area, pointed to the University of Massachusetts. The branch represents not only a fascinating new model of university activity but also the kind of institution we felt would benefit immeasurably from participation in the OSTI study. As a commuter school, it faces all of the problems that involves, but as a new institution it has an enormous range of choice before it. Chancellor Francis L. Broderick is attuned to the problems of urban universities and proved enormously helpful to this project.

State University of New York at Buffalo

At this institution, deeply involved in community affairs, the word community does not refer solely to the black population; it also refers to three Indian reservations on the outskirts of Buffalo and to a very large Polish population in the city. President Martin Meyerson is a leader in urban matters. Some of the students are involved in such political issues as the integration of work teams building the new campus, and some of the faculty make vigorous attempts to grapple with urban problems.

The School of Architecture and Environmental Design is active in planning the Model Cities program, and the School of Management will work with the city in planning and on the Model Cities program as well as counseling small business men in the inner city. The School of Management offers a course that gives credit for working in the community, and there is an active community aid corps. A new program leading to the Ph.D. in policy sciences combines study with field experience, emphasizing problem-solving and social action. There is also a black studies program.

Cleveland State University

Once a small private college, Cleveland State became the city's first public institution 10 years ago and now has 14,000 students. President Harold L. Enarson is attempting to involve the university more deeply in urban affairs. He has, for example, formed an Urban Affairs Institute which offers an undergraduate major and is considering a graduate program. The Institute sponsors workshops and training programs for professionals from the city and has joined in an urban conservatory.

Southern Methodist University

In terms of urban involvement, this university appears to be one of the most active in the Southwest. Although well outside the ghetto, it has many black students who have come through its Upward Bound project. There is a free university, completely student-run, for which teachers are recruited either from the black community or from among professors. Courses at the free university are open to the community. Students have considerable voice in official university channels and seem more actively interested in what happens both in the university and in the city than is generally true at other universities in the Southwest. In 1967 an Institute for Urban Studies was organized. It does not offer a degree; its primary purpose is to expand interdisciplinary research in the urban field. The Institute frequently cooperates with the Urban League.

Wayne State University

In many ways, Wayne State is typical of the kind of institution we examined in this project. Its dedicated president, William Keast, is a member of the Urban Affairs Committee of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and has played a leadership role among urban university presidents. It has a large black enrollment -- 14 percent of its student body -- and an extremely active association of black students. In addition to sponsoring an international urban studies committee, the university maintains close links with the city government and the community.

University of Southern California

This university is not in and of the city. It is upper middle-class, white, conservative, and rather unresponsive thus far to pressures building around it. Nevertheless, since it is located on the edge of Watts (within the curfew area during the riots there), it is seen by community representatives as a potentially significant resource. It has traditionally been involved in several areas of community service and is under considerable pressure to increase its involvement. Its law school has been developing an urban curriculum and provides legal services to the poor through an OEO-funded project, the Western Center for Law and Poverty. The university's dynamic president, Dr. Norman Topping, is concerned about urban involvement.

University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee

In the University of Wisconsin's Milwaukee campus we have a model of the extension of a rural institution into an urban setting, a model that the University of Massachusetts is in some ways following in Boston. The University at Milwaukee is not confined to the campus site, which, though in the city, is not in the core city. Its urban affairs department has established a center in the core where faculty members and students are available to help the community with its planning. The university has also established the "Paintbox," where children can get art materials and help with their art work.

The Center for Advanced Studies is also involved in urban activities, advising government agencies and citizen groups, and working with groups of parents and teachers in a project to improve the city school system.

Pressures on the university emanate mainly from the public sector. The Mayor, for instance, calls on it for help with the Urban Coalition, the Urban Observatory, and Model Cities programs. President Fred H. Harrington has proved responsive.

Temple University

A public institution with a history of serving the underprivileged, Temple has 44,000 full- and part-time students, is located in the heart of a ghetto, and in many ways is the prototype of the urban university. It is deeply involved with inner-city problems, with an office of the administration centrally concerned with community affairs. The university operates 20 neighborhood health centers in which it employs 45 neighborhood people, a program in grassroots journalism which pays neighborhood women $2 an hour to produce neighborhood newsletters, and a program of free music instruction to ghetto youngsters.

In addition, Temple has turned over to community use some property that will not be used for expansion in the next 5 to 10 years and is attempting to plan its expansion jointly with the community.

Southern Illinois University

Southern Illinois' Experiment in Higher Education, in East St. Louis, is a fascinating venture in which a large state university entered an extremely poor area and set up a branch directly devoted to the needs of the black youths residing there, including a new curriculum built around those needs. The venture has been successful; after 2 years youngsters enter the other branches of Southern Illinois University and other 4-year universities.

Catherine Dunham's Black Performing Arts program, located in East St. Louis, is affiliated with SIU and is open to SIU students. The university has formed a Regional and Urban Development Studies and Service Program which responds to requests for expertise from local groups, acts as an advocate for those groups and offers seminars for community members.

St. Louis University

Largely because of its President, the Reverend Paul C. Reinert, this university appears to be moving toward genuine urban involvement more steadily than many others. Father Reinert has instituted an administrative office for the recruitment of blacks into both the undergraduate and graduate schools, and at present one-fourth of the student body comes from minority groups. He has also created an Urban Study Center which provides planning consultants for the Model Cities program and has conducted manpower research and evaluation. The Department of Community Medicine offers staff training programs in a unique attempt to work with neighborhood health centers.

What initially emerged for us from this list of universities chosen for their efforts to respond to urban problems was the haphazard pattern of their response. None qualified as an "urban university" if by that we mean an institution peculiarly responsive to its urban context, with all that this implies about the makeup of its student body, its preparation of students for urban roles, its service to its immediate city. The Experiment in Higher Education in East St. Louis looked as though it was trying to be genuinely responsive to disadvantaged youths, but that institution is hardly a university in itself; rather, it is a small experimental branch of a relatively distant university.

CHAPTER II: THE DEMANDS OF URBAN CONSTITUENCIES

Those who have been a university president and have reflected on his role (like Clark Kerr) as well as those who have studied universities in depth (like David Riesman) have described the balancing of constituent interests as central to decision-making in universities. We made that assumption in this project and focused upon 6 constituencies of "our" 11 urban universities which seemed to us to represent a force for greater responsiveness by these universities to urban pressures:

<u>The communities immediately surrounding the universities</u>, on the assumption that one way to distinguish an urban university from others is the extent to which the community is considered -- or will soon have to be considered -- a legitimate and powerful constituency.

<u>Activist students</u>, on the assumption that the general student demand for greater "relevance" in course work and more community involvement has particular meaning at universities which in the main serve their particular city.

<u>Public agencies</u> of the cities in which the universities are located, on the assumption that school systems, welfare departments, health departments, Model Cities agencies, mayor's offices draw most of their staff members from urban universities and consequently have a vital interest in their training, in fact have considerable impact on that training through field experience, practice teaching, and various internships.

<u>Faculty members</u> who are seeking either individually or through university urban affairs centers to work on urban problems and are pressing for changes within their university that will speed urban involvement.

<u>Presidents</u> of the universities, committed to the task of involving their institutions more centrally with the problems of their cities.

<u>The private or business sector</u> of the cities in which the universities are located, on the assumption that they see the universities not only as key

suppliers of manpower but also as institutions capable of responding to and thereby quieting those "urban problems" which mean trouble.

We met for a day and a half with four groups we had identified as representative of the community, student, public, and faculty constituent groups. (We were not able to meet with either the presidents or representatives of the private sector and so cannot report on their views, although we will have more to say about both constituencies.)

A basic fact that emerged from statements of all four constituencies is that "urban crisis" means different things to different constituencies and even to different members of a single constituency.

Community Demands

From the community constituency we heard:

-- No existing university is capable of solving community problems; the only way to move a university is to lean on it. "I don't want it, but if it is there I want to get something from it."

-- Admit more black students. The universities do not now address themselves to the "right problems," but the demands of black students would change them from within; there would be a "relevancy by sheer number."

-- The universities increasingly rely on public funds and therefore should address themselves to public problems. This means giving up their elitist nature, opening admission to all the people, and no longer screening admissions.

-- The university should help us solve our problems just as it helps the Department of Defense solve its problems. "If scholars can put a man on the moon, they should be able to learn how to solve some of the problems of poverty."

-- Since universities do not have people skilled in working with community problems, they have an obligation to hire new kinds of staff from the community to do that work. The typical faculty member "doesn't perceive our problems, let alone know how to solve them."

-- "Right now the university cannot train anybody." First it has to put its own house in order.

-- The university now produces "social workers who are hated and teachers who cannot teach." After 4 years in a university, people cannot return to the community; if they never were in the community, the university does not prepare them to relate to community problems. Therefore, the university should . . .

. . . encourage large community inputs into training for community service.

. . . make this training, in part, accountable to the community.

. . . emphasize contact with the real world far more in training for urban roles.

. . . blend the professor and the community, decentralizing the training process and encouraging community people, not academics, to organize the field experience.

-- Do not abolish the university. It provides the useful function of allowing a time for critically appraising one's real life experience.

-- Part of the millions of public dollars spent on university planning should go to community problem-solving.

-- Educate the general community, not just the young.

-- Respond when we ask, but don't initiate and don't impose your views or your research on us.

-- Stop expanding into our neighborhood. (This was a demand that community members viewed mainly as a political tactic for attracting support.)

-- Give community folk university jobs in such areas as janitorial, maintenance, and secretarial services.

These statements need understanding and interpretation. In the first place, they show no sense of priorities; they are jumbled. To sort them out is difficult, particularly when the signals that accompany them are confusing. The amount of noise surrounding a demand will not always indicate its importance.

Second, they are self-contradictory and paradoxical. If blacks want to get into universities, they presumably want what universities have traditionally offered: status, legitimation, credentials, time off from the real world, and, it is to be hoped, some learning. These benefits could be lost if such other demands as open admissions policies and education for everyone in the community are met.

Finally, it is hard to determine to what extent demands represent important substance and to what extent they are for the sake of self-expression.

Student Demands

It is not astonishing that many of the comments about community demands can be made also about the demands of students. They were jumbled, noisy, and self-contradictory, and it was hard to know to what extent they represented substance or emotion.

