| **Overview** | *Robert L. Caret and John D. McMahon* |

As we started our planning for this issue of *Metropolitan Universities* (MU), soon after the Fourth Annual AAHE Conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards in January 1995, the overriding theme of the issue soon crystallized. We wanted to concentrate on the theme of "effecting change." We felt that much had been accomplished over the last several years, particularly from the time of the publication of *Scholarship Reconsidered,* by Boyer in 1990. That seminal work, coupled with the momentum that the four AAHE Conferences had fostered, provided the philosophical base for such a focus. We have been talking about the need for and the barriers to change. We have also been debating the potential paths that might make change possible. In the course of this dialogue, many good ideas had percolated to the surface, and many had been affected. It was time to look at concrete examples of initiatives that had worked—initiatives that were beginning to shift the existing paradigm.

We all recognize that higher education is going through one of the most dramatic upheavals it has ever experienced. This challenge, sparked by the increase in the cost of higher education to the student, shifting budget priorities at the state level, and a loss of credibility from a societal perspective, have placed us in a posture of reexamination—a reexamination of our mission and what we are involved with in achieving that mission. We are reexamining our own goals and our way of doing business. We are reexamining our own beliefs. And, where we find change appropriate, we are changing. This issue of *Metropolitan Universities* focuses on initiatives that have worked and have led to change. For each institution, an overview of the institutional context is provided, as is the process that was used. The articles describe the multi-year efforts that led to change at Towson State University (McMahon/Caret), Syracuse University (Shaw and Lee), University of Wisconsin-Whitewater (Shallenkamp), Portland State University (Johnson and Wamser), and Georgia State University (Abdelal, Blumenfeld, and Dressel). The reader

will find that, in each case, there were many false starts and many dead ends. Similarities in the approaches and outcomes are also evident. Perhaps most important to the success of all of the efforts was the need for "champions" who continually moved the agenda forward as a variety of institutional-specific barriers were encountered. Institutional tenacity is an important component to a successful effort.

The need for an increase in institutional productivity is a widely accepted component in the change we are undertaking. Many are suggesting that there will be a need for us to improve productivity by as much as 25 percent over the next 5-10 years. What is unclear is how that goal can be achieved. Again, a concensus appears to be building that focuses on learning productivity as the appropriate measure to track. The article by Giles-Gee and Miyares provides the process used for many years by one state (Maryland) to measure faculty work and productivity. The Maryland approach still relies on traditional productivity measures (e.g., credit hour production/faculty member), but also begins to move us toward the more important measure of learning productivity.

Articles published in the subsequent issue of *Metropolitan Universities* will move into a dialogue on the broadening definition of scholarship, with particular emphasis on professional service and its importance as a change variable. Several contributions will provide the contextual overview of the need and issues related to this broadened definition and understanding of this form of scholarship. As our institutions reinforce the need to be partners with their respective communities, these dimensions of faculty work take on greater import. And, the complexities associated with the evaluation of such work and approaches are legion. Among the items in store for the next issue is a contribution by Cohen that describes the approach being used at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay. Another, by Driscoll and Lynton, includes a number of preliminary insights derived from a national project to develop adequate documentation. One by Checkoway discusses the role of service in a research university.

If any shift in roles and rewards processes on our campuses are to be successful, we will need to find ways to maneuver through these complexities and find acceptable paths to successful change. And we must broaden

our perspective beyond the work of an individual. An article by Hiley approaches the issues surrounding the collective responsibilities of departments and similar units.

The next issue will also contain a provocative forum piece by Greenberg which asks whether tenure is any longer needed or desirable. He places the difficult questions before us. As we know, the issue is also being placed before us by society. It is necessary for us to address the question and to change as warranted: we owe it to ourselves and to the society we serve. And, in a related contribution, Jensen calls on the academic community to abandon its claims of difference when engaged in a dialogue about tenure and other matters with external constituencies.

Our goal with the current and the subsequent journal issues on the theme of Faculty Roles and Rewards, as outlined earlier, was to provide the readers with the resources and help to effect change. We hope we have been successful. Please share your thoughts with us.

Declaration of Metropolitan Universities

We, the leaders of metropolitan universities and colleges...

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

Our teaching must:

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

Our research must:

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

Our professional service must:

• develop creative partnerships with public and private enterprises that ensure the intellectual resources of our institutions are fully engaged in mutually beneficial ways;
• include close working relationships with elementary and secondary schools aimed at maximizing the effectiveness of the entire metropolitan education system;
• make the fullest possible contribution to the cultural life and general quality of life of our metropolitan regions.