

Running Head: STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY

State of the University:

Presidential Perspectives and Twenty-First Century Institutional Mission

Amy Liu

University of California, Los Angeles

Paper for the 2007 32nd Annual Conference of the
Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE)
Organization and Administration
Research Paper
8-10 November 2007
Louisville, Kentucky

Keywords: university purpose, institutional mission, presidents

working paper

October 2007

INTRODUCTION

Research universities in the United States are vast, complex and dynamic institutions with many purposes and various constituents. Whether they are places of learning for the student, places of discovery for the scientist, places of tradition for the humanist, or places of service for the public, universities are organizations with diverse and diffuse missions (Kerr, 1995). In his 1963 book, *The Uses of the University*, Clark Kerr, former president of the University of California, suggests that perhaps the term “multiversity” would be a more appropriate moniker for an institution with such wide-ranging uses. Guided by the multiversity framework of research, teaching, and service, this paper examines the state of the university as expressed by university presidents. Specifically, this study incorporates a review of selected speeches and remarks from the presidents of leading private and public universities to illuminate the themes and trends of university purpose. The central research questions are: What is the mission and vision of a university in the twenty-first century? What do presidents believe are the purposes of universities? What do they think are new ideas that should be incorporated into the mission? What do they consider challenges to university mission?

When the word “mission” is used in reference to universities, a first thought that comes to mind is the “mission statements” that many universities adopt and publicize in their brochures and on their websites. Despite the thought and care that may go into formulating these statements, they are not the focus of this paper, nor is it how the word “mission” is utilized. In this study, “mission” is a conceptual term used to encapsulate the goals, aims, functions, purposes, uses, ideas, and philosophies of universities as educational institutions. While there may be specific nuances about each of those terms that prevent them from being bundled together, rather than being mired in a semantics debate, this paper uses “mission” as a general means of representing the reasons for a university’s existence.

THE ROLE OF THE PRESIDENT

In choosing to examine the issue of twenty-first century university mission from a presidential perspective, it is important to consider more fully why this is an effective approach. The role of university president today is not held in the same high regard as in decades or centuries past (Cohen & March, 1974; McLaughlin, 1996; Shapiro, 1998). This is due partly to presidential responsibilities having been increasingly shifted away from academic leadership towards more managerial areas such as fundraising and budget planning. As a result, presidents are sometimes seen as little more than glorified administrators or pawns of the board of trustees whose presence and leadership do not carry any amount of resonance or importance. Given such little regard for the university presidency, what then is the value in examining their perspectives? Despite the changes in function and significance of the role, the overarching constancy is the president's overall institutional responsibility. McLaughlin and Riesman (1990) state more pointedly that "the presidents of colleges and universities are also guardians, and in failing in that capacity they can cripple an institution or they can help preserve it" (pp. 4-5). Whatever the criticisms that have befallen the changed role of the president, as the university's central figure the president's actions still retain some influence:

As the chief spokesperson for their institution, all presidents have the opportunity to set a tone or style of operation; to help their institutions learn about their environment and their particular niche in this environment; to help develop and articulate agendas for their institutions; to affect quality; to mentor and educate, energize, frustrate, or enervate those who work with them (McLaughlin & Riesman, 1990, p. 14).

The president is also in a position of knowing what happens within the university across the board, whether it is administrative, financial, or curricular issues and hence is able to speak widely about the whole institution. The concern, of course, is the tendency for presidents to be unequivocal advocates and admirers of universities, which then calls their objectivity into question. Additionally, much of what university presidents convey in their speeches and remarks

may be merely rhetoric and institutional public relations designed to be clarion calls for fundraising. However, these characterizations are too dismissive of the potential insight that can be gleaned from their discourse. Presidents are the focal point for the various university constituents and a review and analysis of today's university presidential perspectives can elucidate the priority of issues as well as shape and steer the conversation of university mission in the twenty-first century.

METHODOLOGY

This paper focuses on doctoral/research universities, of which there are 259 not-for-profit institutions (Carnegie Classification, 2001). The sample is narrowed to the top-30 ranked universities within that classification as determined by the 2005 *US News and World Reports (USNWR) America's Best Colleges* ranking. Universities whose presidential speeches were not available online were omitted. This yielded 25 sample institutions ranked within the top-30. These universities represent the best of American higher education and are the popularly recognized prestigious institutions in the nation. Certainly this contention is debatable dependent on what one uses as the qualifications for "best" and "prestige," but these schools are among the most globally recognizable universities. Critics argue that relying on rankings that employ questionable methodology to make determinations of status are a disservice to the field of higher education. These rankings drive schools into a high stakes, "academic excellence" social climbing game that does not accurately reflect true academic quality, creates a needlessly competitive environment, and is counterproductive to educational priority (Ehrenberg, 2002, Jennings, 2004). While it is important to acknowledge and weigh these issues in the process of sample selection, the strengths and weaknesses of rankings and league tables, and the actual institutional ranks themselves are not a concern for this paper. Individual institutional rank is

variable dependent on the particular rankings and/or league table being used, but for the most part the same sample of top-tier institutions exists across the tables. It should also be noted that by virtue of using the USNWR rankings, the sample does not include any women's colleges or historically black colleges and universities. The problem is that this does not provide as rich a data sample, but given that these institutions have an additional historically specialized mission, they warrant consideration in a separate analysis. The USNWR rankings are employed in this study as a familiar rubric for isolating the sample of universities.

The weakness of using presidential speeches as a framework for analysis of mission is that presidents might be perceived as grandstanding and the remarks can come across as lacking substance, prone to "talking points," and pandering depending upon who is the audience (e.g., donors, faculty, alumni, global conference). However, because a discussion of university mission is broad in scope, presidential remarks are useful for encapsulating the important themes and ideals of universities and for manifesting trends and changes in the thinking and discourse. Of these 25 universities, the presidential remarks selected for review were either speeches that specifically centered upon the theme of university purpose or inaugural addresses (see Appendix A). The university purpose speeches were chosen for obvious reasons and with nearly three-fourths of the universities under new leadership (i.e., presidents who began their tenure after 2000), the inaugural speeches were appropriate because they address the university community and public at large and lay out the presidents' overarching goals and visions for their institutions. Because this is an assessment of twenty-first century institutional mission, the selection was limited to remarks made only since 2000 (with the exception of a few speeches made prior to 2000 that directly addressed the topic of the university in the twenty-first century) through summer 2005, when analysis of the speeches began.

The speeches were utilized as documentary data and qualitative analysis employed to formulate a consensus of what current university presidents 1) believe are the purposes of universities, 2) think are new ideas that should be incorporated into the mission and 3) consider challenges to university mission. Transcripts of speeches were coded utilizing both deductive and inductive analysis. Deductive analysis involved processes of thematic coding of transcripts based on the key research questions and related concerns. Inductive analysis was used to identify unanticipated themes, deriving largely from reading and re-reading the data.