Students said:

- "Universities should educate everybody," including people in surrounding communities.
- "There should be zero entrance requirements."
- "There should be a movement toward a black university." As presently set up, colleges "make us white; they eradicate our blackness."
- "Universities should give us something now so that we will be able to effect change later on."
- "The university cannot deal with racism. The university cannot deal with the community. I am giving up on it."
- "Universities should not isolate us from our home environment, make us speak two languages."
- "Universities should not be part of the establishment."

-- Universities should support, but not conceive or design, community programs.

-- Universities should not exploit the community through research or by physical expansion.

-- Universities should not engage in problem-solving for the Federal Government. "They should keep a moral stance."

-- The university should not allow protestors to be cut off from State or Federal aid.

-- The university decision-making process must be radically altered so that it meaningfully includes those who are affected.

-- Universities should not divulge information about students without their permission.

-- There should be no dichotomy between university and outside world. "The university should not be an island."

-- No large minority recruitment program should be without proper counselling and other supportive services.

-- There should be no grades.

-- Faculty tenure should be abolished or alternative routes offered for attaining it.

-- The faculty reward system should be changed to encourage <u>teaching</u>, not production.

-- No one should be "socially forced" to attend a university.

-- Higher education needs to be redefined.

-- The university should provide free legal and health services for the community.

-- It should intensify programs for drop-outs.

-- The university should permit graduate students to teach and counsel undergraduates and to study what they want.

In contrast to the demands of the community, the cry for help, for a home, for purity runs through these demands. There are also certain contradictions. Do students see the university as an island where student protestors would be protected from cuts in government aid or as real life (it "should not isolate us from our home environment")?

Both the student and community constituencies see the modern university as inadequate, but both find it difficult to disregard. Both want its help, but on their own terms. Both want it to be useful and to be open. Both want it to act in good faith and see as a continuing statement of bad faith its failure to change in the directions that they propose.

Public Agency Demands

Questioning of the university's good faith and the demand that it be useful and open were voiced also by representatives of public agencies -- who added the demand that urban universities establish more vital connections with the urban institutions they serve. City officials seemed to be more understanding of the universities' constraints, however, than the first two constituencies. They viewed universities within a framework of the universities' ability to relate to and function cooperatively with the institutions around them. This led to a range of views -- from the university as another department of city government on the one hand to the university as irrelevant to city and community needs on the other.

Some comments by city officials:

-- The expansion of universities raises both physical and political problems: Can the city afford the space universities claim? And how does the city resolve the political question of who is to have it?

-- Students whose life style is different from that of most of a city's residents pose another political problem. They irritate citizens by their different hours and habits, take up parking facilities, illegally park out-of-state cars, and disregard tickets, all of which puts city officials in a difficult position.

More specifically, the city officials continued:

-- The tax-free university in a certain sense "robs" a city of some tax money and should repay that debt, possibly through services.

- -- The university should provide the city with technical assistance, problem-solving, and part-time personnel by, for instance, putting together data about the city, or setting up community health centers, or training indigents.

- -- Graduate schools should be linked with corresponding public institutions far more vitally than at present:

  - -- the school of education with the public school system.

  - -- the school of social welfare with the department of welfare.

- -- "The university is out of touch with the community; it just does not know how to work with it." (Some city officials acknowledged that they share this problem -- "Nobody knows where to go to in relations with the community.")

- -- Urban study centers are expensive and invisible, and they swallow up the people who work in them. Their functions as defined by the university are not very helpful.

- -- Changes are needed in university structure, in student involvement, in decision-making, in curriculum, and in the system of faculty rewards -- but universities will not change until their survival is threatened.

Faculty Demands

What most community, student, and public agency representatives seemed to be asking was that the university be useful, attuned to the real world, open and egalitarian and that, if change is needed, show its good faith by changing. Faculty members at first appeared to be demanding the same things, which would have coincided with our original assumption. As our talks with them progressed, however, we found that their demands were really quite different.

These were people attempting individually to do things in the city or in the community that the universities had often said should be done. Yet they felt they were being punished for these activities in that they were not rewarded in the same way or at the same rate as those who undertook more traditional, publishable research.

These were things faculty members asked that universities do:

- -- Change the reward system -- including promotion, hiring, pay, space allocation, status, and release from other responsibilities -- to include us and our work. Recognize the rewards on a national basis and over time so that our skills are transferable.

- -- Spread the urban responsibility among a larger group of faculty members. At the moment we are the only ones.

- -- Accept community members in faculty roles. Develop joint appointments with the community and establish reward systems for them.

- -- Put community members on the board of trustees, or establish an advisory board of community members.

- -- Support the development of liaison departments or offices within the university to deal specifically with community needs.

- -- Show us you really want to help the community by rewarding us for our work with the community.

- -- Support the faculty member who goes out on a limb for the community even if that raises problems within the university.

These faculty members were not asking the university to change in the ways that the other constituencies did. They were not talking at all about the educational process, about the university's responsibility to the city and the community, about the implications of their own work for the university s curriculum, or about the problems posed for a university by interdisciplinary problem-solving on behalf of the community.

They were asking for acceptance, rewards, a way fully into the system. They felt that they were not sharing in the power and status accorded to most members of the faculty, and they were hurt and angry. Some observed that they could avail themselves of traditional faculty mobility and leave if things got really tough. ("Splitsville" was their phrase for it.)

Generally, these faculty members felt unrecognized and unrewarded for what they considered their central contribution to university rhetoric. As our later analysis will make clear, it was not university rhetoric but university practice that left them out. They felt they represented the university protective device of encouraging involvement by expendable individuals in such things as urban affairs. They felt that somehow they had been "used," but they did not understand how.

That these faculty members felt this way is hardly astonishing. To the extent they thought of themselves as faculty members, this is how they would feel. What they expressed as a wish for a change in the reward system -- which was echoed by the other constituent groups -- is really a desire for recognition by their colleagues for work their colleagues do not regard very highly.

Cross-constituency Demands

We have looked at the demands of 4 individual constituent groups. Now we look at major clusters of demand which represent a shared sense of what urban universities should be doing. Universities usually are forced to focus upon the demands of one constituency at a time, and by highlighting areas of constituent agreement we hope we can help universities see them in a more useful perspective.

New Kind of Faculty

Change in the reward system and hiring of a new kind of faculty were demands heard from all 4 constituencies. A number of persons asked why community people might not serve the university either as technical assistants or problem-solvers, or as instructors helping to shape the field experience of potential teachers, social workers, doctors, lawyers, etc.

Open Enrollment

Another demand, largely by community and student constituencies, was increased enrollment of minority students, even to the point of no entrance requirements and open enrollment -- which was sometimes interpreted to mean admission to a university on the same basis as admission to a high school (residence within the area served by the institution).

It is hard to know how far the proponents of this idea would really want to carry it, but some spoke in terms of enabling not only every high school graduate but also some persons who had not completed high school to attend university. They spoke of community recruitment and selection, of community representatives serving as counselors and advisors, and of a new kind of community education-in-extension for anyone who might want additional schooling. Apparently underlying this cluster of demands was an implicit faith in the university as an agency of personal success and a belief that its major problem lay in its exclusivity.

Problem-Solving and Technical Assistance

The demand for problem-solving and technical assistance came in various forms, but always it involved university members working in the city or the community in a direct and useful way. Research was not a part of it, except conceivably as some data collection and analysis for City Hall. Service was the major aim of this demand. The community wanted help, the students wanted both to give help and to be assured that the university would undertake to give help -- particularly in the form of free health and legal services -- and city officials needed help. Central to this demand for problem-solving and technical assistance was the constituents' view of the university as a valuable resource.

The usual university response to the demand for problem-solving and technical assistance is to create an urban study center. According to our constituency groups, urban centers have not met any real needs and in some cases have exacerbated tensions between community and university by appearing to be a child of the university's bad faith. They are perceived as collecting data which they use for their own rather than the city's or community's purposes, as being university-sheltered consulting firms, as being expensive and useless, as imposing themselves instead of coming only when asked -- as being, in short, empty and foolish gestures. The demand for problem-solving and technical assistance is for something different from what universities are now doing.

Major Curriculum Revision

The cluster of demands for curriculum revision focuses on such statements as "Give us something now so that we will be able to effect change later on," or "The university cannot deal with the community; I am giving up on it," or "Universities produce social workers who are hated and teachers who cannot teach."

What seems to be required here -- aside from a real emphasis on teaching undergraduates -- is a new way of looking at higher education. What students and community members seemed to be asking was that their needs be viewed in terms of the different roles they would be called upon to play: citizen or community member, professional involved in urban problems, family member (though there was little emphasis on the last point).

The university's difficulties in solving community and city problems bothers many students who plan to work in the city because they feel these difficulties point to weaknesses in their preparation. Students who come from the ghetto have a firsthand awareness of the inadequacy of professional training in areas like education and social welfare. Even students with less immediate experience of urban education and welfare have begun to ask for new approaches, new departments, and real field experience. The focus of their demands is mainly on undergraduate education, perhaps partly because some professional schools have begun to show movement toward community involvement.

Law schools have moved in this direction with the growth of urban legal studies as part of the regular legal curriculum and with the involvement of many law schools in the Neighborhood Legal Services Program of the U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity. New programs like Legal Services often can succeed because they fill a gap. Innovative programs in fields already crowded with agencies, like education and welfare, are far more difficult to launch because they are seen as direct challenges to existing programs rather than useful ways to provide new services.

At the undergraduate level the push for involvement has been met largely by the students themselves. They have organized their own service efforts as a way of going outside the curriculum for some "real life" experience. But, whatever the student-initiated attempts of the past, or the small beginnings of the professional schools, the students we talked to wanted much more from their education.

Institutional Neighborliness

A final cluster of demands focuses on the responsibility of a university to its local area, where its very presence as an exclusive institution offends its ignored neighbors. Demands were sometimes for jobs, sometimes for services, sometimes for the institution to go away. But underlying all was a premise that the institution created problems as well as expectations -- simply by existing and growing -- and that it therefore had a responsibility to rectify some of those wrongs by its behavior as an institution perceived as having wealth and jobs and services to offer.

The demands of the various constituent groups helped to characterize those groups and to illustrate areas of agreement. Community representatives and students saw the university in many of the same ways. Their concerns focused on what it was doing to them as an institution in their midst and as a process through which some of them were going. Public sector representatives, most of them products of such institutions, were more likely to recognize constraints on the university, but they too wanted to see it give far more to the city and to the community. The faculty representatives, while at first appearing to say the same things, turned out to be really interested in being rewarded for their urban activities.

