

Part Two:
**The Charge to the
Provost's Committee
on University Out-
reach at Michigan
State University**

INTRODUCTION²

America has the greatest university system in the world. I say "system" because...not all universities are alike. Some are outstanding in pursuing the most fundamental and esoteric problems in science and arts. Some also contain great professional schools of law, medicine, and business that are enriched by being in a community of scholars. Many follow the tradition of the land-grant colleges: the university should serve the community not only by training its citizens but even by providing them information and services that help them in their occupations.

—Noel Annan, quoted in the *New York Times*

Our "great system" is in the throes of significant change. Budget trauma is widespread, and public scrutiny of universities has led to increasing calls for higher education "to deliver." Fueled by books, essays, and media reports on faculty productivity, undergraduate teaching loads, the use of overhead funds, and the capacity of universities to help solve society's problems, today's universities are under pressure to justify their existence and to prove their merit. A Sunday feature published in the *Washington Post* (Anderson 1992), entitled "The Galls of Ivy," represents a case in point.

Some would argue that higher education is simply being asked to be more accountable. As Masey and Zemsky (1992:4B) write:

...colleges and universities have moved...into an era of resource constraints and nettlesome public scrutiny.... Both friends and critics of American higher education are asking increasingly tough questions about the enterprise. How do colleges and universities spend their money? How are priorities determined? Are new revenues the

²Introduction written by Frank A. Fear.

only way to fund new programs? What explains the dramatic increase in administrative costs?

The pressures besetting the modern university, although different in type, are no different or more severe in nature from the challenges facing all contemporary institutions—public, private, and nonprofit. Virtually all institutions are being asked (if not forced) to make hard choices. These choices, the "new realities" of the late 20th century, are propelling institutions to rethink, if not reformulate, their core business and how they seek to operate in turbulent, unpredictable environments. This process is leading to institutional reinvention, refocus, and reform (see, for example, Osborne and Gaebler 1992).

Large, public universities—such as Michigan State University—have historically responded to a variety of different audiences. These audiences include, but are certainly not limited to, undergraduate and graduate students, as well as many groups and organizations that seek the University's knowledge resources, including professionals working in the fields of health, business, agriculture, education, business, and human services. The need to respond to multiple audiences translates into pressures at all levels of the University: at the central level, college level, unit level, and faculty and staff level. No institution can afford to be "all things to all people," and every institution must make choices: What to be (and not to be)? What to do? How to do it?

Is it getting more difficult for universities to answer these questions? Some would contend that it is certainly more challenging today than at any time in memory. In addition to the calls for change coming from outside the Academy and the pressure to deliver for multiple audiences, fundamental questions are being raised about the essential character of scholarship, what a university should expect of itself, its faculty, and its students, and how it should conduct its business. For example:

- ▶ Ernest Boyer's (1990) widely read book on scholarship poses the question: Should not we do a better job in academe of aligning our conception of scholarship with the roles that scholars actually play? Boyer believes that we should, and argues that in addition to valuing the scholarship associated with generating knowledge, we should also value transmitting, integrating, and applying knowledge as scholarship.
- ▶ Walter Massey (1992), Director of the National Science Foundation (NSF)—a prestigious and significant funding source for universities—calls for an expansion of NSF's traditional mission of funding basic scholarship. The "new" NSF, he suggests, should promote interdisciplinary collaboration, view as more permeable the boundaries between basic and applied science, promote university-government-industry partnerships, and measure its success in terms of the benefits to society. (See, also, "Science's Big Shift," *Time*, November 23, 1992: 34-35.)
- ▶ The recently published report of the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) "...tossed a hand grenade into the simmering debate about the future of the research universities," according to Christopher Anderson in a recently published article in *Science* (Anderson 1993). Among the recommendations included in the report: faculty should reemphasize teaching even if it means curtailing research activities; the faculty evaluation and reward system should be based on a balance of teaching and research; efforts should be intensified for universities to collaborate with other universities, industry, and government; and government-conducted research should be shifted to universities where research and education operate in tandem.

- ▶ Nicholas Maxwell (1992), a noted British philosopher, asks: What changes can be made in academe to more effectively harness knowledge resources as a means to address the world's problems? George Brown, member of the U.S. House of Representatives (D-CA), offers a practical response to Maxwell's question in an article published in *Science*: "If scientists are not willing to rigorously and fearlessly confront this question, then they cannot claim, and surely will not achieve, a stronger grip on federal purse strings..." (Brown 1992:201).
- ▶ The national media seem to be intensifying efforts to spotlight the undergraduate function at major universities. According to John Lombardi, president of the University of Florida, a "cottage industry of academic exposes has sprung up" with the "flight from teaching" at centerstage (Lombardi 1993:A40). These activities are probably related to concerns associated with the rising cost of undergraduate tuition which, as reported by Atwell (1992), rose at twice the rate of inflation in the 1980s, and the findings of the Schroeder Commission in its report, "College Education: Paying More and Getting Less" (House Select Committee 1992). For example, the National Broadcasting Corporation, as part of its *Dateline, NBC* program (March 1993), presented the case of the University of California at Berkeley. The profile: very large classes for undergraduate students, heavy reliance on the use of teaching assistants, and limited access to professorial advising. One of the underlying questions posed by the reporter was: Do universities and the faculty really care about undergraduates and their education?
- ▶ An increasing number of academic and government leaders are calling for integrating undergraduate education with service to society. L. Jay Oliva (1993:A24), president of New York University, calls it one of the most important components of a student's education: "We work to help students shape their minds, and to shape a professional career. But this is a third leg: How do you live in a community?" Frank Newman (1985:57), former president of the University of Rhode Island, describes it as part of the process of helping students to develop their personal ethos as they "...move from self-interest to larger-than-self-interest."