FINDINGS

The findings are organized into the following three categories and corresponding subcategories: 1) university ideals – dichotomy of research, undergraduate education, diversity, commitment to excellence; 2) new ideas for universities – convergence of studies, student-centered approach, a global university, universities in the marketplace; and 3) challenges to university mission – high price of higher education, limited resources and the art of allocation. Findings from these categories are then used to discuss the contemporary state of the university.

University Ideals

Given that inaugural addresses tend to embody a more inspirational rather than analytical tone, it is to be expected that most of what is conveyed with regards to university purpose reflects the grander generalities of “the idea of a university” rather than perhaps institutional realities. It is natural and convenient for presidents to extol the basic virtues of a university without providing a prescription for how those virtues are achieved, and without consideration for whether or not those virtues are achievable given any number of institutional constraints. Speeches that address the specific topic of the future of the university or what a twenty-first century university should resemble are a bit more critical and prescriptive, but not to any great

degree. Not surprisingly, many of the key themes are proclaimed through various “catchphrases” that are easily and frequently repeated, not across the board by all presidents, but by the majority. The consensus is that, in no particular order, universities exist for “the search for truth,” “public service,” “citizenship education,” “civic responsibility,” “lifelong learning,” “professional development,” “diversity,” “commitment to excellence,” and “adaptability.” Most of these themes manifest themselves in the form of various “creative tensions” fundamental to universities.

The Continuum of Research

The “creative tension” in the example of “the search for truth” and “public service” relates primarily to the dichotomy of basic versus applied research. One president states:

Universities are places of ideas but also places of idealism. We owe allegiance to the dispassionate pursuit of truth. But universities...have been and should always be places of passionate moral commitment. We cultivate what is special and intellectual here, but we must also nurture the value of generous public service to society beyond these walls (Summers, Harvard, 2001).

Most presidents concur that universities should engage in research activities that may yield no immediate benefits, for the sake of discovery itself, for the sake of generating new knowledge, and for the sake of building “intellectual capital.” However, this declaration is usually immediately followed by the instrumental claim that universities are “not apart from society” and as such they are duty bound to their “social responsibility” of ensuring that research “extends from inquiry through discovery to translation into practice, a continuum that links the most abstruse research with practical improvements to actual lives” (Brodhead, Duke, 2004). This continues further with the idea that research should serve as the “engine of economic growth” and bolster the local, regional, national, and world economies (Hockfield, MIT, 2005). This is a far departure from the pure liberal idea of a university espoused by Newman (1912), but as one president suggests, “It is naïve to suppose that universities have ever existed independent of

cultural, economic, and political forces. The question is not whether universities exist in relation to such forces, but why and how they do” (Randel, Chicago, 2000).

Undergraduate Education

Another “creative tension” exists in the matter of undergraduate education, an aspect of university mission that is frequently touted as one of the most important. The balance in question here is that between liberal, practical, and civic education. The consensus is that a broader based liberal education remains a priority. One president states:

...we should first and foremost cultivate the qualities of thought and discernment in our students, in the belief that this will be most conducive to the health of our society. Thus we distinguish between the acquisition of information, something that is essential for professional training, and the development of habits of mind that can be applied in any profession (Tilghman, Princeton, 2001).

Although there is no disavowal of “professional development,” emphasis is given to “humanistic values” and “learning how to learn,” rather than simply acquiring “technical skills.” The desired goal is to provide an education that enables students to become “effective and engaged citizens” committed to “lifelong learning” and to develop a sense of “civic responsibility” by instilling in students “a sense of public responsibility, of civic engagement, of compassion and moral obligation” (Leebron, Rice, 2004).

Diversity

The pledge for “diversity” is another popularly heralded ideal, especially in the form of a culturally diverse study body. One president proclaims the need to be:

...profoundly committed to the educational principle of diversity...We all have much to learn about different cultures, about different ways of organizing societies, about how life experiences shape how one sees the world, about our perceptions (often inaccurate and oversimplified) of people of different cultures, societies, race, and ethnicities (Bollinger, Columbia, 2002).

Along with this responsibility to diversity is the need to ensure “access” to a university education for underrepresented minorities and international students, in the form of “outreach” or

“financial aid” such that “the campus becomes a true model for a multicultural, pluralistic society” (Mooser, North Carolina, 2000). The hallmark of a university is not only being diverse in its composition, but also in nurturing diverse perspectives, albeit with an obligation to subject all ideas to “critical judgments.” The university must be a haven for “academic and intellectual freedom,” however unpopular the views, but it does not serve as an excuse for blanket acceptance that all perspectives are equally valid. Diversity of viewpoints must be embraced, but not at the expense of academic rigor.

Commitment to Excellence

The most commonly uttered theme by virtually all presidents is that of “excellence.” The pursuit of and commitment to excellence should envelop the entire university from assembling pre-eminent faculty, to engaging in cutting edge research, to attracting the most talented students, to building state-of-the-art facilities. Generally, this entails operating at the highest levels in all endeavors in order to gain the distinction of being a “world-class university.” This is tempered by a need for decisive decision-making as one president states:

To become a flagship research university requires two things: focusing resources on a limited number of disciplines in which you can develop the critical mass to become world class, and to exercise what I characterize as a “ruthless commitment to excellence.”...[This] requires considerable political will to say yes to some investments and no to others, and then to stay the course (Brody, Johns Hopkins, 1999).

For presidents, not all parts of the university are treated with equal weight and this requires universities to maintain an air of “adaptability.” The university must constantly be open and willing to evolve and change in its quest for “excellence,” but not devoid of honor to its “traditions.” Universities should allow their “past to inform the future” in a way that allows for opportunities to “connect wisdom from the past with contemporary thought” (Hatch, Wake Forest, 2005). In this regard, universities very much remain “works in progress.”

New Ideas for Universities

Emerging from the presidential discourse are a number of themes being deemed as imperatives for universities today. These include being “interdisciplinary” and “student-centered,” becoming a “global university,” and engaging in “technology transfer.”

Convergence of Studies

As the research mission of universities developed, areas of study became more and more specialized such that departments across the university resembled silos, operating independently of each other. As one president states, “Universities have a natural tendency to relegate each problem to the province of one or another academic discipline or profession” (Gutmann, Pennsylvania, 2004). Now there are exhortations for universities to be “interdisciplinary” and “multidisciplinary,” as a means to better fulfill the “social responsibility” and “service to society” aspects of university mission. One president goes so far as to state that “interdisciplinarity is fast becoming the sine qua non of the research university of the 21st century” (Sample, Southern California, 2002). Researchers from different fields should work together “symbiotically and synergistically” (Birgeneau, Berkeley, 2005) to realize, as another president states:

...the benefits that result when scholars cross the boundaries of their disciplines to forge new alliances and ideas. I want to encourage the productive synthesis of ideas and cultures at the boundaries of academic disciplines to create new models of learning and discovery (Coleman, Michigan, 2003).