Implicit in all that we heard was a basic belief in the university. Anger was the anger of exclusion or betrayal. Bad faith, failure to do what it presumably could so easily do if only it wanted to, refusal to let "us" in (whether "us" meant disadvantaged students, community people, or activist faculty) -- these were the major charges levelled against the university. Poor performance was also charged, but that was seen as the result of pigheadedness on the part of the university toward accepting insights and persons from different walks of life. The failure of the university to prepare people adequately for urban jobs was seen as part of its wish to remain elitist.

Universities are encountering new demands partly as a result of the inadequacy and coldness of other institutions compared with the apparent openness of universities, the presence of students who become involved in social and community issues, the tendency of faculty members to express their individual social and political stands, and the collective presence of talented people who university constituents feel must have something useful to contribute to people in need.

But partly, too, universities are a target for a wide range of demands because of their history, which has produced a wide range of university images. Universities are viewed as genuinely able to accomplish simultaneously all of the goals that have been claimed for them and which they have claimed for themselves.

That universities' failure to perform is not a failure of will but a failure of clarity about the possible -- this never occurred to any of our constituents. Nor did it appear to be much in the minds of university presidents. Time and again we heard optimistic statements by administrators about how, with a little effort and will, all could be accomplished. Our analysis will suggest that universities cannot begin to do all that is claimed for them or by them.

Our examination of universities has been brief and our conclusions oversimplified. A university administrator would have to be concerned with many more constituencies than we have dealt with here. Moreover -- as concerns those constituent groups we do describe -- we do not know how representative they were. But we feel that a major dynamic is at work on university campuses to try to quiet dissidence. This is part of the faculty mode which we will examine in chapter IV.

The noise of protest, regardless of whether it is representative, always brings reaction, frequently overreaction. The need to attain peace usually means that in any university disturbance few questions are asked about the representativeness of the protestors. Presumably, the same standard can be applied to the constituencies quoted here. If they are not representative, they are at least angry and noisy.

CHAPTER III: UNIVERSITIES IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The post-Civil War years were the great period in American university development. There was enormous competition among theories of higher education. In fact, a kind of war raged in which even those theories that lost failed to die neatly. Vestiges of them still govern practices within the university of today.

So that we may talk about the present crisis more intelligently, let us look briefly at some of the warring theories of higher education of the post-Civil War period; sketch the views of two notable exponents of differing views, Newman and Flexner, and look briefly as well at the land-grant and urban universities, both of which exemplify another view.

The intellectual history of universities is spelled out by Lawrence R. Veysey with great sensitivity to their complexity.[2] Veysey sees 4 strands to this history:

Mental Discipline and Moral Development

The first strand of the university's intellectual history grew out of Puritanism. It emphasized development of the mental and moral faculties, focusing intellectually on mental discipline, by which it meant the sharpening of the mind on the whetstone of Greek verbs. The curriculum was prescribed; relevance to later life was ignored, although this training actually was quite relevant to, say, a future minister.

The mind was not to assume dominance over the other faculties, however, and students were encouraged to balance the development of their mind with that of their other faculties. Teachers were chosen for their moral character and religious beliefs. Out of this came most of the early colleges, like Harvard and Yale, with their efforts to produce certified gentlemen in a rough, provincial society. This movement lost its battle against the scientific spirit but bequeathed something to each of the other three. To the ideal of public service it bequeathed a strong moral sense; to research, a glory in hard work; to liberal culture, a special emphasis on literary and linguistic attainments.

---

[2] Laurence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965. pp. 21-259.

Public Service

The idea of utility is Veysey's second strand. This was based on a concept of real life as opposed to the cloister. Democratic and vocational in outlook, it saw the university as an agency for personal success, with equal status for all subject matter and for all students, ease of admission, the provision of culture for the general public, and sometimes even the supremacy of the non-academic mass of citizens over the university itself. These views led to electives in the curriculum, to treating students as men rather than boys, to calls for action and social uplift. Research was viewed as sound when carried out for a serviceable social goal but not when conducted simply for the rewards of discovery. Utility was the principal idea behind the land-grant movement.

Pure Research

Pure research is the third strand in Veysey's analysis. It gained popularity as universities began to look to the model of the German university. This meant a focus on what is unknown rather than known; on discovery for its own sake; on proofs of intellectual excellence like the Ph.D. and publications as a basis for hiring; on academic freedom, graduate schools, emotional absorption in the spirit of inquiry; and on the premise that reality exists not outside but within the university walls and can be isolated and systematically investigated. It triumphed earliest at new institutions like the Johns Hopkins University, Cornell University, the University of Chicago, the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce at the University of Pennsylvania, and the Universities of Wisconsin and Illinois.

Liberal Culture

Veysey's fourth strand -- liberal culture -- was tied in many ways to the idea of mental discipline and moral development. Like that earlier strand, it also was doomed to partial failure.

Liberal culture looked to the humanities (to English and philosophy) rather than to science; it emphasized aesthetic, moral, emotional, and social feeling rather than fact and it focused on taste, which gradually came to mean polish, elegance of style, and manners.

Liberal culture produced "gentlemen." Its philosophy was idealism, Emerson's Transcendentalism. It looked to Greek and Latin literature because it regarded them not only as good for the mind but as the richest and rarest literature, connecting with all humanity.

Breadth of character -- the well-rounded man -- was the goal, and this meant an emphasis on undergraduate study producing substantial acquaintance with past civilizations. It meant a turning away from the elective system towards a more prescribed curriculum. Liberal culture flourished for a while, especially in some of the Eastern universities.

None of these theories was embodied in its pure state in the development of universities. Rather, complex mergers occurred, with vestiges of each theory surviving. Current university practices and conflicts must be viewed as made up in part of these vestiges of older intellectual movements.

Newman and Flexner are representative of the educational theorists to whom those interested in higher education have turned throughout the 20th century when they wanted definitions of education without caring much about the actual historical contexts. Let us look briefly at these two men and their beliefs.

Newman

John Henry Cardinal Newman remains the purest as well as the most quotable exponent of the classic, undergraduate, liberal arts viewpoint. The product of his university's education would be a man who:

> ...apprehends the great outline of knowledge, the principles on which it rests, the scale of its parts, its lights and shades, its great points and its little, as he otherwise cannot apprehend them. Hence, it is that his education is called "Liberal." A habit of mind is formed which lasts through life, of which the attributes are freedom, equitableness, calmness, moderation and wisdom; or what in a former discourse I have ventured to call a philosophical habit. This then I would assign as the special fruit of the education furnished at a university, as contrasted with other places of teaching or modes of teaching.[3]

Once students were liberated and humane men -- generalists -- then, Newman held, they could pursue their specialities. As for the development of knowledge itself, he conceded it was

[3]John Henry Cardinal Newman, The Scope and Nature of University Education. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1958. p. 82.

important, but he would let other institutions see to it. "If its object were scientific and philosophical discovery," he said, "I do not see why a University should have any students."

Newman speaks to a modern audience. What does the modern emphasis on "relevance" mean if not the ability to see "the great outline of knowledge?"

Today's students sound remarkably like Newman when they demand a new emphasis on teaching. They may not really want what Veysey suggests has historically accompanied such a thrust -- prescribed curriculum, interest in the mental and moral development of the student, elitist views of society. Yet they seem to want what Newman advocated, a truly liberal education.

Flexner

Abraham Flexner called for a university not on the English model as described in its ideal form by Cardinal Newman, but upon the German model as it evolved out of the mid-18th century's thrust toward science. The University of Berlin became the prototype, with its emphasis on research and the advancement of knowledge rather than on teaching and the growth of its students, and with its detachment from everyday life in order to seek and publish new knowledge.

The excitement generated by this kind of university spread to America and found a home at the Johns Hopkins University, which pioneered in establishing research graduate studies, nurturing skilled specialists, and focusing on scholarship as the major university activity, relegating undergraduate education to a secondary role. Flexner defines the "modern university" in terms which seem indeed modern:

> ...in this world rocking beneath and around us, where is theory to be worked out, where are social and economic problems to be analyzed, where are theory and facts to be brought face to face, where is the truth, welcome or unwelcome, to be told, where are men to be trained to ascertain and tell it, where, in whatever measure it is possible, is conscious, deliberate, and irresponsible thought to be given to the task of reshaping this world of ours to our own liking, unless first and foremost in the university? The wit of man has thus far contrived no comparable agency.

> The urgency of the need is not ... without its danger. The history of the more manageable sciences contains a warning which the social scientist will do well to heed. Chemistry made no progress as long as men were concerned immediately to convert base metal into gold; it advanced when, for the time being, it ignored use and practice ... To be sure the social scientist must find his material in the thick of events; but *qua* scientist, he must select and approach and frame his problems, from the viewpoint of science, without incurring the responsibility for policies. In the social as in the physical sciences, the university is, insofar as scientific effort to understand phenomena is concerned, indifferent to the effect and use of truth. Perhaps, in due course, use and theory may in the social sciences also prove mutually helpful; perhaps social experimentation, involving application, may prove the only laboratory. But even so, it is one thing to incur responsibility for policies, and quite another to set up an experiment primarily in the interest of ascertaining truth or testing theory. The modern university must neither fear the world nor make itself responsible for its conduct.[4]

Flexner is contemporary in a number of respects. His view of what a university could most usefully provide society -- objectivity and detachment -- is close to the demands of many modern students for university disengagement from the Federal Government and for an independent moral stance. He is also contemporary in his feeling that society needs some stable institution in which changing conditions may be held still long enough for intelligent men to draw some conclusions. But Flexner ignores the question Newman posed: How is wholeness of vision to evolve from isolated pursuits, no matter how impressive the individual accomplishment? And Flexner does not answer another question: How is the institution busy protecting its temporal *irresponsibility* going to respond to demands for practical involvement in contemporary problems?

---

[4] Abraham Flexner, *Universities: American, English and German*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1930. pp. 13-14.

Newman and Flexner are obviously contradictory, but modern universities not only attempt to respond at some level to the conflicting precepts of the two men; they also try to behave like service institutions. As we have seen, that idea originated with the theory of utility and culminated in the land-grant movement.

The Land-grant Movement

Social demands in America for responsible university involvement in practical issues date back to Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin. Both of those men felt strongly about the need for "useful" knowledge and tried to build it into the universities they helped create, but their dreams were not fully realized until the land-grant movement.