And U.S. President William Clinton announced his intention to fund a multimillion dollar national service program for students. In exchange for performing community service, students will earn credits to pay for college or job training. The program may be seen as an example of a "new covenant" movement, called "communitarianism"... that seeks to balance rights and responsibilities and to nourish the moral ties of family, neighborhood, workplace, and citizenship" (Galston 1992a:A52). In this paradigm, which emphasizes more participatory, "for the common good" policies and governance, important concepts are opportunity, responsibility, community, and reciprocal obligation (Galston 1992b). The national service program is especially relevant for higher education, according to Rutgers political scientist Benjamin Barber (quoted in Zook 1993:A29), because he believes that "...American educational institutions suffer from a corporal weakness of community that permeates campus life." Integrating the classroom with service, according to Barber, transforms "teaching liberty from a metaphor into a practical pedagogy."

- ▶ More and more concerns are expressed about the administration of higher education, especially about the number of persons who play nonacademic roles in universities. The U.S. Equal Opportunity Commission recently released the results of their study of full-time employment in 3,300 U.S. colleges and universities during the period 1989-90 through 1991-92. The data, reported in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* by Nicklin and Blumenstyk (1993:A43), show that the number of faculty increased by about 1 percent, the number of top-level administrators (e.g., vice presidents, deans, unit administrators) was virtually unchanged, and the number of clerical, skilled crafts, and service workers declined in the 2 percent range. During

the same period, however, the number of nonacademic, professional staff increased by nearly 5 percent despite "...the recession and concerns over 'administrative bloat'."

These are challenging times, to be sure! But, the landscape of the late 20th century offers tremendous promise and opportunities for institutions like Michigan State University. Greatness comes from confronting and mastering challenges, not from avoiding them or waiting for others to show the way. This greatness comes from exercising leadership—not only by positional leaders, but by the faculty. Otherwise, excellence will be an impossible dream rather than an achievable reality.

Recognizing this, the Office of the Provost at Michigan State University commissioned a variety of campuswide committees and task forces from the mid-1980s through early 1990s as part of its efforts to move the institution in desired directions. The purpose of this report is to communicate the results of one of these task forces, the Provost's Committee on University Outreach. How and in what ways can Michigan State make its knowledge resources more available and accessible to external audiences? Certainly this is one of the important questions to be answered by universities—especially publicly assisted institutions—in their quest for accountability.

On January 18, 1992, then-Provost David K. Scott gathered committee members, presented the committee charge, and discussed the charge with committee members. The committee charge is reprinted in Chapter 2. Observations and comments made to the committee by Dr. Scott and Dr. James C. Votruba, Vice Provost for University Outreach, are presented in Chapters 3 and 4, respectively.

Chapter 2

THE COMMITTEE CHARGE³

Our University's Covenant with Society

From its earliest beginnings, Michigan State University has maintained a special covenant with the larger society that created and sustains it. Flowing from this covenant has come the responsibility to ensure that the University's vast knowledge resources are put to optimum use in service to society. To fulfill this responsibility through the remainder of this century and well into the next, Michigan State has, in recent years, begun the process of forging a new university model for outreach, one that is fully integrated into the fabric of the institution at every level and that is flexible in its capacity to adapt to the knowledge needs of society as they emerge.

A vital and energetic university outreach mission is dependent upon the institution's capacity to adapt continually to the changing knowledge needs of society. This adaptation is particularly challenging today because society is undergoing rapid and fundamental transformation. Nearly 20 years ago, Michigan State's Lifelong Education Task Force described the dawning of a new era in which knowledge would grow exponentially and learning across the lifespan would become a necessity for nearly all as they pursue careers, raise families, and exercise their civic responsibilities. Today, that era is upon us and higher education is struggling with its implications.

In addition, society confronts a host of major challenges that require higher education's active and creative involvement. We are struggling with the advent of a global economy in which all economic sectors must be prepared to compete. We are experiencing the growth of an underclass characterized by high unemployment, crime, and a breakdown of the social fabric. We confront a crisis among our youth who struggle with substance abuse, teen pregnancy, academic failure, crime and delinquency, and the search for meaning in their lives. Environmental challenges threaten our capacity to pass on to future generations enough fresh air to breathe, clean water to drink, and safe food to eat. We live with a health care system that grows increasingly costly and inaccessible for large numbers of our population. As a nation, we are undergoing a fundamental cultural transformation as thousands of non-European immigrants bring a new vitality, diversity, and pluralism to our communities and forever change the nature of our educational, religious, governmental and business institutions.