The aim here is to promote a “collaborative” environment and to foster a sense of interdependence across the university, thereby strengthening the instrumental aims of research and discouraging academic isolation. One president analogizes it as a move from the “classical physics idea of the atom [as] a sphere with sharply demarcated boundaries” to a “quantum physics model of the atom [as] a cloud with fuzzy borders” and suggests that collaborations and

multidisciplinarity can even extend beyond the confines of a single institution to multiple universities (Brody, Johns Hopkins, 1999).

Student-Centered Approach

On the issue of educating students, although the merits of a liberal education are unquestioned and championed, a broader overall conception of education is also advocated. The contemporary thinking is to place just as much emphasis on the “comprehensive experience outside of the classroom” as on a rigorous academic program (Wright, Dartmouth, 1998). New approaches to education, such as experiential education which tends towards the practical, and service-learning which helps build “civic responsibility,” will become important components of the full university educational experience. According to one president:

Future classrooms will more likely extend into the field, with a guide (virtual, remote, or proximate) assisting field study and research....Classrooms will remain important but they will become just one of many sites of formal learning overseen by teachers and practitioners (Simmons, Brown, 2002).

Education, no longer bound by traditional walls, extends beyond time and space. A few presidents also speak about the movement towards a “student-centered” conception wherein the non-academic student life aspects of the undergraduate experience are co-opted into a learning experience. As another president states:

...the education of the classroom forms only a part of the experience we must bring to our students. In our charge to bring our undergraduates from the cusp of adulthood to full participation and ultimately leadership in our society, we must take a holistic approach to the education we provide. We do this by assuring that they learn as much outside the classroom as they do in it. Their experiences – in leadership and participation in campus activities, on the athletic field, in constructive dialogue with students different than they are, in their work or study abroad, in public service...are all essential parts of their education (Leebron, Rice, 2004).

The idea is to channel extracurricular activities into educational activities by acknowledging that all aspects of the university experience, whether athletic, organizational or intellectual, inform students’ development. On some campuses these activities have such

dominance that perhaps the call for a student-centered approach is a means to justify their expansion and validate the institutional preoccupation on non-academic, social enterprises. While only a few presidents made specific remarks about being student-centered, it is decidedly in keeping with the broader discussion of a “holistic education” wherein a liberal education is still considered paramount, but not sufficient for students’ university education today.

A Global University

Just as the conception of education broadens, so too does the magnitude of the university itself. With the phenomenon of globalization, university presidents now call upon their institutions to transform themselves into “global universities.” One president describes this in four points (Levin, Yale, 2003):

1. Increasing the representation of international students in our institutions.
2. Incorporating more international content into our research and teaching.
3. Forming collaborative relationships with institutions in other nations.
4. Reaching broader audiences around the world through the use of improved communications technology.

Enrolling a spectrum of students from across the globe presumably enables a richer understanding of different cultures and perspectives and it serves as a demographic manifestation of a “global university.” Beyond simply increasing the representation of nationalities in the student population, the more important aspect of becoming a “global university” is integrating international dimensions into the substance of what is taught and studied. As another president states, the “global paradigm” requires universities to “educate [its] students about the global context of their life and work” (Simmons, Brown, 2002). One other president, borrowing a term from the president of the University of Mexico, speaks about the need for students to acquire the “intercultural competence” necessary to “navigate today’s globalized society” (Birgeneau, Berkeley, 2005).

The internationalization of the campus, in both people and educational content, must “transcend the tendency to parochialism” so as to grant universities the passport of an “international citizen” (Leebron, Rice, 2004). A “global university” must extend its reach beyond its own national borders. One means of achieving this is through the use of technology to reach students in even the farthest corners of the world, the caveat being that there is access to such technology. Advances in communications technology offer universities considerable opportunities to expand their educational missions and to transcend geography through online learning media. Another means of crossing borders is through the “development of larger-scale institutional partnerships that will become an increasingly important feature of truly global universities” (Levin, Yale, 2003). Collaborative projects between scholars are not new occurrences, but as they become “institutionalized,” they take on a “depth and permanence” and achieve greater instrumental aims:

[Institutionalized collaborations] exemplify the future of scholarship and service in the global university. They permit scholars and scientists to share expertise in the pursuit of new knowledge and in the application of that knowledge to improving material and social conditions....we must deepen these relationships and expand the connections. For it is these institutional partnerships that will serve as the bedrock for the future, ensuring not only the continued advancement of knowledge but a growing mutual understanding among citizens (Levin, Yale, 2003).

The global ideal is present in virtually all of the presidential speeches, with Levin defining it most specifically. However, one president spoke of the university amidst globalization in a slightly different manner. Rather than “global university,” he states that the “American university has matured into the transnational university of the future” (Lehman, Cornell, 2003). As such, it has a “special duty to nurture a transnational perspective,” which he defines as being “different from a global perspective because it transcends nationalism without insisting on a unitary global substitute.” Although the “transnational perspective” may be slightly more nuanced thinking on the subject of globalization, the fundamental idea that the university must

be attentive to international concerns, in addition to national issues remains consistent. Although the connection was not explicitly made in some of the presidential remarks, underlying the appeal for a transformation to a global university are considerable economic and commercial motives.

Universities in the Marketplace

Another theme emerging from the presidential perspectives is that of “technology transfer,” which one president defines as “the process of taking research done at universities into the marketplace” (Sample, Southern California, 2002). This promotes the increasingly commercial ventures of universities and validates them as a core aspect of university mission. In order for a university to improve, it must be “venturesome and opportunistic” (Hatch, Wake Forest, 2005). Although the university has long ceased to resemble the “classic concept of the academy” (Sample, Southern California, 2002), it may be a dangerous proposition to invite such entrepreneurial endeavors. Many presidents concur that partnerships with the private sector are an increasingly important and needed development for universities. However, most of them try to couch it in euphemisms of doing so for the “public good” or “social good” because the commercialization of universities is a subject that generates its fair share of controversy and protest.

The continuum of liberal and instrumental aims is extended even further with the addition of a market-oriented ethos that institutional leaders feel is necessary for the survival of their universities. As one president states, “If the public is to continue to fund inquiries largely unintelligible to the common understanding...universities are going to need to become far less self-enclosed and self-absorbed, to take more pains to demonstrate the value of advanced research for men’s and women’s lives” (Brodhead, Duke, 2004). Additionally, in the hugely competitive drive for “excellence,” another president states that “the key to the 21st century is

expertise – that quality which transforms ubiquitous information into useful and economically valuable knowledge” (Brody, Johns Hopkins, 1999). However, to temper the profit-seeking market ideals, presidents do acknowledge the need to uphold certain standards, albeit somewhat half-heartedly. One president asserts the need to be “even more vigorous in facilitating the commercial applications of the results of our research,” but also notes that the need to “continue to partner actively with the private sector” must be done so in a way that “the rights and freedoms of both our own faculty and students as well as our industrial partners are properly protected” (Birgeneau, Berkeley, 2005). Another president states:

We need to have strong conflict-of-interest safeguards in place, and we must constantly guard against undermining the basic purpose of the academy. But at the same time we have to get beyond the idea that commercialization of university research is inherently inimical to the role of the university. The role and function of universities is evolving within an overall tradition. Innovation does not necessarily mean a break with tradition. Rather, it should mean incorporating new approaches within the academic tradition (Sample, Southern California, 2002).