The Morrill, or Land-Grant, Act of 1862 brought reality to the idea of a university as a service institution which admitted new subject matter and new kinds of students and attempted to answer questions growing out of practical fields of activity like agriculture and engineering. These institutions have provided an enormous democratizing influence, legitimizing new professions and new age groups for university study. They have developed extension programs, got involved in political reform, and established service bureaus and agricultural experiment stations.

Urban Universities

A variant of the land-gra : strain appeared with the rise in the latter part of the 19th century of private institutions, often in cities, whose aim was to educate the city's poor or provide professional men for the growing urban centers. The charter of Temple University, for instance, states as its first purpose:

> ... to provide meaningful education for the workingmen of Philadelphia ...

Like the land-grant colleges, these schools represented a response to the thrust for upward mobility by immigrant and other poorer groups. And, like the land-grant colleges, these universities represented an accommodation to a changing economy as those changes were felt in the city. Unlike the land-grant colleges, however, these universities did not in the 19th century receive Federal land or money. They grew hand-to-mouth, largely out of the skills and determination of local entrepreneurs. Many were mergers of smaller schools (such as mortuary schools, schools of chiropody) or began as offshoots of basically non-educational organizations. (Cleveland State, for example, started in 1881 as the educational branch of the local Y.M.C.A.) Their focus was on teaching vocational skills relevant to urban life; direct service in the land-grant sense was not their aim. They never sponsored extension or problem-solving; there was no urban counterpart to the experimental agricultural station.

The growth of these city institutions seems to have followed at least three patterns. These patterns can be seen as the consequence of some choice among the historical strands. Some universities, like Temple, grew rapidly but fairly evenly through amalgamation and addition of new schools. If these universities became State institutions, as did Wayne State, for example, their character did not substantially change.

On the other hand, the incorporation into a State system caused a transformation in a second genre of urban universities, made up of small, originally predominantly vocational, professional colleges. Among these were institutions which have now become the State University of New York at Buffalo, Cleveland State, Southern Illinois University, and the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee.

Finally, there were urban colleges with a liberal arts focus, and frequently with a religious background, that evolved gradually into universities without any special vocational or technical orientation. Of the universities we looked at, St. Louis University, Southern Methodist University, and the University of Southern California fit this pattern.

In the period since World War II, all universities, no matter what their origins, have experienced enormous growth in federally sponsored research and activities. This has spurred the development of "multiversities." In the case of city institutions, it was part of their essential nature to take on new schools and activities, culminating typically with a hospital, perhaps a secondary school, and various other service activities.

The modern American university, then, appears to be a blend of service, research (much of it federally financed), and vestiges of liberal culture. This institution has defined its mission as teaching, research, and service, despite the internal contradictions of those three emphases delightfully suggested by Clark Kerr:

> Undergraduate life seeks to follow the British, who have done the best with it, and an historical line that goes back to Plato; the humanists often find their sympathies here. Graduate life and research follow the Germans, who once did best with them, and an historical line that goes back to Pythagoras; the scientists lend their support to all this. The "lesser" professions (lesser than law and medicine) and the service activities follow the American pattern, since the Americans have been best at them, and an historical line that goes back to the Sophists; the social scientists are most likely to be sympathetic. Lowell found his greatest interest in the first, Eliot in the second, and James Bryant Conant (1934 to 1954) in the third line of development and in the synthesis. The resulting combination does not seem plausible but it has given America a remarkably effective educational institution. A university anywhere can aim no higher than to be as British as possible for the sake of the undergraduates, as German as possible for the sake of the graduates and the research personnel, as American as possible for the sake of the public at large -- and as confused as possible for the sake of the preservation of the whole uneasy balance.[5]

The essential conflicts over the purposes of universities were never resolved in this country. Instead, they were all brought into an "uneasy balance" leaving their implications subject to even greater conflict. Built around competing images of a university's true purpose, the basic tensions include:

-- The conflict between the guarantee of academic freedom, the need to keep research pure, to pursue knowledge free from the responsibility for its uses, and the social demand that the university help the real world. This can be seen, at an individual level, in the conflict between a desire for professional independence and for political power. Academic public service, the goal borrowed from the Germans, confronted

[5]Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1963. p. 18.

the absence in America of a philosophy or a tradition to justify it. This confusion led to an American tradition of the academic entrepreneur who had to develop a market for his services and who concentrated on techniques, leaving goals, ends, and values to those who paid for his services.

— The conflict between the differentiation of knowledge as a way of organizing and producing knowledge and the need to integrate techniques and disciplines in applying that knowledge to social problems. This conflict is heightened by the knowledge explosion, which pushes in both directions. More specialization is required for greater knowledge; more integration is needed for its effective use.

— The conflict between emphasis on the solo performance of faculty members as they individually pursue their own research, write their own books, teach their own classes, tutor their own graduate students, and the need for interdisciplinary team problem-solving. The complexity of modern problems seems to need not only individual integration of insights and techniques but also group integration on a larger scale.

— The conflict between measurable criteria of production for both teachers and students (grades obtained, books written, grants earned) and less measurable criteria of intellectual and emotional growth for students and the nurturing of that growth by faculty. This is another way of looking at some of the implications of the old conflict between the strains of pure research and a combination of mental discipline and liberal culture.

— The conflict between the elitist conception of excellence through a liberal education and the growing egalitarian notion of a university education for everyone. We now see the egalitarian movement carried to its ultimate extreme in the demand for open enrollment.

-- The conflict between liberal education -- liberating students through contact with a core of knowledge held to be immutable, essential, and best -- and response to demands for relevance in a world where the knowledge explosion puts to serious question the notion of an essential core of learning (Newman versus the contemporary world).

-- The conflict between faculty membership in a community of scholars ("guilds," Reisman calls them), which transcends the individual university, and membership in an urban community with a long-term commitment to the local struggle for change.

-- The conflict between the needs of researchers for time, facilities, money, and graduate student manpower, and the needs of undergraduates for real teaching, which demands the time and energy of senior faculty.

-- The conflict between the view that knowledge resides primarily within academic walls and the feeling that real knowledge lies outside those walls. Dating from far back in the history of Western thought, this manifests itself today in confusion over field experience versus classroom instruction.

-- The conflict between the rhetoric of egalitarianism and the reality of poorly prepared students. In many instances men committed to research, and even a high level of teaching, have been called upon to spend a significant part of their time providing custodial care and basic education. Since these tasks did not fit their conception of university teaching, they tended to ignore them.

These essential conflicts exist for all universities, although to the extent that universities vary in students, location, and local problems, the conflicts carry different importance.

An original urban mission, however, does not emerge as a key variable. Despite their different origins and missions, all universities share these conflicts and therefore tend to look alike. This similarity surprised us at first. We had assumed that universities with, for instance, traditional urban missions might look different from institutions whose constituencies and goals are national. In terms of the central operations of the university our assumptions appear to be wrong.

As early as 1901, President Arthur Twining Hadley of Yale had this to say about the similarity of emerging universities:

> It was confidently predicted that the results of these (academic) endowments would show themselves in one of three ways: either by an increasing popularization of learning, which should make the university thus founded a vast lyceum; or by a development of new facilities for technical training, which should equip the student to make a better living...; or, finally that they should serve as places for the endowment of scientific research and discovery... Not one of these three ideals has been realized. On the contrary, ...all institutions -- new or old, ecclesiastical, political, or springing from private endowment -- have been compelled by force of circumstances to approximate toward a common type more or less independent of the wishes of those who established and controlled them.[6]

A major insight springing from the urban university project is that <u>there is "no such animal" as the urban university</u>. Urban universities really belong to the species university. Their location in a city is incidental to their functions and does not, at present, lead to educational approaches or activities different in kind from those of non-urban universities.

To help explain this, the next chapter will examine some of the ways in which universities resemble each other.

---

[6] Quoted in Veysey, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 261.

CHAPTER IV: THE REALITIES OF UNIVERSITY STRUCTURE

In The Emergence of the American University, Laurence Veysey says:

> One would like to know the reasons for such phenomena as increasing presidential authority, bureaucratic procedures of many sorts, the new functions of the deanship, the appearance of the academic department with its recognized chairman, and the creation of a calculated scale of faculty rank. These questions were almost always evaded by the participants themselves. Thus President (James Burrill) Angell, commenting on the transformation of the University of Michigan during his day, much too casually remarked: "Our rather multifarious usages ... have grown up without much system under peculiar exigencies." Here was a form of organization which came into being without deliberate debate on the part of its creators and yet displayed such great uniformities that it could not be termed a response to varying local desires or needs. What one sees as one looks at the leading campuses toward the end of the nineteenth century is a complicated but rather standard series of relationships springing to life before one's eyes -- yet practically everyone at the time taking the fundamental choices for granted. The lack of self-consciousness that was displayed over the new organization as it came into being points directly toward a predominance of latent elements, rather than manifest intentions, in bringing it about.[7]

This statement suggests that something besides mission or context determined universities' structure. It further suggests that one must penetrate the rhetoric of mission to examine the implications of structure.

To say that university structure is much the same everywhere is not to say, of course, that the problems of individual institutions are identical or that similar remedies can be applied.

[7]Veysey, op. cit., p. 268 (underlining added).

Each institution is very different in its leadership, leverage points, foci of power, constraints on that power, etc. Nevertheless, we can say that apparently a large role in determining the behavior of faculty is played by a university structure everywhere similar and that faculty appear to determine the responsiveness of universities to new demands.

University structure, as we all know it, is built around boards of trustees, presidents, deans, departments, professorial ranks, etc. It crystallized during the 1890s, and, as Veysey says further:

> To succeed in building a major university, one now had to conform to the standard structural pattern in all basic respects -- no matter how one might trumpet one's few peculiar embellishments. A competitive market for money, students, faculty, and prestige dictated the avoidance of pronounced eccentricities. Henceforth initiative had to display itself within the lines laid down by the given system.
>
> Consider the inconceivability of an American university without a board of trustees, or with a board composed of men lacking the confidence of the respectable elements in the community. Consider the inconceivability of it without the lure of a well-defined system of faculty rank. Imagine an American university lacking a president, department chairmen, athletic stadium, transcripts of students' grades, formal registration procedures, or a department of geology. Institutional development could seldom any longer be willful. Only on the peripheries of expectation, where standards had not yet clearly formed themselves, could it be experimental. All contenders for high institutional honor had to follow the prescribed mode ...
>
> The structure of the new American university did not, of course, wholly determine the daily functioning of those who participated in the institution. However, the effects of this structure were clearly relevant to the tenor of American academic life. These effects could be direct, as in all the visible relationships of command, or indirect in terms of expected roles and ways of

> doing things. Compatible thoughts and activities were rewarded; threatening actions were tacitly or openly punished. Expectations of reward and punishment led to unconscious habit patterns.[8]

Unconscious patterns of behavior are what we need to examine both to understand how universities behave and to see how that behavior transcends particular institutions and is shared by many.