The Outreach Tradition at Michigan State University

Michigan State University has a well-established history of extending knowledge in service to society. For over 75 years, the Cooperative Extension Service has drawn upon the University's

³ This charge was created by the Office of the Provost, Michigan State University, under the leadership of James C. Votruba, Vice Provost for University Outreach.

knowledge resources to support the educational needs of Michigan's 83 counties. The Continuing Education Service, later renamed Lifelong Education Programs, provided credit and noncredit instructional outreach across the state. International Studies and Programs has given university outreach an international dimension by providing applied research, technical assistance, and instructional programs to nations around the globe. Urban Affairs Programs has joined research and outreach in addressing the problems of our cities. The Institute for Public Policy and Social Research offers programs specially designed to support public policy makers at the state and local levels. The newly reformulated Institute for Children, Youth, and Families is bringing together scholars from across the campus to engage in research and outreach related to the challenges confronting our young people. In summary, outreach activities involving hundreds of faculty and staff are occurring throughout the University's 14 major academic units and its various centers and institutes.

Recent Outreach Planning at Michigan State University

Michigan State University has, in recent years, taken a variety of initiatives to strengthen its outreach mission by making it a more central and integrated dimension of the institution's overall academic mission. In the mid-1980s, the position of Assistant Provost for Lifelong Education was created and the University began the process of phasing out Lifelong Education Programs (LEP) as a separate administrative unit and integrating responsibility for addressing society's lifelong learning needs into each of the campus major academic and administrative units parallel with graduate and undergraduate education.

At the same time, lifelong education became one of five major university planning platforms (along with CRUE, CORRAGE, MSU IDEA, and AMPS⁴). Known as PLUS (Planning the Lifelong University System), this platform was intended to strengthen adult access to MSU's instructional programs, increase the University's capacity to respond to lifelong learning needs as they emerge, and build a statewide network of regional exchanges that would engage in both needs assessment and program delivery. In 1988, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation awarded MSU \$10.2 million to support this lifelong education agenda.

In 1989, a committee chaired by Dr. John Cantlon, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, completed a comprehensive study of the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service. Recommendations included broadening the MCES mission in order to better serve clientele needs, integrating the MCES more fully with the rest of the campus, and strengthening links between the MCES and the University's faculty. The Cantlon committee further underscored the need for MSU to strengthen its overall outreach mission.

Soon after the Cantlon committee issued its findings, the Council on the Review of Research and Graduate Education (CORRAGE) began its deliberations. While the primary focus of CORRAGE was on strengthening the research and graduate education mission of the campus, the council also reaffirmed the importance of the knowledge extension process:

⁴ CRUE—Council on the Review of Undergraduate Education; CORRAGE—Council on the Review of Research and Graduate Education; MSU IDEA—Michigan State University—Institutional Diversity, Excellence in Action; and AMPS—Administrative Management Program Support.

Michigan State University must ensure that knowledge, once discovered through research, is transmitted in a variety of ways to a variety of audiences. In short, MSU has the responsibility to combine the highest quality research with the highest quality teaching and application of knowledge for the purpose of human enlightenment and enablement.... MSU's distinctiveness among other public institutions in Michigan lies in its combination of basic and applied research and outreach programs functioning as a dynamic and interactive system.

In January 1991, when it created the position of Vice Provost for University Outreach to replace that of Assistant Provost for Lifelong Education, MSU indicated that it was taking a broadened conceptual approach to the University's knowledge extension activities. From lifelong education, with its emphasis on making campus instructional programs available at times and in locations convenient to adults, MSU moved to defining university outreach as the process of extending the research, teaching, and professional expertise of the university and its faculty in order to respond to the problems faced by individuals, groups, and the larger society.

Given this definition, university outreach may take a variety of forms. It sometimes involves applied research and technical assistance designed to help clients, individually and collectively, to better understand the nature of a problem that they confront. It often involves demonstration projects designed to introduce clients to new techniques and practices. Frequently it involves the extension of the campus instructional capacity through credit and noncredit courses to meet the needs of adult students. University outreach also includes policy analysis designed to help shape and inform the public policy process.

Committee Objectives

What began in the mid-1980s as a focus on lifelong education (PLUS) has evolved into a far broader and more complex outreach agenda. While much has been done in recent years to advance this agenda, it is clear that much more needs to be accomplished. Accordingly, it is now time to assess our progress thus far and to chart a strategic course for the future, one that results in the further strengthening and integration of MSU's outreach mission.

The Committee on University Outreach is convened to accomplish two primary objectives:

1. Review the university's progress to date in strengthening and expanding its outreach efforts
2. Recommend strategies for further consolidating, strengthening, and integrating the extension of knowledge in service to society as a fundamental element in the university's academic mission

To accomplish this charge, it will be important to address the following strategic questions in addition to others that may be identified. The committee should also ensure that its work is placed within the context of the other university planning platforms (CRUE, CORRAGE, MSU IDEA).