To a university purist of disinterested inquiry, such sentiments are undoubtedly troubling, but they reflect the realities of universities in the present day.

Challenges to University Mission

Given that presidential speeches tend to address what should be included in university mission rather than what should be omitted, a slew of varying purposes for universities are presented. However, what are some potential challenges that universities must contend with that could encumber a university from fulfilling its mission? Very few challenges are actually brought up in presidential remarks, but some that are mentioned or implied include affordability, limited resources, and resource allocation.

The High Price of Higher Education

The high cost of a university education is seen as a significant barrier to one aspect of university mission. According to one president, “Nowadays the danger is that colleges and

universities will exclude not in the crude old-fashioned way, by category of social identity, but more invisibly, by cost” (Brodhead, Duke, 2004). The concern is that prohibitive tuition costs have the latent effect of hindering diversity because certain demographics of students, such as those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, tend to not have sufficient means to pay. Although most of the top-tier institutions have need-blind admissions policies and need-based financial aid programs in place for these students, the “sticker price” shock of tuition costs can itself be a considerable deterrent for students. A solution to this would seem to be in finding ways of lowering tuition costs, but as this same president states:

In the last generation and indeed in the last decade America's selective colleges have offered a more and more super-enriched experience to students, and every component – state-of-the-art labs, the most up-to-date information technology, instruction in more and more foreign languages, the widest array of extracurricular activities – comes at considerable expense. But the problem can't be solved by simple-minded cutting. Rich or poor, the students...would never be attracted to a no-frills university...(Brodhead, Duke, 2004).

Another president adds that things universities could do to defray costs and make them “‘more efficient’ – larger classes, fewer faculty, less mentoring, fewer independent studies – would make [universities] much, much *less productive* by every measure that really matters...” (Bacow, Tufts, 2002, emphasis in original). Lowering the price of tuition does not seem to be a preferred option for the elite research universities, yet by not doing so a university education becomes increasingly unaffordable to all but the affluent few. This could potentially derail the goals for “diversity” in the student body, which ultimately could also affect “diversity” of perspectives.

Limited Resources and the Art of Allocation

If finding means to reduce costs is not a readily embraced course of action, then finding money to sustain university goals is, not surprisingly, a subsequent challenge for universities. As one president states, “Trying to do all things inevitably means that we cannot be superior in all respects, especially when resources are limited” (Carnesale, Los Angeles, 1998). Painting a

picture of a university unable to fulfill its mission to the fullest due to limited resources certainly makes for good fundraising strategy. Universities are in fact large institutions that undoubtedly require a lot of money to operate, especially given the overarching desire for “excellence.” Not all university endowments are created equal so some universities have a financial advantage over others. Yet despite the size of any endowment, most schools would likely agree that resources are never in abundance.

The pursuit of excellence is a part of university mission, but it is also an intrinsic challenge. Identifying areas of strength and potential to allocate resources is not an inherently negative task, but finding the proper balance between disciplines is the difficulty. According to one president:

...like many of my colleagues, I have seen a disparity in emphasis between the sciences and humanities. Outside research funding has, no doubt, been the dominant source of that disparity and has led to an inequality in total resources, if not in institutional emphasis, and a consequent concern that we are not doing enough for the arts and humanities.... (Hennessy, Stanford, 2000).

The art of resource allocation is an abstract one with the potential to be divisive and corrupting of what one president calls “the spirit of the university” (Randel, Chicago, 2000). The discord begins “when disciplines or departments or individuals assert their moral superiority over one another” (Randel, Chicago, 2000). Parts of the university that enjoy the bounties of external and/or internal resources would seem to hold positions of privilege and may inevitably attempt to establish hegemony of university mission. If resources are allocated disproportionately in favor of the sciences or professional disciplines, then presidential pronouncements about the importance of liberal education and the enduring commitment to “humanistic values,” ring hollow as it would appear that priority for those areas diminish and become afterthoughts.

Explanations for prospective changes in university priority usually resemble what one president states is the need for universities to “renew itself in each generation” in order to “succeed and endure”:

Renewal does not just mean doing new things and growing larger. It means moving beyond activities that have run their course, being selective and disciplined about the most critical paths to pursue, and nimbly and rapidly responding to the opportunities created by a changing world (Summers, Harvard, 2001).

Being open to change and maintaining a willingness to evolve is an important university ideal, but the complexities involved in determining what is worthy for excellence and what has “run its course” in the process of resource allocation is certainly a challenge to university mission.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

In relation to the question of mission and vision of a university in the twenty-first century, the analysis of presidential speeches yielded many ideas and values. The aim here is to take those presidential perspectives and anchor them in a wider context to bring forth a more complex and reflective understanding of the state of the university today.

A Ruined Institution

Readings (1996) refers to the university as a “ruined institution,” but acknowledges it is important to think about “what it means to dwell in those ruins without recourse to romantic nostalgia” (p. 169). Presidential rhetoric about the need for universities to nourish the creative tensions at the heart of institutions results in a sort of double-speak about university mission – research for its own sake should be pursued, but technology transfer must be emphasized; students should be given a liberal education, but must also avail themselves of experiential education; traditions should be upheld, but universities must be open to change. Kerr’s idea of a multiversity seems to be in full force with universities embracing a collection of purposes, all under the guise of excellence. Readings argues that the prominent usage of “excellence” is a

paradigm illustration of “dereferentialization,” which Beck (2002) defines as “the use of terms having no intrinsic meaning but that can be mobilized to legitimize whatever priorities markets or managements require” (p. 624). According to Readings, the (over)use of excellence, not just by university presidents, but by the university community at large, is sustainable because “as an integrating principle, excellence has the singular advantage of being entirely meaningless, or to put it more precisely, non-referential” and this “very lack of reference allows excellence to function as a principle of translatability between radically different idioms” (p. 22 & 24). As a result, excellence is often invoked “to say precisely nothing at all: it deflects attention from the questions of what quality and pertinence might be, who actually are the judges of a relevant or a good University, and by what authority they become those judges” (p. 32). Hence, presidents can speak unambiguously about being stringent with resource allocation while hiding behind a veil of excellence, which has enabled market and student-as-consumer ideals to flourish.