The Faculty Mode

Conflicts over university purpose, as we have said, are felt by different members of the university in different ways and vary from institution to institution. Yet, no matter what the disagreement among faculty members, there is a dynamic at work which tends to resolve these conflicts in one way. The faculty usually tends toward:

-- freedom for the faculty to pursue knowledge.

-- differentiation of that knowledge into schools and departments.

-- differentiation of the people developing that knowledge, with the predominant image that of the lonely scholar on his individual frontier of knowledge.

-- measurable criteria for judging the production of knowledge.

-- an elitist theory of excellence.

-- a membership for faculty in the larger world of scholarship as opposed to the particular world of the institution.

-- an emphasis upon research and graduate students.

-- a concept of knowledge as residing primarily inside the university in a citadel of knowledge.

-- a lack of interest in poorly prepared students and a lack of skill in dealing with them, with little transfer from research in learning theory to university instruction.

---

[8]Ibid., p. 340.

This will be recognized as a list of the points of view from one side of each of the conflicts cited near the end of chapter III. It represents a mode of activity. It is, to be sure, an uneasy mode, full of the tensions we have described. Much of the rest of the world is pushing against it. But, despite conflicting theories of education and competing images of universities, this mode is what has resulted. It has resulted because the faculty has gained power, and it favors the German research model of a university.

To be sure, faculty members are modern men and recognize at some levels the inadequacy of this mode. Yet it has brought them new freedom, recognition, money, and power. In explaining how universities behave, faculty power over the university, within the framework of its structure, may be more important than the conflict between missions.

Faculty Power

A long quotation from Jencks' and Riesman's The Academic Revolution helps to delineate the growth of faculty power since 1900 within the university structure:

> From the very start the professionalization of university professors brought conflict on many fronts. Late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century academic histories report many battles in which the basic question was whether the president and trustees or the faculty would determine the shape of the curriculum, the content of particular courses, or the use of particular books. The professors ... lost most of the publicized battles, but they won the war. Today faculty control over these matters is rarely challenged, and conflict usually centers on other issues. The faculty, for example, have sought the right to choose their colleagues. While they have not usually won this right in the formal sense of actually making appointments themselves, their recommendations are sought at all reputable colleges and universities, and heeded in nine cases out of ten...
>
> The faculty has also sought to apply to the selection of undergraduates the same meritocratic standards that have long been used to

select graduate students. Here again they have largely won the day, although marginal exceptions (geographic distribution, alumni sons, faculty sons) still stir sporadic controversy. The faculty has also sought some voice in choosing top administrators and in this too it has been increasingly successful. Once chosen, these administrators have broad powers to make policy (in the name and with the consent of the trustees). But even here a unified faculty has an informal veto at most universities and colleges.

It is important to be clear what these victories mean. College professors have not for the most part won significant formal power, either individually or collectively, over the institutions that employ them. On paper the typical academic senate is still a largely advisory body whose legal jurisdiction is confined to setting the curriculum and awarding degrees. Departments, too, have little formal power except sometimes over course offerings and requirements. Budgets and personnel, for example, are in principle subject to "higher" review, and ultimate control mostly remains where it has always been -- with the administration, the lay trustees, and in some cases the legislature.

The trustees, however, are seldom what they once were. Most are more permissive than their nineteenth- or early twentieth-century predecessors. They are also more sensitive to individuals and groups unlike themselves. They share the general upper-middle class allergy to "trouble," of whatever sort ... But the overall trend seems to us toward moderation and an increasingly ceremonial role for trustees. Beyond ceremony, they can be useful as buffers to cope with legislators, potential donors, and other pressure groups, giving legitimacy to the institution and its activities that would otherwise be hard to achieve.

The transfer of power from boards of directors to professional administrators has not, of course, been confined to higher education. The "managerial revolution," while not so widespread, so complete, or so progressive as some of its prophets have suggested, has taken place

> in many non-academic enterprises. What is perhaps unusual about the academic world is the extent to which the top management, while nominally acting in the interests of the board, actually represents the interests of "middle management" (i.e., the faculty), both to the board and to the world. Despite some notable exceptions, today's college and university presidents, as already noted, usually start out as members of the academic profession. When they become administrators and have to deal more often with non-academicians, they inevitably become somewhat deprofessionalized. Nonetheless, most university presidents still see their institution primarily as an assemblage of scholars and scientists, each doing his own work in his own way. Most university presidents see their primary responsibility as "making the world safe for academicians," however much the academicians themselves resent the necessary (and unnecessary) compromises made in their behalf. The typical president's greatest ambition for the future is usually to "strengthen" his institution, and operationally this usually turns out to mean assembling scholars of even greater competence and reputation than are now present.[9]

The faculty have gained not formal but functional power, and they use that power partly to protect their mode of behavior. Presumably the mode helped them attain their power, and the power supports the mode, making it less susceptible to change.

One way that faculty power is used to support the faculty mode is to control faculty deviance that may provoke attacks on the mode.

Deviance is tolerable, to different points in different institutions, when it is practiced by persons whose main area of expertise is harmless or is a luxury, a "good" thing to do. Professors of philosophy, English, linguistics can be allowed latitude as a demonstration of tolerance and academic freedom. For the rest, as long as dominant faculty goals and attitudes are congruent with those of the affluent, funding community, there is little reason to interfere. Understanding this, most faculties have by now rooted out or contained visible heretics.

---

[9] Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, The Academic Revolution. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1968. pp. 15-17.

Some people are now arguing that the urban and war crises are creating a widening gulf between faculties and governing boards and that it is therefore necessary to reassert faculty power, to make guarantees of power more explicit. Others contend that, particularly as the war diminishes, faculty power will be re-established as a conservative force, that young deviants in the sensitive disciplines will subtly be told to conform or leave, and that they will be told this, not by governing boards but by the same men who have been controlling meaningful deviance for 50 years, the professors who control appointments, promotions, and research funds. Younger faculty members who are attempting to assert faculty power as a way to legitimize and protect their own deviance may well be overwhelmed if this view proves correct.

The traditions and structure of universities guarantee a certain irresponsibility of faculty power because responsibility and accountability are divorced. Why should a man change his ways of thinking and acting when seniority usually brings power; he cannot be fired, no matter how he exercises his power; undesirable internal pressure can be dismissed as a naive power play punishable both locally and nationally through the guild and undesirable external pressure can be publicized as an anti-intellectual attack on academic freedom? The tenure system and the ability of the faculty hierarchy to control deviance do more than merely reinforce resistance to change. They breed insensitivity to internal and external pressures for change. With some notable exceptions, by the time a man has finished the hazing process -- in his mid-thirties -- he has put up with so much and made so many accommodations that he does not want his hard-earned peace disturbed.

Faculty Mobility

The mobility of scholars is another force in the mode's universality. The talents of scholars are transferable; their loyalty is to a world of scholarship, not to their university; their work is judged outside particular institutions as well as within. The world of academic competition, with its scouting and raiding, in some ways resembles the major leagues. To the extent that there is trading among teams, the teams come to resemble each other, and the game they play is always the same. Furthermore, it is the team members who participate in the selection of new members and help accredit the other teams. The analogy is not totally applicable, but it does suggest why faculty members even in low status institutions often work hard to establish the mode no matter how inappropriate that mode may be for certain schools. Faculty members also serve on accrediting committees, another way in which the faculty mode spreads.

Again, we are not suggesting that the faculty members of any university -- let alone of all universities -- share identical views of the goals and purposes of higher education. There are probably few institutions in modern life in which key members disagree so fundamentally on what their institution is about. Likewise, to imply a similarity in viewpoint between faculty and administration would be to ignore the warfare between them. What we are suggesting is that there are basic practices in all universities which tend to make faculty members of any one of them behave like faculty members of any other. They all share in the mode.

This similarity of mode, emerging despite different original views of the university, suggests that beneath the rhetoric of university mission lies a more important tradition of faculty power. It is really the faculty that must be reckoned with when talking about university change.

Strategies of Stability

As a way of exploring the premise that the faculty holds the key to university change, let us look at the most dramatic changes that have occurred in universities, changes brought about usually by large Federal grants.

New activities have all been absorbed without altering the basic mode we have just described, because universities do not respond to a new demand by deciding either to eliminate an outmoded activity or to take on the new activity. They respond by adding on to what they are already doing. Little is jettisoned; most is retained; the new is added on.

War research? Fine, we add on a research institute. Peace Corps training? We can do that too. Designing a new transportation system? Mid-career refresher programs? We can add them on like the rest. As long as there is money, there is no limit to what we can do. If money cannot be raised, then we usually cannot manage. Choices are not made. A new venture does not replace an old one, for there is always a tenured professor who cannot be moved, a constituency in favor of that activity.

The administration, busy, as Riesman says, "making the world safe for academicians," adopts the strategy of adding on as a way of attempting to respond to a changing world while keeping the faculty happy. Frequently the administration is not even involved, for the Government or the foundation goes directly to the faculty member, bypassing the administration's budgetary procedures. In either case, the added-on activity then spends a fair amount of time denying its appendage nature and attempting to demonstrate its central role in the life of the university by jostling for location nearer to the heart of the university.

To respond fully to new demands would be to destroy the balance, and an outright "no" to inappropriate demands would require a greater sense of itself than the university apparently possesses. With protection as its goal, a university usually finds itself faced with making one or more of the following responses to new demands:

1. Do nothing.

2. Respond minimally and haphazardly.

3. Undermine the demand; for example, by admitting black students but in such a way as to ensure that they will fail.

4. Leave it to individuals to undertake activities the institution can then point to with pride or back away from with ease.