Strategic Questions Posed to the Committee

The committee's work will focus on 10 strategic areas of attention:

Institutional mission

Like most universities, MSU describes its mission as involving research, teaching, and service. Often, each element of this triad is treated as a conceptually distinct form of professional activity that takes place apart from the others.

How might our mission be reformulated to more accurately reflect the interaction and interdependence of its various dimensions?

How should university outreach be defined with reference to our academic responsibility to discover, transmit, preserve, and apply knowledge?

How well understood is MSU's outreach mission across the campus?

What steps can be taken to increase outreach visibility and understanding both internally and externally?

Institutional access

Throughout its history, Michigan State University has been committed to providing expanded access to postsecondary education for Michigan residents. Indeed, we often refer to ourselves as the "people's university." This commitment to access has generally been expressed through the enrollment of large numbers of undergraduate students on the East Lansing campus.

What does this concept of access mean in a society that requires people to continue learning throughout their lives?

To whom should MSU be accessible? What form should access take?

If access is viewed as both an individual and a societal benefit, how should the costs associated with access be apportioned?

Outreach planning

Michigan State University's outreach strategy must be built on the assumption that we cannot be all things to all people. The University and its various academic units should define outreach initiatives according to the needs of society, the capacity of the university, and the unique role that MSU can play with reference to other postsecondary institutions.

How is this planning best achieved?

Who should be involved?

Cross-disciplinary strategies

In order to adequately address many of the complex issues confronting society, Michigan State University must strengthen its capacity to organize knowledge around problems as well as around subject matters and disciplines. MSU has a long tradition of cross-disciplinary faculty activity.

What steps should be taken to enhance and facilitate cross-disciplinary outreach efforts that address societal problems from a more comprehensive perspective?

What organizational forms (e.g., centers, departments, programs, etc.) are most effective in encouraging cross-disciplinary approaches?

Faculty incentives and rewards

A strong and highly integrated university outreach mission requires a faculty incentive and reward system that encourages outreach participation and acknowledges excellence. Currently, Michigan State does not have such a system.

What steps can and should be taken to integrate university outreach into the faculty reward system at the departmental, college, and campus level with particular reference to salary, promotion, and tenure decisions?

What should be the criteria used to evaluate faculty outreach activities?

How should paid consulting and other forms of compensated outreach activity be treated in the faculty reward system?

If the goal is a strong and fully integrated outreach mission, what are the implications for graduate student preparation, as well as for faculty recruitment, orientation, socialization, and development across a professional lifespan?

Unit incentives and accountability

A strong and energetic university outreach mission requires not only a system of incentives that encourages faculty participation but also a parallel set of incentives for departments and colleges.

What steps should be taken to enhance unit commitment to outreach involvement?

How should unit performance in outreach be evaluated? By whom? With what consequences?

How do the various "economies" within the university (e.g. SCH, faculty time/workload, research release time, etc.) work to support or hinder unit involvement in outreach?

Outreach evaluation

Michigan State should strive to achieve excellence in every dimension of its academic mission. Since the extension of knowledge in service to society is an important element of our mission, a process must be established for assessing both the quantity and quality of our outreach efforts.

What type of management information system should be developed to measure the quantity of our various outreach activities?

What steps should the university take to ensure that outreach efforts meet appropriate quality standards?

Financial support

If Michigan State University's outreach efforts are to address the most important issues confronting society, it will require greater financial support than is currently available.

From where should these resources come?

From what constituencies will advocates for use of scarce resources to support MSU's outreach efforts come?

What strategies should be employed to secure them?

How are nonrecurring funds best used to stimulate an ongoing institutional commitment to outreach?

Statewide networks

MSU currently has a variety of off-campus networks designed to support the university outreach process. Cooperative Extension has offices in 82 of Michigan's 83 counties. The Agricultural Experiment Station has 13 statewide locations. Six MSU Regional Exchanges cover the state and engage in needs assessment, program development, and administrative support related to university outreach activities. In addition, Urban Affairs Programs, College of Business, College of Education, and Human Health Programs have community-based sites that conduct outreach efforts.

Could university outreach achieve greater efficiency or effectiveness through enhanced collaboration among these networks?

How can these networks be strengthened through the use of telecommunications and information technology?

Should MSU build new partnerships with other postsecondary institutions, or other agencies and organizations in order to build a more collaborative and systemic approach to addressing societal needs?

University governance, policies, procedures, and administrative support systems

A strong and fully integrated outreach mission must be supported by the university governance system and by the policies and procedures that influence the knowledge extension process.

How should university outreach be integrated into the campus governance system?

At the operational level, what institutional policies and procedures enhance/inhibit university outreach?

How effectively have the university's administrative and student support systems taken responsibility for providing support services for university outreach?