Readings further contends that “the appeal to excellence marks the fact that there is no longer any idea of the University, or rather that the idea has now lost all content” (p. 39). Adopting a position of “institutional pragmatism,” he recognizes the university today as:

An institution that is losing its need to make transcendental claims for its function. The University is no longer simply modern, insofar as it no longer needs a grand narrative of culture in order to work. As a bureaucratic institution of excellence, it can incorporate a very high degree of internal variety without requiring its multiplicity of diverse idioms to be unified into an ideological whole (p. 168).

Presidents therefore talk at length about creative tensions without any recommendation of what the balance in tension should be or how the tension should be reconciled. The tensions in a university are therefore not considered negative, but positive aspects of institutional mission.

For these reasons, Readings considers the university a ruined institution, proclaiming that:

To inhabit the ruins of the University must be to practice an institutional pragmatism that recognizes this threat, rather than to seek to redeem epistemological uncertainty by recourse to the plenitude of aesthetic sensation (nostalgia) or epistemological mastery (knowledge as progress). The ruins of culture's institution are simply there, where we are, and we have to negotiate among them (p. 171).

This suggests a sort of it-is-what-it-is mentality, accepting a disillusionment about the university, yet seeing no reason to “redeem or rebuild” it. Delanty (2001), however, is critical of Readings' view and counters that the university is not “in ruins.” He states that “it is instead a site of conflicts...more a battleground than a ruin,” pointing out that “corporate culture's discourse of excellence” has not completely subsumed the university; it is only one force shaping the contemporary university (p. 141). The university remains a relevant institution, albeit without a singular unifying mission.

Two Institutional Logics

Gumport (2002) uses the concept of institutional logic, defined as “a set of material practices and symbolic constructions – which constitutes its organizing principles and which is available to organizations and individuals to elaborate” (p. 52), to explore the tensions inherent in the academy. Her study identifies two institutional logics that universities invoke for legitimacy – social institution logic and industry logic. On the one hand, the social institution logic encompasses more traditional academic ideals, such as liberal education, academic freedom, knowledge advancement and preservation, intellectual pluralism, and social criticism. Service to society for social aims, including mobility and citizenship, are important and societal expectations are influential. On the other hand, market forces power the industry logic. Labor market needs and commercializing knowledge for economic aims, such as revenue generation are central. Industry logic regards students as consumers rather than as campus community members.

Not surprisingly, when outlining a vision for their respective universities, presidents tend to include ideas from both logics in their remarks. Rather than declaring these two logics mutually exclusive, perhaps the genuine thought is that in theory universities truly can engage in both the social institution and industry activities equally. In practice, however, the story is likely to be quite different with one logic dominating the other. According to Gumport, overall the social institution logic has lost momentum to the industry logic, but for each individual institution, “the ways in which either of the two logics are evident in the organizational discourse or prevail in structural modifications depend upon a mix of historical legacies, inherited structures, and perceptions of resource needs and constraints” (p. 56).

University Identity

While the university as social institution and the university as industry are not incapable of co-existing, they do appear at odds with each other. Given the presence of two institutional logics, Delanty’s (2001) metaphor of the university as a battleground seems especially pertinent, with each logic battling for campus hegemony. The identity of a university as an institution with a uniform narrative culture, has long ceded to one comprised of multiple (potentially schizophrenic) identities. Depending on the current agenda on the table (e.g., appeal for more research funds, recruitment of students, facilitation of town-gown relations), sometimes the traditional liberal ideals are emphasized, other times the innovative market ideals are advocated. The battleground, therefore, is also home to tension between tradition and innovation. As an historic and establishment institution, the university is perhaps more considerably bound by tradition than many of its members and even its leaders might like. However, they are looked upon as institutions that will preserve the best of the past and therefore presidents often speak of allowing the “[university] past to inform the [university] future.” This impacts university identity in two ways: institutional identity and educational identity.

Institutional Identity

Presidents frequently call their universities works in progress, thus suggesting that their institutions are under constant construction, necessarily redefining themselves according to the times. Universities rely on history and tradition as guides for what is important and central to their mission, but recognize that nothing is immune from examination or reinterpretation. Some customs are preserved (e.g., academical dress at graduations) for the sheer pomp and circumstance of it, others are discarded (e.g., only admitting [white] males) when they cease to be defensible. The problem is who or what determines what should be preserved and what should be discarded – students, scholars, administrators, politicians, culture, society, or economy? In a community of scholars it seems self-evident that scholars determine what is relevant, but in a framework of social institution and industry logics, the idea of relevance is much more diffuse.

Sullivan (2000) writes that “vital and successful institutions stand out by their ability to maintain their direction and sense of meaning even amid significant shifts in the social landscape” (p. 19). To him, the direction and meaning seem to be missing:

When the issue of purpose is raised within higher education, it is as often a source of division as it is a rallying point. Conflicting influences from various external patrons such as industry, philanthropy, and government, as well as dissension within, have pushed academic leadership to simply shelve the whole issue of identity and purpose, instead getting by on bland managerialism (p. 20).

Hence, the rise of a discourse of excellence. However, Bogue and Aper (2000) disagree and suggest that:

Dissent over mission may be seen as evidence that higher education is indeed meeting its most fundamental responsibilities for asking what is true and what is good, and for equipping its graduates with both motive and skill to challenge conventional wisdom (p. 34).

Whether presidents are merely engaging in simple rhetoric when they lay out their statements of university purpose in their addresses or are truly committed to establishing some sort of

institutional identity, the agreement is that there are conflicting influences and dissent about what that identity should be. The prevailing industry institutional logic, however, suggests that the university's traditional identity as an academy is being placed on the back burner in favor of a corporate institutional identity. Naturally, this has implications for its educational identity.

From Liberal Arts to Practical Arts

The values of liberal education are consistently heralded in the university mission discourse. Presidents like to draw attention to their liberal arts programs as a testament of their institution's commitment to liberal ideals. Simply having a liberal arts curriculum or distribution requirement is sometimes accepted as proof positive of this commitment. The reality is that liberal education has had a rather fluid definition. According to Shapiro (1997):

This consistent devotion to an educational ideal is all the more remarkable given the enormous and continuing growth in our stock of knowledge, changing notions of what the word "liberal" implies, the ever-shifting nature of society's educational objectives, and the rather more startling fact that rarely has there been much agreement regarding what educational program or programs are included within the coveted label of "liberal education" (p. 85).

This everlasting allegiance, however, has also meant that "the constellation of ideas" in the liberal education universe has continuously expanded. At one time it only included the trivium and quadrivium, but now many other disciplines including sciences (e.g., chemistry and physics) fall under the liberal umbrella; though "the literary and philosophical traditions still seem to hold a special stature" (p. 87). The lack of a precise definition of liberal education can be attributed to the fact that there are many different areas of study within liberal arts (and sciences). Nevertheless, Lipkin (1994) offers an attempt at a definition:

The standard conception of the role of the university and of a liberal education includes a foundationalist conception of human inquiry. According to this conception students should be taught to acquire a value-free method of inquiry that reveals truths about the universe as well as about human existence (p. 56).