5. Insulate the activity from the main body, as black studies are frequently insulated. (In the case of black studies, black students are often unconscious allies of the university's protective strategy, although they may oppose the university over the issue of control.)*

6. Create a new but separate entity, such as an institute or center.

7. Respond centrally but on such a small scale that it does not significantly challenge the core mode.

---

*Insulation is not a strictly modern defensive strategy. Veysey indicates that the earliest university administrators, in their fight against the challenge of science, also used this technique:

> ...one principal means by which pious academicians sought to stave off an intellectual revolution ... was the erection of a "scientific school" in loose affiliation with the college proper. Such a school might be treated as a stepchild, given a starvation budget, and calculatedly ignored; yet its existence could be used conveniently to "prove" that science had its own, carefully segregated, place within the educational scheme and that therefore no revision of the college curriculum was necessary.

To summarize, universities preserve the precarious balance between the mode of the faculty and the demands of the rest of the world, demands which have historical legitimacy and cause conflict for the universities, not by choosing between alternatives but by adding on new activities which can be handled by the faculty mode, i.e., by individual professors working from a base of differentiated knowledge. Universities can add on as a tactic of defense or out of a desire actually to take on the activity. It appears that they cannot respond to demands that transcend the faculty mode or the add-on pattern without enormous upheaval. If the resources are limited, and choices must be made, universities will keep what they have and will adopt some of the tactics of their protective strategy.

CHAPTER V: STRATEGIES OF CHANGE

In chapter II we examined the demands of constituent groups and their expectations of all that universities can do. In chapter III we looked at the history of universities and the unresolved conflicts about what they can do and for whom. In chapter IV we examined one theory of how universities behave, particularly in terms of demands for change, with conservatism emerging as the dominant university mode. Now it is time to test the demands of constituents for change against our sense of university conservatism.

First we will examine some of the demands made upon universities and possible responses by universities to these demands. Then we will look at university change from the perspective of various university constituent groups and consider the strategies open to each group to bring about change.

Demands and Responses

Some demands cannot be met while preserving what we have described as the faculty mode. Other clusters of demand do not go to the heart of the institution and consequently do not pose so large a threat to the university as it is. We will deal with the least "threatening" demands first and move on to those to which the university cannot respond fully and remain what it is:

Change in Institutional Practices

A number of demands had little to do with the university as a teaching and knowledge-producing institution. They might have been made of any large institution, an automobile plant or a chemical company: stop expanding, hire community residents for maintenance jobs, share some of your resources with us. This suggests that the university might respond to community demands in a manner appropriate to any large institution -- be sensitive to its impact upon the community and, for the sake of public relations, devote a part of its resources to ameliorating local conditions by hiring local people and by opening some of its facilities to local groups for public purposes. Business as usual, but with a sensitive eye to impact upon one's neighbors.

It is difficult for the university to respond in this manner, however, because of the difference between the usual business employees and students. Students tend to be less docile, more politically involved, more sensitive to community problems. They will often adopt community agendas for their own purposes, or alternatively, they can be used by a community group for its purposes.

Despite this, changes in institutional functions appear to be the university reform most easily accomplished. These functions do not touch the faculty mode or faculty power. They are the responsibility of administrators who, by and large, have been moving away from faculty status and thus tend to be more sensitive to the impact of their institution upon a spectrum of interests. They are not locked into the faculty mode; indeed, many recognize it as a key constraint.

One strategy of change, therefore, might focus upon all those activities in which the university engages as an institution, capitalizing upon the relative flexibility of administrators in an area which does not concern the faculty. A careful examination might help determine which of those functions could be redirected, altered, expanded, or stopped. In this regard, the fact that a university constitutes almost a micro-city of services may be important. Most universities provide postal service, garbage disposal, health care, snow removal, landscaping, etc. These and other activities might include some parts of the neighboring community at costs that are not prohibitive. Other institutional activities, like physical expansion, might well be planned on some kind of joint community-university basis which would mitigate local anti-university feeling. (Temple University has attempted this strategy with some success.)

Other neighborly actions might include directing a portion of the purchasing budget towards local enterprises (as Temple, again, is attempting to do), using the construction budget to pressure builders to comply with equal opportunity regulations and labor unions to take on black workers (as Tufts University is doing), and establishing a university-community clearinghouse to keep track of the variety of projects which take place in the community.

Still another possibility would be for the university to sponsor low-income housing. This would in no way interfere with the central activities of the university and therefore should be feasible, although it must be recognized that the extent to which the university invests in limited return projects diminishes its capital return. This, of course, means not only fewer professors and new programs, but also fewer scholarships.

All of these ideas suggest the need for sensitive and accurate community pulse-taking if the university is to provide services or respond to demands that are priority items for the community. There is little evidence that many universities now employ people with skills in this delicate area. Any wide-scale redirection of institutional practices would necessitate the hiring of some people with community organizational skills or a new kind of university involvement of students which would make them the pulse-takers. Using students in this way, however, would also call for a skilled person who would know how to interpret the information that students might bring him. A problem with this lies in students' tendency to see the university acting in bad faith; they might feel that they were spying on the community. The same suspicion would also plague black community organizers.

Problem-Solving and Technical Assistance

Problem-solving and technical assistance do not go to the heart of the educational activities of a university either, although they touch them.

When discussing problem-solving, it is necessary to differentiate among problems. The university has demonstrated that it can handle large-scale research projects with outside funding. This pattern of adding on activities can be easily applied to urban problems also if by urban problems we mean things like the creation of new anti-pollution devices, new transportation systems, etc.

If the problems involve reform in delivery of services like education, community mental health, and welfare, it becomes more difficult for the university, because (1) the real problems will cross disciplinary and departmental lines, (2) the problems often demand restructuring a field to which the university has committed a department or school and for which it has trained many of the professionals threatened by a dramatic change, and (3) the problems of service delivery involve the university with community problems, which pose difficulties for most faculty.

Yet, with enough outside funding, the university can make some contributions to these areas. If faculty members from a variety of departments are fully released from academic responsibilities, they may even learn to work together and temporarily step out of the differentiated knowledge, solitary scholar part of the faculty mode.

If, however, a problem-solving request from the city or community is not supported with funds, the university has real problems. It cannot add on this activity; if it is going to meet the request, it must reallocate resources. And this, as we have seen, it rarely does.

Finally, if the request is for direct technical assistance to the community, whether coming from the city or from the community itself, the general view of our constituencies is that the university cannot respond effectively because it lacks personnel with the appropriate skills. Even if a few remarkable faculty members do possess the necessary skills, the requirements imposed by technical assistance -- living through long hours of local crises and being available when needed -- conflict with teaching schedules and interfere with scholarly research.

And, again, the problems of communities do not correspond to departmental lines, so that a team with multiple skills, cutting across departments, is required. The university, out of its own funds, would be very unlikely to put together such a team. If it is to engage in real technical assistance, we are once again faced with the implicit demand that the university hire people who can cope with community problems and who are not constrained by the faculty mode. Urban Study Centers are perceived as extremely inadequate university attempts to solve local urban problems or to offer technical assistance, as we have already seen.

Changes in Curriculum

A third area of demand, one more central to the university than either of the first two, is that of curriculum reform. New courses, even departments, are being added on to the established curriculum, so clearly the university can respond to this demand. The protective add-on technique does not threaten faculty or administration as much as other more direct steps. Furthermore, in the case of curriculum change, the demand usually comes from within the university. Students may demand Black Studies, for example. Liberal faculty members may want the administration to recruit larger numbers of disadvantaged students or to "do something" about current social problems, both of which imply curriculum change. Coming from those to whom the institution already has made a commitment, rather than from outside, a demand for curriculum change usually has a greater likelihood of response.

<u>This set of circumstances leads us to feel that the add-on strategy in curriculum promises to produce some real change in the university, although it may take time</u>. This strategy is promising mainly because, once the university has recognized the need to offer new courses, it will then, as a necessary corollary of the add-on approach, have to hire new faculty members.

If subject matter is sufficiently outside the normal purview of Ph.D. training -- e.g., Black Studies -- the university will be forced, not only by students but by its own logic, to broaden its standards for hiring instructors for those courses. A new kind of faculty member may produce ripples greater than the original splash of his course, at least for a time. If he is a solitary soul, he may soon succumb to the faculty mode. But if he is buttressed by others like him, and eventually they make their way out of the add-on compartment, this group could have an impact.

A "critical mass" of such faculty members might be able to alter the university in central ways. But there is always a good chance that the "faculty mode" will co-opt them and that, despite their origins, they will turn into individual entrepreneurs. To avoid that it may be necessary to hire teams of new faculty members who would develop a group style very different from the individualized faculty mode. The crucial point is that it will take sheer numbers to make the add-on response a central one.

Black Studies departments may some day achieve centrality within the university through another avenue. At present, Black Studies bring to the campus the schizophrenic feelings ghetto students have always experienced as they sought to combine the cultures of home and university. Black Studies departments provide a home within the university, but this in no way relieves the strain experienced by ghetto students, even though the presence of others feeling similar pressures provides support and occasionally even some perspective. Growing awareness of the inadequacy of Black Studies may soon lead to an explosion in which blacks ask not for compartmentalized blackness within a world of whiteness, but for more profound recognition.

If this happens, one of three things will follow: blacks will leave; blacks will give up and accept the status quo, or blacks will fight. Presumably the first is unacceptable and there would have to be compromises of the other two. Whether the central university activity will be vitally affected by this struggle is hard to say, but the breakdown of compartmentalized walls probably will occur and could constitute an important step in opening the way for the admission of an add-on to central status.

Another tactic in the add-on strategy for curriculum change is to use physical distance as well as numbers of new faculty. This can be seen in its most developed case in the Experiment for Higher Education (EHE) of Southern Illinois University.

As a branch located 60-odd miles away from the Carbondale main campus in one of the worst ghettoes in the country, East St. Louis, EHE has been able to hide itself and consistently present the university with a fait accompli, giving faculty committees the burden of rejecting a success rather than a plan.

EHE owes its existence to a remarkably strong administratôr, who was willing to support the design of a 2-year college program appropriate to the needs and life style of 100 black youngsters who were totally outside the usual college-going stream but who would be acceptable at the mother institution or other universities at the end of 2 successful years.

EHE's insulation provides both opportunities and constraints.

It has developed new methods of teaching, new courses, new ways to organize instruction. For many students it may be termed a great success. Youngsters who would not have otherwise gone to college are making it in the same amount of time as everyone else. Test scores show unprecedented increases in learning. Success in the remaining 2 years of college has been great.

