

Articles in the first three issues of this journal have explored some of the tasks of Metropolitan Universities, both within the institutions and without. An entire issue was devoted to student diversity; another contained descriptions of various modes of interaction between a metropolitan university and its community. The inaugural issue also touched upon other ways in which metropolitan universities move beyond the customary roles and functions of traditional institutions: contributing to the social and economic development of their region; preparing the skilled work force, the practicing professionals, and the political and commercial leadership; providing technical assistance and other professional services to the local schools, regional business and industry, government agencies, and community groups. Future issues of the journal will carry additional articles discussing these and other areas of activity by means of which the metropolitan universities can respond to the broad range of instructional and other intellectual needs of their region.

But an academic institution can implement its response in only one way: by means of the activities of its faculty, bolstered perhaps by nonteaching staff. It is the faculty, individually and collectively, which—by its qualifications, its activities, its choices, and its priorities, by what it does well and what it does badly, by what it does with enthusiasm and by what it does grudgingly—will determine whether a metropolitan university is successful in reaching its goals. Therefore, this entire issue of *Metropolitan Universities* is devoted to discussions of faculty-related matters.

To emphasize the crucial role of faculty is not to denigrate the importance of administrative leadership, nor to overlook the need for effective management of the institution. Both are required, as is the adequacy of budgetary support and of human, as well as physical resources. All these matters are essential—but they are not sufficient. Because faculty members are professionals, because their working conditions provide them with a goodly degree of autonomy in the choice of their activities and the manner in which these are carried out, an institutional mission can be implemented only to the extent it is accepted, and shared, by the faculty.

Unfortunately, it is highly unlikely that the goals of metropolitan universities are adequately shared by the majority of their faculty members. In contemporary universities, the professoriate tends to identify with, and to derive, its values and priorities from the discipline, rather than from the institution. The principal consequences of the prevalent disciplinary affiliation are the definitions of scholarship and the concomitant criteria for academic status. The existing rank order of academic values and the prevailing priorities of the faculty—all too often shared by the very administrators who call for their university's greater involvement with external constituencies—are based on a very narrow definition of scholarly activity in which, as Roger

Soder points out, knowledge production is seen as superior to knowledge dissemination. Metropolitan universities will have great difficulty in obtaining the essential faculty commitment to an extended institutional mission without a widely shared understanding—by faculty and administrators alike—that scholarship encompasses a much broader range of activities than traditional basic research, and that many of these activities are at least as intellectually challenging.

That is the heart of the matter, and that is why Eugene Rice's article on the new American scholar leads off this issue. Rice pleads for the recognition of different forms of scholarship reflecting the broadened task of the modern university: the scholarship of integration and the scholarship of practice, as well as the scholarship of discovery and, deeply imbedded in those three, the scholarship of teaching.

A great deal of lip service is being paid to the need for a "new scholarship," as described by Rice, especially by administrators and faculty in metropolitan institutions. But, as he points out: "when 'emerging' institutions launch drives toward higher standards of academic excellence, the older, narrower definition of scholarship as research is reasserted and given priority." This also was likely to happen "in the recent period of retrenchment," Rice notes, "when promotions were being denied and positions eliminated...."

Many institutions continue to be of two minds about their mission and send conflicting and confusing messages to their faculties. Two other articles in this issue illustrate this problem. In his report on the results of a survey of faculties in the field of education, Soder describes the lemminglike urge of many schools and departments of education to emphasize traditional research at the expense both of teaching and of outreach. Faculty members questioned in the survey perceive their institution to be much more research oriented than they, themselves, want to be. In her contribution, Sandra Elman deplores the failure of many institutions to view their faculty reward system as integral to their mission. She underscores Rice's call for "greater congruence between individual faculty scholarship and institutional mission," and suggests that the regional accreditation process provides an opportunity to bring this about. Her article further describes ways of documenting and evaluating the diverse instructional activities and the nontraditional scholarship and professional service in which faculty must engage to implement the mission of metropolitan universities.

The importance of expanding the concept of scholarship and broadening faculty horizons exists, as well, at the other end of the academic spectrum. Robert Smith describes the need to widen the range of faculty activity in emerging universities, which in the past expected and rewarded only routine classroom teaching. In such situations, it is necessary also to adapt the faculty reward system in order to bring about changes in faculty priorities and activities—and Smith indicates ways in which this can be done.