These transcendental ideals of a university past are why presidents continue to engage in the rhetoric of liberal education, even though the educational landscape has long since shifted to instrumentalism.

The metamorphosis towards a corporate institutional identity has been facilitated by the transformation in educational identity from liberal arts towards practical arts, the roots of which date back to the mid-nineteenth century Morrill Act. According to Brint (2002), the movement towards market-oriented educational instrumentalism and the emerging dominance of practical arts has been slower and more restrained at the leading research universities, which are slower to adopt new occupational programs, than at other less prestigious institutions. Nevertheless, the rise of practical arts has encouraged the “reinforcement of utilitarianism as the dominant ethos among students; contributions to the acceptability of faculty and university entrepreneurship; and encouragement of collaborative models for the solution of social problems” (p. 254). These developments are certainly reflected and advocated from a presidential perspective, with the endorsement of interdisciplinarity and technology transfer.

The shift towards practical arts has also transformed the pedagogic identities of the disciplines and of knowledge production. Referring to the work of Basil Bernstein, Beck and Young (2005) describe this as an evolution from Bernstein’s singulars to regions to genericism. On the one hand, singulars “generate strong inner commitments centred in the perceived intrinsic value of their specific knowledge domains” and are “most clearly exemplified by the traditional ‘pure’ academic disciplines” (p. 185). On the other hand:

Increasing regionalization of knowledge, especially in its recent strongly market-driven forms...creates identities whose organizing principle is that they “face outward towards fields of practice” with the result that “their contents are likely to be dependent on the requirements of these fields.”...The extrinsic is raised above the intrinsic (Beck, 2002, p. 621).

Because regions (i.e., practical arts) are “increasingly dependent on the requirements of the external fields of practice to which they are linked,” they are more responsive to “commercial considerations” which are “likely to become increasingly dominant not only in shaping the content, but also in determining the pace and directions of change” (Beck & Young, 2005, p. 189). As a result, this “promotes a progressive loss of academic autonomy” and changes the dimensions of singulars in that “the terms on which singulars contribute to regions are increasingly shaped by external forces; singulars themselves are increasingly fragmented” (p. 189). Presidents may persistently and explicitly reiterate the importance of a liberal education (however amorphous the concept), but that rhetoric is consistently weakened by market-driven realities, especially within a context of genericism:

[The emergence of genericism] arises from a view that we are in a world in which “life experiences cannot be based on stable expectations of the future and one’s location in it.” Wider claims for genericism typically also link it to the spectre of globalization depicted as an irreversible reality to which national economies and education systems, including universities, must adapt or perish (p. 190; Bernstein, 2000, p. 59).

At the center of genericism is the concept of trainability, which Bernstein defines as “the ability to profit from continuous pedagogic re-formations and so cope with the new requirements of ‘work’ and ‘life’” (p. 191; Bernstein, 2000, p. 59). Therefore, what presidents imply is to let the past specter of liberal education inform the development of future educational identities. Liberal arts is important, but with practical arts fully integrated into universities, the imperative lesson is for students to learn how to learn so that they can readily adapt to any changing circumstances throughout their lifetime.

Academic Capitalism

The growth and rise of the American university has been more of an evolution rather than a revolution wherein its mission has expanded in response to the changing needs and desires of

society. Two contemporary conceptions that university presidents communicate are the idea of a market university and the idea of a global university.

The Idea of a Market University

The market idea implicitly and explicitly sanctions revenue generating academy-industry relations in the university's core educational, research, and service missions. Rhoades and Slaughter (2004) describe this as the emergence of an academic capitalist regime wherein the revenue seeking activities of the university entails:

A systematic revision and creation of policies to make these activities possible; a fundamental change in the interconnections between states, their higher education institutions and private-sector organizations to support such activities, blurring the boundaries between the for-profit and not-for-profit sectors; and a basic change in academy practices – changes that prioritize potential revenue generation, rather than the unfettered expansion of knowledge, in policy negotiation and in strategic and academic decision making (p. 37).

The push towards this type of market-like behavior can be partly attributed to competitive pressures (e.g., for better students, more research funding, greater prestige) and to the growth and increasing acceptance of for-profit institutions (e.g., University of Phoenix), which has transformed (or perhaps marred) the overall higher education landscape (Newman & Couturier, 2001). The race to establish for-profit, online-learning ventures in the late twentieth/early twenty-first century was perhaps an example of profiteering run amok given their subsequent demise (Carlson & Carnevale, 2001; Carlson, 2003). Whatever lessons learned from those forays into the for-profit game does not seem to have mitigated the drive to incorporate market into mission, particularly in the area of research and knowledge production. Remarks from the presidents do seem to acknowledge the need for a cautious approach, taking care to establish conflicts-of-interest safeguards, but they without question support and advocate technology transfer. The industry logic is prevailing and all signs are pointed towards academic capitalism.

The goal of “knowledge for use” is dominating the aims of “knowledge for its own sake,” particularly with the growing commercialization of research (Delanty, 2001, p. 108).

The idea of a market university and its ethos of academic capitalism can seem a rather nefarious proposition, but the reality is never quite so simplistic. As with most university endeavors, academy-industry relations are multifaceted and subject to misconceptions. Anderson (2001) notes that some of the issues to consider are to what extent is this a “radically new phenomenon” versus “a natural extension of earlier patterns of university research,” what size role does this have in a university (e.g., minor or all-consuming), and how beneficial or harmful is it to universities. She writes that “no one involved in an agreement between a university and a corporation would seriously argue that [academy-industry relations] are wholly good or bad, but the rhetoric of advocates and detractors sometimes expresses such one-sided views” (p. 235). Because there can be both positive and negative aspects to these ventures, the challenge is for universities to ensure an appropriate balance between knowledge for use driven by commercial and competitive forces and knowledge for its own sake driven by original ideals of truth and discovery, without succumbing wholeheartedly to capitalism.

Globalization and the University

While globalization itself is a contested phenomenon, its economic dimensions and ties to information technology, the knowledge economy, and markets indicate it is something that universities cannot ignore (Rhoads & Torres, 2006). Presidents have spoken about the need to internationalize the campus and the need for international collaborations to transform their institutions into global universities. Delanty (2001) writes that “globalization has also opened a window on cosmopolitanism for universities, which have been too imprisoned in their national contexts” (p. 115). However, it is also worth remembering that the American university itself emerged as a blend of international, namely European, influences (e.g., the English colonial

college, the German research university) (Geiger, 1999). As the present calls for globalizing the university grows stronger, what are some of the implications? Altbach (2004) brings up the following issues: global marketplace for students and scholars, internationalization of the curriculum, multinationalization of institutions, and widening inequalities amongst nations. Presidential remarks address the first three issues, but they are remarkably silent on the last.