Although some students face difficult problems of transition at other institutions with different approaches to education, EHE points with pride to the fact that two of its former students are now working as junior staff members at Federal City College in Washington, D. C.

Nor is the achievement limited to the successes of those who have passed through the program. EHE has demonstrated to the rest of the university and to others that extremely high-risk ghetto youths can master college courses, and it has demonstrated some of the techniques for helping that to occur.

That this demonstration could take place depended on several factors. A committed administrator was vital to it. Federal funds provided resources that did not have to be siphoned from other university activities. And, importantly, the experimental function and the isolation from the main structure of the university provided freedom from the faculty mode.

But EHE's position as the child of a distant parent also presents problems. Its dependence on Federal funds and its relative isolation from the main university may permit it to expire. It may have no impact whatsoever on the core of the university, on the faculty, on the courses they teach, or on the other students in the university. The approval of SIU has so far come in the form of encouragement to expand EHE as it now exists rather than to incorporate its techniques into the university itself.

Nor may EHE be as immune as it thinks from the disease of the faculty mode. It is safe to predict that as EHE becomes more established, its faculty will become more concerned with formal credentials, status, mobility. In fact, EHE is already facing the problem of providing enticements for faculty. Eight members of the staff (including 5 out of 10 teacher-counsellors) so far have moved on to more established institutions.

The program's staff remains nevertheless optimistic, arguing that the program is "not just for the 100 or so kids in EHE." "It will affect the entire university," staff members contend. "It is much bigger than high-risk kids, black kids. It is a process which must affect the whole educational fabric."

Only if the program finds some way to infiltrate the core of the university, which it cannot do from a distance, do the staff's prophecies seem likely to come true. Apparently the leaders of the program sense this; some principal staff members have moved up into the university to head a new department of experimental studies, where they have some privileges and powers in connection with curriculum and appointments. They have other plans for change as well; for example, bringing together key people in the university who may act as change agents. How much they can bring a successful add-on inside the core structure is now the prevailing question.

Efforts to produce real change in curriculum through assimilation of an add-on look as though they will either take a long time or, like Black Studies, provoke a confrontation of 2 university styles which in turn may take a long time to synthesize. This approach, nevertheless, looks like a promising strategy of reform.

Change in Hiring Policy and Reward System

Just as the impact of new curriculum units depends upon the quality and number of new persons they can bring into the university, so is this true to a degree of the other 2 demands we have examined -- for change in institutional practices and for problem-solving and technical assistance.

While possible without some community expertise, responsiveness to a demand for change in institutional practices would be greatly enhanced by the presence on a university's staff of a number of people knowledgeable about and able to talk with people in the neighboring community. The same is true, but even more so, of the demand for problem-solving and technical assistance. The university is unable to respond to community cries for help because it lacks people with skills in community development.

If the university means to do anything in these areas, it must consider hiring people who lack the usual credentials.

Presumably, a university president could hire such people by using the add-on strategy. He could take on community members as "fellows in urban affairs," grouped together in a new kind of community-oriented institute. He could create new non-tenured slots, "adjunct professor," "research associate," "associate in community science." His problems would begin if he attempted to take on large numbers of such people. His problems would get worse if he pressed for tenured positions for people without the regular academic qualifications. He would have a battle on his hands that he probably could not win, for the absorption of large numbers of non-credentialed faculty strikes at the basic faculty mode as well as at the accomplishments of individual faculty members and is, therefore, intolerable. This is not a demand the university can respond to on a large scale and remain a university as presently defined.

Nor can the university respond to a demand that it change its reward system. If the faculty really controls hiring, it is the faculty that sets the standards. And those standards are national. They must be transferable from institution to institution. Demanding change in the reward system implies the enormous task of taking on the faculty mode. It is not a demand to which one institution can respond, because if it does it takes itself out of the national system and presumably loses most of its upwardly mobile faculty.

Open Enrollment

A very small number of disadvantaged students can be assimilated directly into a university just as 1 or 2 differently credentialed faculty can be. As the number grows to approach a "critical mass," these students by their very number are able to demand and get those things they need. Support services may then look different because the students may support each other, and they may begin to affect the curriculum.

At this point, if these students choose to isolate their group from the rest of the institution, as blacks have sometimes done, they may play unwittingly into the university's usual defensive practice of encapsulating the "virus." But if their number threatens to become decisively large, as is the case with open enrollment, then the present university cannot respond. The add-on approach will not work, and the faculty mode will conflict with the demands posed by such a student body.

If open enrollment means that a small percentage of the total student body will be from the local community or will be accepted on the basis of academic standards different from those required of the rest of the students, then universities will inevitably duplicate the experience of high schools with their sad story of ability tracking. The less well prepared students will tend to be grouped together, and that patent judgment will tend to make them behave so as to fulfill the obvious prophecy.

If open enrollment is interpreted as admitting community youths as the entire student body, or as a substantial proportion of it, then this will prove the most threatening of all the demands we are examining here.

An open enrollment student body will be egalitarian rather than elitist and will want a curriculum which gives meaning either vicariously or directly to their experience (relevance) rather than preparing them for graduate school. They will want an emphasis on teaching, not research, and will ask that knowledge be seen as existing in the real world and that it be integrated rather than differentiated. In other words, such a student body will be in total conflict with the faculty mode.

Changes in Decision-Making Structure

The attempt to open decision making to students as a way of easing tensions and meeting demands is not entirely within the focus of this report, but our analysis suggests that these efforts will temporarily satisfy some demands even if on the periphery of real change.

If our reading of the faculty mode and faculty power are correct, however, the central decisions affecting how a university behaves toward students and toward knowledge have already been made or, if still open, will not be made either by the board of trustees or by the large faculty committees on which students will sit. The decisions about who is hired, who is promoted, who teaches what, and with what kinds of recognition -- these decisions will be made in the political atmosphere of the offices of departmental chairmen.

To be sure, some celebrated dismissal cases that pit students against the faculty will be sufficiently in the open so that students will have their say. But whether students can win in such cases, on any kind of long-term basis, is highly questionable, especially since some beleaguered faculty members will not respond to student support for fear of alienating the guild. The strategy of change that focuses upon adding students to official decision-making mechanisms may therefore well miss the mark in the long run in that it fails adequately to recognize where the vital decisions are made.

Perspectives and Implications

Our analysis suggests that the two things which will most quickly and radically change a university are open enrollment and the hiring of large numbers of a new kind of faculty. A slower way of doing the same thing, less threatening to the university as it is, is to work at changes in the curriculum, seeking methods of bringing add-on efforts into the core of the university.

The strategy for change that each university constituent group uses will depend on its interests and purposes. Let us, therefore, place what we have said so far in this chapter in the perspective of each constituent group to see what the implications are for each and what each might be able to do. (We do not deal with the private sector because, contrary to our expectations, it never proved sufficiently interested in this project to participate.)

University Presidents

Assuming that a president wants to move his institution into a more central involvement in urban problems, certain broad avenues of change emerge. Naturally, a president's choice among them will depend upon a local context of opportunities and constraints which it is beyond the scope of this paper to examine, but in general:

-- He can attempt to utilize the functions of the university over which he has real power in such a way as to be genuinely helpful to his city and to the communities which surround the university. In doing this, he will need to be sensitive to the way in which students take on the communities' agenda. But this can work in his favor also if, for instance, he initiates reforms of which students would normally approve -- using his construction budget to force equal employment compliance among construction companies and unions, re-directing his purchasing budget to community enterprises, sponsoring low-cost housing in local neighborhoods. Few of these changes will strike at the educational core of the institution -- indeed, that is why he has some real leverage with them -- but they could be extremely useful.

-- He can attempt to move more centrally but slowly in the area of teachers and curriculum by using the add-on approach, seeking the incorporation of the add-on over time into the core of the university. In this, he must be alert to the possibilities for tying the add-on into the central activities by developing techniques like joint appointments over which he might have some control. He can be frustrated in this effort by separatist-minded students or by the length of time the strategy may require. But this approach provides opportunities for central change in the hiring of new faculty members to teach new courses in areas like urban and black studies. His leverage comes in his faculty's failure to recognize this strategy as a threat, inasmuch as it has frequently been used by universities as a defensive strategy.

-- He can decide to confront the faculty in the most central way by agreeing to open undergraduate enrollment to community youths. His problems here will be enormous. Not only will he have to cope with those youths who had expected to enroll but whose places will be taken by the new group of students, but also with outraged alumni. Many of his faculty will leave, and they may well be those he most prizes for their prestige. If they stay, they will tend to separate themselves from the undergraduates, which will lead to two distinct faculties. And, of course, his trustees would probably not permit such an innovation. More acceptable would be the add-on technique, bringing in small groups of community youths and letting their anger at being segregated blow up the compartmentalized add-on. This strategy, too, could be frustrated by the separatist instincts of such students.

University Students

Students may well want to consider the implications of a move to separate themselves. Doing this can either play into the defensive mechanisms of the institution or frustrate a creative attempt on the part of a sophisticated administrator to begin to affect the core through the students' presence.

Students may wish to concentrate their pressure upon universities so as to emphasize change in curriculum and in the faculty who teach new courses. Our analysis indicates that the part of university structure which should concern students most is not the administration but the faculty and the departments, which make important decisions about who teaches what courses. The implication of this finding is in many ways a difficult one for students to handle. It assumes far more decentralized power in the university than is currently popular, and it casts doubt on the effectiveness of student confrontations with presidents and deans.

Community Groups

Our theories also suggest options for community groups who wish to bring pressure on the university:

- They could encourage a president in his efforts to reform various institutional activities so as to make them useful rather than harmful to the neighborhood. In this, their assistance would lie in identifying their greatest needs.

- They could increase their pressure for curriculum reform in terms of their own and their children's needs, emphasizing their sense of the inadequate education received by service personnel, like teachers and social workers, who serve them, and the failures of the education offered their youngsters.

- They could increase their pressures for opening the enrollment provided that pressure did not prove obstructive to real efforts by the administration to move in other useful directions.

-- They should stop pressuring the university for problem-solving and technical assistance, first because the university cannot do those things effectively and secondly because its response will be to create more urban studies centers in the classic add-on response.