The Committee Challenge

Michigan State University is committed to extending its research, teaching, and professional expertise for the benefit of individuals, groups, and the larger society. The task of the Committee on University Outreach is to assess our progress and give shape to this commitment through broad consultation and bold assessments and recommendations. Creative and challenging strategies will be necessary if the university is to pursue an ambitious outreach vision. However, recommendations must also be framed in the full knowledge of the institutional realities and constraints within which we must work. Therein lies the challenge.

University Outreach at Michigan State University

Chapter 3

OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE CHARGE FROM THE PROVOST

David K. Scott, (former) Provost
Michigan State University⁵

Learning to Dance Better

I often say that the best way to plan was well described by Prince George, the Duke of Cambridge. He said something along the lines that there will be great changes in his time, great changes indeed. But he believed that every change took place at the right time, and the right time is when you cannot help it. Prince George, as you know, came from a line of British conservatives whose plan and practice was to pause, postpone, procrastinate, and usually end by leaving things alone.

I do not think that this committee is going to leave things alone, or that our University is going to leave things alone when it comes to looking at how we approach outreach in the future. But, in a sense, it is almost at a point where we cannot help but do it.

I like one of the headings of the agenda materials for today's meeting which refers to the committee's work needing to be vision-driven. I think that is a good phrase for all of us to keep thinking about—vision-driven as opposed to issue-driven as opposed to constituent-driven. Those are important dimensions, too, but increasingly one needs to think about being vision-driven. So that is what I hope that we will do. The work of this committee is going to be a key part of synthesizing the vision form that all of our planning for the direction the university takes in the future.

There is a somewhat more enlightened description of change than Prince George's in a book by Rosabeth Kanter, *When Giants Learn to Dance*. Maybe that is what MSU is, a dancing giant. But we have to learn to dance better. We probably have to learn new steps and we have to choose new partners.

Transformations in American Higher Education

My own feeling is that great changes are due and are taking place in the world, in society, and in universities at this time. A very common word that is around these days to describe what is happening in the world and in organizations is "transformation." The whole world is undergoing transformation and universities are undergoing or probably are about to undergo a major transformation.

⁵ This text was transcribed from a taped version of remarks made to the Provost's Committee on University Outreach, Michigan State University, by Dr. Scott on January 18, 1992. Dr. Scott currently serves as Chancellor, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

There have been several transformations in the past. When one hears people saying that we should return to some kind of golden age or golden era of universities, I always think to myself, which one are they talking about? Because if you look from the founding of Harvard in 1636 up to today, there have different periods and eras describing universities in this country, so there is no single age to which we could return. In fact, one could probably identify three or four major transformations that have taken place.

The first one would be identified with the period from 1650 to 1850, with the foundation of universities like Harvard that had a kind of liberal arts focus and a very small, elite population. At that time, knowledge was pretty much viewed as teaching, so to serve was to take teaching out into a much broader spectrum of society than before.

About 1850, a major transformation took place in education, and Michigan State was very much part of that transformation with the creation of the land-grant universities (1862) and a new concept in education of using knowledge in service of society. In those years, there was not really great understanding of how research could be used in service to society.

By about 1880, another transformation was taking place in universities in this country, with the introduction of the research model borrowed from Germany and other places. It is kind of paradoxical that today we often speak about the tension or battle between the land-grant mission of the university and the research mission of the university. The fact is, at least in my view, it was very fortunate that a research model was introduced shortly after the creation of the land-grant universities. It was the research dimension that really allowed land-grant universities to develop into something that is very valuable in terms of taking knowledge to people in a much broader way than was conceptualized in 1862.

Other transformations have taken place in this century, notably during the period from 1945 until 1990, which one could identify as a period when the major research dimensions of our university were built. I am not sure that, prior to 1940, there was actually a great deal of research at MSU, except in some areas connected with science and agriculture. The period from 1945 until the 1980s was also a period when, across this university and others, a transformation took place among the student body. MSU expanded in an explosive way after 1945, leading to a new type of dissonance; at the same time that the university was trying to develop and build up a scholarly research faculty, it was also recruiting a student body that needed much greater attention, nurturing, and support than earlier student bodies. The aftermath of that difficulty is still with us today, and certainly prepares us well for the future when our student body will also be changing and probably will also be needing great support and nurturing. At the same time, society is once again putting lots of other demands on the university. So transformations are always going to be associated with a great deal of stress.

From University to Multiversity to Transversity

One can talk about these transformations and changes in another way. The first great period of American universities was one in which the emphasis was on the unique, the unified, and the uniform. I think there was a uniformity in universities by the very concept of the universities bringing all knowledge together and making knowledge all one. One could also say that the universities were also generally uniform in terms of the people that they had. Neither of these ideas seems to be all that practical at the moment.

By the middle of this century, Clark Kerr used the word "multiversity," as opposed to university, to describe what we had by the 1950s and the 1960s. The multiversity was multidimensional rather than unidimensional. It was multidimensional in terms of how it was organizing knowledge and in terms of its people. As Clark Kerr described it, the universities were out of sync with the issues, with problems, and with the needs of society. Therefore, a whole transformation took place and units were developed around the basic structures of the university and the departments, which had become very strong as the result of the implications of the German model, but were out of step with what was needed.