Enrolling international students is not a new development, but a global economy actively encourages the flow of students and scholars in both directions and ensures that growth continues. Universities recruit students from other countries in order to internationalize their student body and they encourage American students to study abroad at some point during their undergraduate years so that they can develop intercultural competence from a global perspective. An economic incentive also exists for institutions because international students typically pay full-price tuition, sometimes even higher overseas student fees, thereby serving as a good revenue stream for all universities. With the rise of international conferences, scholars are also more apt to travel abroad, thereby forming global research networks and developing broader perspectives even though their research may be highly specialized (Delanty, 2001). The interaction of scholars facilitates the internationalization of curriculum as they return to their home universities with global ideas that they infuse into their courses and pedagogy. While international content and perspectives are built into the curriculum, there is also expansion in the “use of common textbooks, course materials, and syllabi worldwide, stimulated by the expanding influence of multinational publishers, the internet, and databases,” though mostly bearing a distinctly Western imprimatur (Altbach, 2004, p. 12).

Presidents’ calls for their institutions to become global universities can sound like twenty-first century common sense, but as universities develop multinational collaborations and partnerships with universities in other nations, questions regarding true purpose arise. These

multinational initiatives, exemplified by “twinning programs” that involve universities in one country establishing branch campuses in other countries or the linking of institutions or academic programs in one country with corresponding ones in another country, may provide productive cross-national exchanges. However, Altbach (2004) states that “with few exceptions, a central goal for all of the stakeholders...is to earn a profit” (p. 14). Hence, the global university perpetuates academic capitalism with its focus on market-driven values. Altbach also notes that these multinational arrangements are marked by inequality, as they usually represent a “union of unequals” wherein “when institutions or initiatives are exported from one country to another, academic models, curricula, and programs from the more powerful academic system prevail” (pp. 12-13). The concern then is that certain universities may resemble “neocolonists” seeking ideological, political and commercial gain. As presidents have made clear in their remarks, research universities in the twenty-first century will need to incorporate globalization into their institutional mission in order to remain relevant, but this heed should not be blindly followed without more nuanced consideration of what exactly a global university entails.

CONCLUSION

Universities are multifaceted, multipurpose institutions that provide many different services to many different constituents. They have grown so much more complex than when the term “multiversity” was first introduced that one wonders if it might be easier to ask what is *not* a part of university mission. Considering the evolutionary path that universities have taken and given its present state, perhaps a newer, more appropriate term for the university is a “marketversity.” Whether it concerns the research, education, or service functions, the bottom line is that market-ideals have been incorporated into university mission, and the path appears irreversible.

For university presidents, women and men who must remain ardent supporters (at least publicly), the vision is that of a large, heterogeneous institution that remains devoted to the exalted goals of truth, discovery, and public service while necessarily assimilating into the current social and economic environment. They embrace their universities market-missions, but they continue to champion the meaningful, timeless aspects of university mission. Above all, universities are committed to excellence and to them there can be no more cherished pursuit than that.

The reality, of course, is not so lofty and presidents are very aware of that. They may use slogans such as “creative tensions” and “excellence,” but the activities and agendas that university presidents pursue on a daily basis as part of their profession as institutional leaders may more clearly demonstrate their aversion or preference for the current ideals. While it is true that the role of the president today is not as influential as in the past, the office still maintains some institutional power. A deft manager and scholar should be able to navigate the campus terrain to set the appropriate balance of tensions she or he believes to be in the best interests of the university.

APPENDIX

PRESIDENTIAL SPEECHES SELECTED FOR ANALYSIS

| University Tenure from | President Credentials | Speech Date of Speech |
|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Harvard University 01 July 2001 | Lawrence H. Summers PhD, Economics Harvard University | President's installation address 12 October 2001 http://www.president.harvard.edu/news/inauguration/summers.html |
| Princeton University 15 June 2001 | Shirley M. Tilghman PhD, Biochemistry Temple University | “Discovery and discourse, leadership and service: The role of the academy in times of crisis,” Installation address 28 September 2001 http://www.princeton.edu/pr/president/01/10-24-01.html |
| Yale University 1993 | Richard C. Levin PhD, Economics Yale University | “Creating global universities: From student exchanges to collaboration” NAEA international day ¹ 12 November 2003 http://www.yale.edu/opa/president/speeches/20031112.html |
| University of Pennsylvania 01 July 2004 | Amy Gutmann PhD, Political Science Harvard University | Inaugural address 15 October 2004 http://www.upenn.edu/secretary/inauguration/speech.html |

¹ NAEA: National Academy of Education Administration.

| University Tenure from | President Credentials | Speech Date of Speech |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Duke University 01 July 2004 | Richard H. Brodhead PhD, English Yale University | “More day to dawn,” Inaugural address 18 September 2004 http://www.duke.edu/inauguration/inaugural_address.html |
| Massachusetts Institute of Technology 06 December 2004 | Susan Hockfield PhD, Life Science Georgetown University | Inaugural address 06 May 2005 http://web.mit.edu/hockfield/speech-inauguration.html |
| Stanford University 2000 | John L. Hennessy PhD, Computer Science SUNY Stony Brook | “Stanford in the 21 st century,” Inaugural address 20 October 2000 http://news-service.stanford.edu/news/2000/october25/inaug_speech-1025.html |
| Columbia University 01 June 2002 | Lee C. Bollinger JD Columbia University | Inaugural address 03 October 2002 http://www.columbia.edu/cu/president/communications%20files/inaugural.htm |
| Dartmouth College 01 August 1998 | James Wright PhD, History University of Wisconsin | “Dartmouth: Forever new,” Inaugural address ² 23 September 1998 http://www.dartmouth.edu/~presoff/speeches/1998/0923.html |
| Northwestern University 01 January 1995 | Henry S. Bienen PhD, Political Science University of Chicago | “State of the university speech” 17 February 2005 http://www.northwestern.edu/president/addresses/05state.html |

² Though the address was given prior to 2000, the content addresses change for the twenty-first century.

| University Tenure from | President Credentials | Speech Date of Speech |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Brown University 03 July 2001 | Ruth J. Simmons PhD, Romance Languages and Literatures Harvard University | “Reinventing education: From the elite to the unlimited” ³ February 2002 http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3839/is_200204/ai_n9067322 |
| Cornell University 01 July 2003 | Jeffrey S. Lehman ⁴ JD/MPP University of Michigan | Inaugural addresses 12 October 2003 (Doha, Qatar) http://www.cornell.edu/president/speeches_2003_1016.cfm 16 October 2003 (Ithaca, New York) http://www.cornell.edu/president/speeches_2003_1012.cfm |
| Johns Hopkins University 01 September 1996 | William R. Brody MD/PhD, Electrical Engineering Stanford University | “Experts will be winners in the new economy,” Higher education forum: The research university in the 21 st century 23 April 1999 http://www.jhu.edu/~president/speech/umd.html |
| University of Chicago 01 July 2000 | Don Michael Randel PhD, Music Princeton University | Inaugural address 02 November 2000 http://www.uchicago.edu/docs/education/record/pdfs/35-3.pdf |