Two additional articles indicate how much more than routine classroom teaching is expected of faculty in metropolitan universities. Both are written from a highly individual perspective and in a personal voice, and carry a sense of immediacy. Nancy Hoffman describes her approach to teaching about differences and building community in a classroom of highly diverse students. She indicates the great potential benefits for all teachers, especially white ones, to take the risk of teaching material about and from the perspectives of ethnic, racial, and gender groups, of which they are not a part. Johnnella Butler, in an equally personal way, speaks about being a minority faculty member on a predominantly white campus. She calls for thorough self-examination and pervasive changes in attitudes so as to make institutions more hospitable to faculty members who diverge from the traditional norm, and more receptive to scholarship and teaching outside the accepted canon. Her argument is an important corollary to the need to have faculty priorities and values reflect those of their university, as pointed out in the contributions of Rice and Elman. By the same token, it is equally essential that institutions adapt so as to include faculty members of all backgrounds fully in the institutional mainstream.

If faculty norms and perceptions about scholarship and academic status are to be changed, then the process must begin in graduate school. Edward Schuh addresses himself to the issue of the preparation of future faculty and calls for greater breadth both in the undergraduate and in the subsequent graduate education of future faculty, without sacrificing the depth needed for expertise. But, as Schuh points out, faculty are as much in need of systematic further study during their career as are all other professionals. Schuh states that both individual faculty members and their institutions must invest substantially more in ongoing professional development. He makes the bold suggestion of mandatory sabbaticals for all faculty.

The issue of future faculty involves the question of numbers: What will be the availability of new recruits to the academic profession in the years to come, and how are metropolitan universities likely to fare in what is almost certain to be an increasingly competitive market? Zelda Gamson, Dorothy Finnegan, and Ted Youn report on the preliminary results of their survey of comprehensive universities, and describe some of the imaginative ways in which a number of institutions are beginning to address probable shortages of faculty.

The articles in this issue constitute only the beginning of discussion in the pages of *Metropolitan Universities* regarding faculty preparation and development, and their tasks, values, and incentives. Some pertinent topics did not find room in the current issue. For example, metropolitan universities are likely to make growing use of part-time and adjunct faculty, not only as a tactic to offset possible shortages in candidates for full-time positions, but also as an effective way of bridging the gap between theory and practice,

and between campus and the outside world. An upcoming issue of the journal will carry an article describing how less-than-full-time faculty can become full participants in academic discourse, and how the experience of seasoned practitioners can most effectively be utilized, not only in the classroom, but also in curriculum design. Future issues of this journal will carry additional contributions that explore other aspects, raise further questions, and pose additional challenges. But in their aggregate, the present articles sound a message loud and clear: without the commitment of the faculty, the goals of metropolitan universities cannot be met fully, and without substantial changes in currently held values and rewards, that commitment is not likely to be made.

The dangerous divergence between faculty and institutional priorities in higher education generally, and in metropolitan universities especially, requires much more systematic attention than it has received to date. The issue has not been ignored. The influential American Association of Higher Education has taken the lead in placing classroom teaching on the agenda of higher education. In addition, some of us have, for several years, urged a broader definition of scholarship, such as is being articulated now so well by Ernest Boyer in the latest report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, *Scholarship Reconsidered*. But these efforts, however important, have not, as yet, led to what is really needed: a fundamental reconceptualization of the profession of the professor, a redefinition of the necessary skills, and an integrated model for her or his preparation, further development, career goals, incentives, and rewards.

We hope that *Metropolitan Universities* will provide a forum for the evolution of such a new concept and new model. We would welcome critical comments about the articles in this issue and further descriptions of existing or recommended policies, procedures, and programs that are pertinent. We are particularly interested in further discussion of faculty preparation and lifelong development, as well as of appropriate definitions of scholarship. We also seek descriptions of institutional experiences with revised systems of faculty rewards and incentives. Above all, we solicit broad perspectives and integrated views. Please send us letters or an opinion piece to be printed in a future issue, or write to me if you are interested in submitting an article.