So, we created new structures around the departments. We saw a proliferation of centers, institutes, and bureaus. Today, at Michigan State University, we have the same number of centers, institutes, and bureaus as we have departments. We have about 100 of each (i.e., departments/schools and centers/institutes/bureaus). We still have departments of zoology, botany and plant pathology, and entomology, and so on, and one could really ask: Should knowledge be organized that way today? It is very hard to change it, and yet clearly the structure did not lend itself to dealing with what it was doing, so we created 100 new types of units.

One could describe Kerr's multiversity not as a city of intellect on a hill but as urban sprawl. As I think about what the future of the university has to be, I have tried to come up with a single word that conveys a concept that takes us logically from universities through multiversities. I believe that in the next transformation, there is a "transversity." Transversity may not be a word, (but neither is multiversity) but it is a good description.

Actually, Clark Kerr did not invent the term multiversity. The concept came from James, who introduced the word "multiverse" as opposed to universe. In fact, I think that if I were writing a paper on this subject, I would title it, *Of Universities, Diversities, Multiversities, and Transversities*. The transversity would be the university that goes beyond where we are. A transversity would have to begin to connect things that are currently proliferated and disconnected. We have to begin to reconnect around some kind of design as to what kind of issues the university has to address. This will not be easy, but it is going to be one of the tasks that confronts this committee.

The Challenge of Transforming the Academy

Transformation and change at universities have never been easy. Each transformation has been fought tooth and nail by the universities. When land-grant universities were introduced, the universities and the academics of the day resisted the idea fiercely. It was absurd to think that one was really going to try and take knowledge out to society! This was a silly concept, many thought, and it was so silly that the federal government had to create a new university around the rigid structures that could not deal with what was needed.

It is not at all impossible that society may do that again, if we are not able to transform and deal with what has to be done. If universities are going to continue to live their old ways and have to spend in their old ways, we will find another way of addressing the issue and will do it around the current structures. And, no doubt, in 50 or 70 years, we will have academies that are quite comfortable with whatever that new concept is, and they will be taking credit for it! They will do it much in the same way that many others took credit for the land-grant movement and said what a wonderful thing it was.

I am pretty sure that the GI Bill was viewed by most academics as a very bad thing. Why? It made it possible for universities to be opened up to hordes of people who did not have the proper mindset or values. Perhaps many of us in the 1950s and 1960s saw the growth in the community college movement as a bad idea, too. But now many of us are likely to view it as a good thing and, in fact, we'll probably lean on community colleges even more in the future.

So you need unidimensional, multidimensional, and transformational. And what we say about the organization of knowledge is really true about any dimension of the university. The same thing happened with people. The early universities were uniform in terms of their populations of students and faculty. The multiversity began to draw on a much less uniform population of students with the GI Bill. But opening up of the universities was really done in the same kind of disconnected way. It is fragmented to this day, and some days I think it is beginning to fragment even more. But there will be a transformation that will begin to reconnect the disconnectedness among different groups of people.

Transformation and the University Outreach Committee

All that has happened was not good, but it was probably all necessary in order for us to get where we have to go in terms of the transversity. We do not start from zero. We have a history at MSU, and you will be reading about it. But we also have a more recent history. As you know, we have gone through lots of planning platforms at MSU in the last few years and many of these, while they do not deal directly with university outreach, do talk about outreach.

So the kind of transformation and synthesis that I have been talking about involve some very well-discussed MSU ideas. But it is important for you to know that this committee is neither just another committee nor something totally new. As a matter of fact, I really see the work of this committee as a gateway toward bringing everything together and going into the future with what we design as the new university. It is a kind of capstone in a way, but it is also a gateway to synthesize everything and to create the design for a university.

Throughout the university as a whole, we can see a great misunderstanding of outreach and how it fits into the scholarly activities of the university. A very important aspect of this committee's work is determining the agenda of what the future of the university should be.

Many analyses as to what is wrong with the university claim that universities are not responsive to undergraduate education or outreach and take the view that somehow we are exclusively latched on to research and are ignoring these other dimensions. These are foolish discussions because such analyses are generally written by people who are not in academe at all. They are often written by journalists. Even the book by Ernest Boyer, which has many good things in it, does not necessarily reflect a good understanding of the kind of stresses and strains that are on faculty and staff in a university today. Alan Bloom, although he is actually in a university, has a concept of transformation back to the golden age of the university that will not work at all. It is not a very useful concept and, in general, will not work for the future.

Even though many of these writings are not useful, they do have some elements of truth in them and I think that we in academe are kind of bewildered, in disarray, and we allow these things to go forward and gather momentum in legislatures and with boards of trustees. But such analyses of a complex problem are simplistic and if we do not manage to get hold of the agenda and begin

to redesign the university in different ways, it will be done for us and it will be done in incredibly simplistic ways.