Faculty Members

In some ways the faculty member is in the hardest position. The profession to which he has committed himself is in turn committed to a rigid mode which unfortunately stands in the way of accomplishing much of what we have been discussing. Individual faculty members, like the university itself, face enormous and difficult choices. Presumably some are sufficiently secure in their role that they can afford to be more flexible and feel less threatened than the mode within which they operate. Such men represent an important ally for most of the other groups. Faculty members in the professional schools like law, business, and medicine (among the latter our experience points particularly to those trained in community psychiatry) are likely to be freer of the faculty mode, and more able to relate to community aspirations, than professors in the faculty of arts and sciences.

The Public Sector

The public sector ought to be able to help universities in their efforts to change by supporting the strategies adopted by the university and other groups. Since problem-solving and technical assistance appear to be areas of university weakness, it would be wise for city officials to face this. They might be importantly supportive of curriculum change. They could assist the university in extending its notion of field work, helping to break the false dichotomy in which field work and classroom instruction are now locked. Currently field work means practice teaching or social work placement experience, or it is a euphemism for community action. Clearly, there are other experiences, differently shaped, which could be useful to the student seeking better preparation for an urban role. In this, the range of city agencies might make a real contribution.

Alliances Among the Groups

To the extent that these groups can develop effective communication and can agree on strategies, the university has an opportunity to move toward real change. Alliances, however, have a rational base. They are predicated on partners' knowing and working toward their own ends. If the demands of some groups represent not statements of substance but utterances for the sake of being heard, then it is difficult to develop real alliances. But real communication and shared agendas appear to be necessary.

In this context, let us now look at the national Urban University Conference held in June 1969 at Martha's Vineyard. From that conference emerged some of the real difficulties in bringing together the groups we have described. At the conference we could begin to appreciate the differences between what we had labelled "constituencies for change" and what was needed -- effective working coalitions.

CHAPTER VI: THE URBAN UNIVERSITY CONFERENCE

In the preceding chapter we discussed the kinds of university changes which would meet the demands of the constituent groups with which OSTI worked. We also indicated that some of those changes seemed more possible than others in light of our thesis about university behavior. Actions that might be taken to carry out possible changes we called "strategies."

Before these strategies can be useful we must examine what is required to enable a university to move from where it is to where it might be ready to undertake some of the changes we have suggested: curriculum revision to include urban topics, restructuring of services to include the local community, opening enrollment totally or in part.

OSTI's experience indicates that there are real barriers to any such changes. Our experience is not sufficiently deep to enable us to pinpoint the particular obstacles in the case of each of the institutions with which we worked -- though in some cases we have a better feel than in others -- but we did encounter a broad sweep of obstacles in our 3-day working conference at Martha's Vineyard in June 1969.

The Summer Conference

The conference at Martha's Vineyard attempted to pull together all of the people with whom we had previously met in small constituent groups and to add representatives from the Federal government, national organizations concerned with universities, the media, and foundations.

Our sense of urban universities and the problems they face, even among those committed to change, can best be conveyed by telling what we saw at the conference. This is particularly important against a background of our report thus far, which might well lead the reader to contemplate giving up on the urban university altogether and seeking to start a new kind of institution. Such a new venture would encounter all of the following problems in addition to many not examined here.

Here is what we saw:

1. There was no agreement about the meaning of the phrase "urban problems." To faculty members and

national organization representatives, urban problems meant not only poverty and racism but also pollution, inadequate transportation, etc. To black community representatives and black students, urban problems meant principally the plight of their people. A major confrontation occurred around this very point, with a result of better feelings but no agreement.

2. The problem of communication was paramount. The participants spent the better part of the three days talking past each other. Their rhetoric inhibited real exchange. Students talked about organizing suburban high school students or about schemes which seemed to the other participants either naive or beside the point. They showed impatience with any position they did not instinctively agree with.

Blacks tended to engage in something which, together with its consequences, we came to call the "Black Rap." It consisted of powerful speeches by blacks to the effect that the only problems are black problems, that only blacks truly know about those problems, that if you get enough blacks into the university all else will follow. In response to this, the whites were passive and unbelieving, and this was read by the blacks as failure to take them seriously. Only when a challenge was presented to the blacks (and to the students who tended to be supportive of the blacks) did significant movement in small working groups occur. Once the blacks were asked to address someone else's problems, they retreated, failing to produce the energy and militancy that their earlier statements led one to expect.

Faculty members also evidenced real difficulty in talking to anyone besides their own colleagues. One faculty member even publicly suggested that it was only in small groups of like-minded men that any progress could be made. Some of the men drawn to urban studies centers appeared to be marginal types who did not clearly fit into their university and who were drawn into the comparative vacuum of its urban center. This, of course, makes sense in terms of our previous analysis. These were the men who felt used by their university in doing what they felt the university said should be done but for which the university did not reward them. For many working groups at the conference, dealing with this kind of faculty member became a central and time-consuming problem. Only when the groups finally got these people to stop attempting to dominate the discussion could they begin to move forward.

Representatives of the Federal Government and of national organizations concentrated upon the need for national strategies and new lobbying organizations. They were not heard by the majority of the participants.

Administrators tended to be passive or evasive about what they thought should be done, although by the end of the conference some of them proved impressively open and willing to talk and to hear what other groups were saying.

Private sector representatives did not attend in sufficient number to be heard from or to demonstrate real interest in the problems of the urban university.

Public sector representatives did not show up in the numbers we had expected either, although considerably more came than from the private sector. Some of those who did attend appeared to be more open and better able to listen than many other representatives.

In short, nobody wanted to focus on anybody else's problem long enough to test out the possibility of coalition.

3. <u>The conflicts that divided the groups proved the major substance of the conference</u>. They included:

black / white
students / faculty
students / adults
faculty / administration
faculty / community
community / administration

The conflicts were such that they did not permit either an exchange of information or problem-solving in small discussion groups.

4. There was almost exclusive reliance upon confrontation and riots as the only strategy of change. When some groups asked whether other strategies existed, they were met by silence. No one apparently could remember any others. As one person put it: "Few people there had ever realized that there are 50 routes to Rome and that if you get to Florence it may be better."

5. The "successes" of the conference emphasize the degree to which the actors in the drama of urban universities are locked into their roles. Certain university presidents, for instance, were able to get to know members of their own faculty in ways that had not happened at home. One president heard from two people centrally engaged in his city's business how they and much of the rest of the city viewed one of his key urban program appointees. Although the president and the two other participants knew each other and saw something of each other formally in their own city, this bit of communication had not previously occurred in two years. (In fact, this exchange became central to the most significant outcome of the conference, which will be described under "The Continuing Conference.")

Communication seemed to loosen up with distance from home and from normal roles. This indicates that the degree of conflict at the conference, significant as it was, may not have been so great as it is on home ground.

6. What finally emerged as central areas of interest were issues of university power and politics. The most excitement -- and, according to most of the participants, the most valuable information -- came out of discussions of the pressure points available to administrators: how to evade dollar constraints, how administrators can use what little power they have, how to nurture alliances.

Limitations on discussion were imposed by a lack of intimate knowledge of differences in personality of administrators and the strengths they brought to the tasks of change, varying kinds of local constraints, problems of institutional accountability (to the trustees, to the State legislature). Without full knowledge of the significance of those constraints, the conference could only deal with the politics of the margin.

We have pointed out that strategies of change need more than our identification of areas and processes. They need ways of bringing key actors into fruitful communication. The conference can be viewed as one way to do this. It served to bring people into contact with each other, to disseminate information -- but it could not fight local battles. To work within the local constraints and with local talent would involve a further effort, well beyond the scope of this project, of living close to the situation, of really getting the feel of it, of acting as a catalyst to help the real actors in their work.

Outsiders will be necessary for this local process of change to occur because the chief actors are locked into their roles and into their perspectives at home and seldom are in real communication.

The Continuing Conference

Another strategy for effective communication was attempted in one city as a result of the June conference. This can be looked upon as another way for bringing about change -- or at least for bringing about the consideration of alternate routes to change.

A group of persons from this city who had participated in the conference met at home under the leadership of their president after the conference and continued to meet to see what they could develop.

The participants from this city had been particularly outstanding and had got much out of the conference individually. The president wanted to move. The public sector representative was a particularly talented Model Cities Agency director. The student had proved one of the most responsible and helpful. The private sector representative, an experienced labor union man, was a particularly important and astute member of the group. The faculty member, a professor of community psychiatry, was more flexible and attuned to the issues than many other faculty members. There was no community representative, but both the public and private sector representatives were attuned to the community viewpoint.

For this city's group, the conference had provided a number of key exchanges. One has already been described -- public and private representatives felt they could honestly tell the president of the impact of one of his main appointments in the urban field.

Another exchange occurred in a small working group where participants were made to focus upon the problems of this president's university and to face the fact that its financial support was being cut off by the business community because of its activities in the ghetto. Students from other cities, who wanted to talk about organizing the suburbs, and blacks, who wanted to describe the problems of blacks, were made to look at the problems of money for an institution attempting to undertake some of the activities they were advocating. Despite admitting they knew nothing about business, they began to explore how they could form an alliance to help this president with his problem.

When the group first met at home each of the conference participants brought along another person. Among the newcomers were two impressive members of the community. What resulted was a vehicle for more candid and realistic communication from several perspectives and across university-community-city lines, leading to a greater level of sophistication in the perception of problems.

The new vehicle has a number of interesting characteristics:

- It has the potential to pull in all sorts of persons who influence or are influenced by the university and to produce unusual alliances.

- It can remain flexible in structure, organization, and role because, although it is under the university's umbrella, it does not have to fit into any prescribed place in the university or in the city.

- It can potentially be in touch with all parts of the university.

This group met a number of times. At that point, the university president felt that he was ready to use another, far larger group, which cut across many more interests, had been previously assembled for other purposes, and had been moribund for almost a year. This was a largely political decision, and in his particular situation it made sense.

Yet the original idea of a new arrangement, meeting under university auspices and with university backing, but not locked into any part of the university structure and hence able to move with far greater flexibility -- this idea may be a useful one to try elsewhere. It is, to return to our previous analysis, an add-on, but it is a highly unorthodox one, and under a university president's leadership it may be able to intersect the university's core at key places. It depends on the identification and involvement of effective persons who are central to the groups they represent and who have power and flexibility.

We end our report with the image of this open-ended, searching attempt to create mechanisms for continuing the process of the conference. To help all of the urban university actors remove the cloaks of their rhetoric and penetrate to the realities which lie beneath is to begin the process of dealing with and, we hope, resolving the various conflicts we have discussed.

# # #