³ Article adapted from the 2002 Robert H. Atwell distinguished lecture, delivered by President Ruth Simmons

⁴ President Lehman unexpectedly resigned in June 2005 and since 01 July 2005, his predecessor, President Hunter R. Rawlings III has returned and stepped in as the interim president. Despite this unanticipated occurrence, the inaugural addresses of the resigned president have still been used for the analysis, but the online url links for the speeches may no longer be active.

| University Tenure from | President Credentials | Speech Date of Speech |
|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Rice University 2004 | David W. Leebron JD Harvard University | Inauguration address 02 October 2004 http://www.professor.rice.edu/professor/041002.asp?SnID=453811442 |
| Emory University 2003 | James W. Wagner PhD, Materials Science and Engineering Johns Hopkins University | Inaugural address 02 April 2004 http://www.emory.edu/PRESIDENT/speeches/Inaug2004.pdf |
| University of California, Berkeley 22 September 2004 | Robert J. Birgeneau ⁵ PhD, Physics Yale University | “Frontiers of knowledge, frontiers of education,” Inaugural address 15 April 2005 http://cio.chance.berkeley.edu/chancellor/birgeneau/remarks/4-15-05-frontiers.htm |
| University of Michigan, Ann Arbor 01 August 2002 | Mary Sue Coleman PhD, Biochemistry University of North Carolina | “Look to your roots, to discover your future,” Inaugural address 27 March 2003 http://www.umich.edu/pres/inauguration/address.html |
| University of Virginia August 1990 | John T. Casteen III PhD, English University of Virginia | “The new deal: Why the university needs charter status” Winter 2004 http://www.virginia.edu/president/spch/04/newdeal04.html |
| Georgetown University 01 July 2001 | John J. DeGioia PhD, Philosophy Georgetown University | “Engaging the tensions, living the questions,” Inaugural speech 13 October 2001 http://president.georgetown.edu/speeches/jjd10132001.html |

⁵ Chancellor

| University Tenure from | President Credentials | Speech Date of Speech |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| University of California, Los Angeles 01 July 1997 | Albert Carnesale** PhD, Nuclear Engineering | “A strategy for a great university” 09 November 1998 http://www.ucla.edu/chancellor/university/univ_strategy.html |
| Wake Forest University 01 July 2005 | Nathan O. Hatch PhD, History Washington University | “Questions I am asking to learn about Wake Forest,” Remarks to the university senate; 16 March 2005 http://www.wfu.edu/president/2005.03.16.php |
| Tufts University 01 September 2001 | Lawrence S. Bacow JD/PhD Harvard University | Inaugural address 19 April 2002 http://president.tufts.edu/speeches/2001/inauguration.php |
| University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill August 2000 | James Moeser** PhD, Music University of Michigan | Installation remarks 12 October 2000 http://www.unc.edu/chan/speech_archive/speech.2000.html |
| University of Southern California March 1991 | Steven B. Sample PhD, Electrical Engineering University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign | “The research university of the 21st century: What will it look like?” Address to the 23 rd army science conference 02 December 2002 http://www.usc.edu/president/speeches/2002/research_university_21c.html |

** Chancellor

REFERENCES

- Altbach, P. G. (2003). Globalisation and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 10(1), 3-25.
- Anderson, M. S. (2001). The complex relations between the academy and industry: Views from the literature. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 72(2), 226-246.
- Beck, J. (2002). The sacred and the profane in recent struggles to promote official pedagogic identities. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23(4), 617-626.
- Beck, J., & Young, M. F. D. (2005). The assault on the professions and the restructuring of academic and professional identities: A Bersteinian analysis. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 26(2), 183-197.
- Bogue, E. G., & Aper, J. (2000). *Exploring the heritage of American higher education: The evolution of philosophy and policy*. Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.
- Brint, S. (2002). The rise of the “practical arts.” In S. Brint (Ed.), *The future of the city of intellect: The changing American university* (pp. 231-259). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Carlson, S. (2003, January 17). After losing millions, Columbia U. will close online-learning venture. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A30.
- Carlson, S. and Carnevale, D. (2001, December 14) Debating the demise of NYUonline: Did the venture go under because of the changing economy or bad decisions? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A31.
- Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. (1974). *Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Delanty, G. (2001). *Challenging knowledge: The university in the knowledge society*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Ehrenberg, R. G. (2002). Reaching for the brass ring: The U.S. news & world report rankings and competition. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(2), 145-162.
- Geiger, R. (1999). The ten generations of American higher education. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp. 38-69). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gumport, P. J. (2002). Universities and knowledge: Restructuring the city of intellect. In S. Brint (Ed.), *The future of the city of intellect: The changing American university* (pp. 47-81). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Jennings, M. V. (2004). A thin line between love and hate: Institution rankings are here to stay. *Currents*, 30(9), 22-25.
- Kerr, C. (1995). *The uses of the university* (4th ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lipkin, R. (1994). Pragmatism, cultural criticism and the idea of the postmodern university, in M. N. S. Sellers (Ed.) *An ethical education: Community and morality in the multicultural university* (pp. 49-88). Oxford, UK: Berg Publishers.
- McLaughlin, J. B. (1996). The perilous presidency, *Educational Record*, 77(2/3), 12-17.
- McLaughlin, J. B., & Riesman, D. (1990). *Choosing a college president: Opportunities and constraints*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Newman, F., & Couturier, L. (2001, June). *The new competitive arena: Market forces invade the academy*. Providence, RI: The Futures Project: Policy for Higher Education in a Changing World.
- Newman, J. H. (1912). *The idea of a university: Defined and illustrated*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.
- Readings, B. (1996). *The university in ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rhoads, R. A., & Torres, C. A. (Eds.). (2006). *The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Rhoades, G., & Slaughter, S. (2004). Academic capitalism in the new economy: Challenges and choices. *American Academic*, 1(1), 37-59.
- Shapiro, H. T. (1997). Cognition, character, and culture in undergraduate education: rhetoric and reality. In R. G. Ehrenberg (Ed.), *The American university: National treasure or endangered species?* (pp. 58-99). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Shapiro, H. T. (1998). University presidents – then and now. In W. G. Bowen & H. T. Shapiro (Eds.), *Universities and their leadership* (pp. 65-100). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sullivan, W. M. (2000). Institutional identity and social responsibility in higher education. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education* (pp. 19-36). Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.
- (2001). *The Carnegie classification of institutions of higher education: 2000 edition*. Menlo Park, CA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.