Among the most important redesign issues involves how to make the university more responsive to society. Outreach is a very important dimension of that. But in order to prevent it from becoming a zero-sum game, there have to be ways of bringing together the activities that we do in outreach with the other activities that we engage in as scholars. There cannot be so much separation of the two. We have to begin to reconnect this sprawl and begin to optimize the university.

So we must get hold of the agenda, and you are going to help us do that. The committee touches on the issues I have been talking about, and it touches on how these activities are measured, how the quality of them is measured, and how one rewards faculty for doing them. In reality, what you are being asked to do involves cultural transformation of the academy.

Final Observations

Once again, I want to thank you for your willingness to engage in this difficult task. I like the way that it is being approached, beginning with a pretty intensive period of work on a scholarly dimensions that tries to set a base from which to diverge. I think that is the way to do it because then the divergences will be legitimate divergences that are built on a knowledge base, as opposed to polarizations from people coming in with predetermined views.

As I say, your work really will be very helpful in creating a vision of the university, which in fact we will be doing in parallel. We are not going to wait until you are finished, but we shall be listening very carefully to what is going on. We shall be folding your work into our synthesis of all the prior platforms to create a design for the university of the future.

Chapter 4

OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE CHARGE FROM THE VICE PROVOST FOR UNIVERSITY OUTREACH

James C. Votruba
Vice Provost for University Outreach
Michigan State University⁶

The Role of the University in Society

In the most fundamental sense, I think the challenge of this committee is to bring into clearer focus the role of the university in society. Sometimes I think we, as scholars, view the university as if it exists in a hermetically sealed environment. In fact, we are an institution that plays a variety of social roles. In large measure, many of the questions that are being raised as part of your charge have to do with the role of the university in society, as well as the multiple uses of knowledge.

Universities ought to be places where knowledge is valued as an end in itself. We have many faculty on our campus who look at knowledge as an end product. But there is another dimension of the university that looks at knowledge as instrumental to other social ends. People involved in the extension and application of knowledge spend a good bit of time, as I do, thinking about the uses of knowledge and, in a sense, that is the large question that you are being asked to address in this committee. You are looking at knowledge in its instrumental form.

The Michigan State Legacy

If we look at the history of American public universities, we see—in our society probably more than any other—a history and tradition of university engagement in issues related to society. Indeed, if you look at the history of Michigan State University, both in terms of Michigan and the world, you see an involvement in knowledge extension and application to address the larger social arena. In fact, many scholars of higher education argue that one of the reasons that American higher education has received such strong public support over its history is because it has been connected with broader societal issues and agenda.

In this sense, universities have become instrumentalities for larger social agendas. One need only look at the kind of involvement that Michigan State has had in International Studies and Programs, Cooperative Extension Service, and the former Continuing Education Service to see our long-term

⁶ This text was transcribed from a taped version of remarks made to the Provost's Committee on University Outreach, Michigan State University, by Dr. Votruba on January 18, 1992.

commitment to outreach. Isn't it appropriate that we are meeting today in the very first Kellogg Center for Continuing Education that was funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation in 1952? More recently, we have seen the development of the Institute for Public Policy and Social Research (in the College of Social Science), the work of the Native American Institute (Urban Affairs Programs), the Partnership for New Education (College of Education), the Institute for Children, Youth, and Family (coordinated by the College of Human Ecology), and the technology transfer work in our College of Engineering. As I look across campus, I see hundreds of faculty members involved in literally hundreds of projects that involve the extension and application of knowledge. All in response—and that is the key, all in response—to societal needs.

The Wharton Task Force on Lifelong Education and Its Implications for University Outreach

Some 20 years ago when I was a doctoral student at Michigan State, President Wharton's lifelong education task force described the dawning of a new era characterized by two important forces. One was the transformation of learning from something that occurred early in life to something that is a lifelong necessity for just about everyone as they pursue their responsibilities as an employer, employee, parent, and citizen. This transformation has brought about fundamental changes in the way that universities now conduct the knowledge transmission (teaching) process.

The second force described in that report was the growing complexity of issues confronting our society as we approach the 21st century. For example, I recently spent a day in Flint talking with a variety of people about the formidable challenges confronting children in that community. At the end of the day, I felt almost overwhelmed. What is the appropriate role for Michigan State? We are not a social service agency, we are—above all else—a knowledge agency. So the question of MSU's involvement in serving youth in Flint must focus on finding appropriate uses for knowledge in addressing youth issues and problems.

One can move very quickly to other major challenges confronting Michigan and, indeed, the nation. Global competitiveness: How do we support communities and states to revitalize, to diversify, and to "globalize" their economies? Again, the question is: What is the proper role of a university vis-à-vis other social institutions?

Another challenge is environmental quality—water quality, solid and hazardous waste, etc. Again, what is the proper role of the university?

Still another issue that comes up in nearly every community I visit has to do with health and health care. Accessibility to health care, and the array of complex health issues, are terrifically important to Michigan's future. What is the proper role of a university?

I cannot overemphasize the fact that society is demanding that universities engage these issues. How we engage them is the critical dilemma, not whether we engage them.

The Metamorphosis of Outreach Philosophy and Structure at Michigan State University

On many university campuses, the extension and application of knowledge is being administered in separate units. If one looks at instructional outreach or education-across-the-lifespan, one finds—as one would have found at Michigan State until six years ago—a separate office variously called "continuing education" or "public service" or "extension" or "outreach" or "lifelong education." In 1986, MSU made the decision to eliminate its separate lifelong education administrative unit located in the Kellogg Center. The gameplan involved weaving lifelong education into the fabric of the institution—at the college and department level—in the same ways that we do with undergraduate and graduate education. The commitment at Michigan State to fully integrate the extension and application of knowledge across the university is as ambitious—perhaps more so—than one will find anywhere in the nation.

In 1988, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation awarded Michigan State what was, at the time, the largest grant ever given to a university—\$10.2 million—to help stimulate that integrative process. MSU took another important leap in 1989. Up until that point, lifelong education on most university campuses was primarily conceived in terms of instructional outreach, that is, credit and noncredit programs for adults. Certainly, one of the important questions is: How do you make credit and noncredit instruction more accessible to a broader range of people across the lifespan? But it is important to remember that we are also a research university. So, beginning in 1989, we began to intensively pose the question: How does one extend the research capacity of the university for the purpose of societal problem solving?

The first year that I was here, I spent more than half of my time visiting communities, talking about challenges that confront those communities, and asking what role the university should play. What I heard in the initial stages in most of those conversations was that people would like access to more of our instructional programs. But, as we got deeper into the conversation, people began to focus, not on the instructional capabilities of Michigan State, but on the problem-solving capabilities of our institution. In one community, people said to me: "We've got a stagnant economy that needs revitalizing. Can the university help us better understand our problem?"

With the broader emphasis on knowledge extension and application, which can take a variety of forms, MSU has moved from the concept of lifelong education—one that primarily embraced instructional outreach—to a concept of university outreach that includes a range of knowledge-extension and knowledge-application activities.

The Challenges Facing this Committee

Where are the outreach models?

Over the past six years, this university has been pursuing an extremely ambitious agenda. Now, it is time for this committee to look at how far we have come, and where we need to go. One of the frustrations you may encounter over the next year is the lack of models. It is not possible to say that we should be like Stanford or Berkeley or Michigan or Illinois because, in fact, the approach that we have taken in terms of concept and application has not been tried elsewhere before. Consequently, one finds a great deal of interest around the country about whether Michigan State is going to be successful in its approach.

Outreach as part of MSU's academic mission

Your challenge, as we begin working together, is to make sure that you continually embed your discussions of outreach within the broader context of the university's academic mission. Please don't allow yourselves to disengage your discussion from the research and instructional functions that this university plays. In fact, you may decide to generate a new language that describes Michigan State's mission. You may decide that teaching/research/service is not the most appropriate way of conceptualizing our mission because it carries too much baggage and treats each function as separate and conceptually distinct activities.

The mutually reinforcing contributions of outreach and research

It also seems to me that, to a very great extent, the future of our university—as we move into the transformational mode that David Scott discussed—has to do with two very important traditions at Michigan State. One goes back to the Morrill Act of 1862; that is, of course, the land-grant tradition. The second is more recent, but every bit as compelling; that is the AAU (Association of American Universities) tradition. I would say to you, just parenthetically, that to my knowledge Michigan State is the only AAU and land-grant university that makes a special point to describe itself explicitly as AAU and land-grant.

That distinction should not become a constraint, though. In my opinion, the focus on AAU and land-grant often lead to a false dichotomy when we consider our academic mission. It is too easy to become polarized over AAU and land-grant as though it were a tug-of-war. Sometimes people describe themselves as representing either the land-grant or AAU "side of the house." Land-grant, in this case, is supposed to mean extension or outreach, and AAU is supposed to mean research. Well, in fact, land-grant universities were intended to be strong research universities, and there is no reason why AAU universities—universities that emphasize research—should not also be interested, and involved with, the extension and application of knowledge.

My hope, and this is an ambitious hope, is that part of your work will result in a new language that synthesizes these two traditions and takes us to a higher level. I say that because the polarization of AAU/land-grant does not serve us well. It quickly leads to a zero-sum game that, if you are involved in outreach, somehow diminishes the importance of research.

I often say to the people with whom I work that you cannot possibly extend and apply what you do not know first. Those who are heavily involved in outreach at times will say that they are really working on problems when all that some faculty members do is think about them. My response to that is: How do you know what to do? You have to have insight into problems before you can act on them, and it is the intersection of scholarship with action that defines university outreach.

Basing strategic recommendations on a strong intellectual foundation

Finally, I hope that in a year you have established a strong intellectual foundation that places the extension and application of knowledge within the broader context of the university. Flowing from that intellectual foundation should be a set of strategic priorities—ones that we can implement.

I challenge you to think boldly. Do not let yourself be captured by either history or conventional ways of thinking about issues. And also think creatively. The issues that you will be confronting are complex issues, and we need your insights.