

## Part Seven: A Value Base for University Outreach

### INTRODUCTION<sup>20</sup>

The central challenge facing American universities today is how to reconnect their mission with the knowledge needs of society. Over the past decade, there has been a rising tide of public criticism that universities have increasingly become mandarin institutions, caught up in the ritual of scholarship that is too often disconnected from the needs of society, while allowing the undergraduate curriculum and outreach to become increasingly devalued. We need strong leadership in reconnecting universities with the society that created and sustains them. If we succeed, we will help usher in a new era in American higher education; one in which universities are once again seen as full partners in addressing the advanced knowledge needs of society. However, if we fail, society will fill the void by creating new institutions that support the needs of the knowledge age. The stakes are high, and there is no time to lose.

—James C. Votruba (1992:79)

### 1973. . .1993: Twenty Years Later and the Same Opportunity for Leadership

In 1973, MSU President Clifton Wharton assembled a group of faculty and administrators to advise his office on how Michigan State might more effectively become a university for the "lifelong" learner. Learning throughout the lifespan was an emerging concept two decades ago, and many universities reconceptualized their mission and reorganized their structures to enable them to engage the lifelong learner in ways that they had not done before. Michigan State was in the vanguard of that movement.

Today, universities are being asked—in unprecedented ways—to make their knowledge resources more available and accessible to society. Lifelong learning (labeled *instructional outreach* earlier in this report) is still very important. For example, one could persuasively argue that continuing professional education (one dimension of instructional outreach) is even more important in the 1990s than it was in the 1970s because the knowledge base for professionals is changing so

---

<sup>20</sup> Introduction written by Frank A. Fear

rapidly. In addition to the many challenges associated with instructional outreach, universities are being asked to partner and collaborate with public, private, and nonprofit organizations for the purpose of generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge. This is what the committee labeled *problem-focused* outreach in Chapter 10.

So, it is easy to pose and answer the all-important questions: Why outreach? Why outreach now? And it is hard to picture the 21st century university—how it will work, what it will look like, and how it will function—without outreach. That is not to say that outreach will be the organizing theme or that it will be the most important thing done by the 21st university. But it does suggest that outreach will become an increasingly important part of the university of the future.

Twenty years after the publication of the Wharton report, Michigan State again has an opportunity to be a leader nationally. This time the issues are more complex, and the challenges are more difficult. Whether Michigan State will be at the forefront of this effort is up to our faculty, staff, and administration. As authors of this report, the committee's goal is to make it easier to seize this opportunity. Indeed, many MSU faculty, staff, and students are engaged in cutting-edge outreach work. That makes the committee's task less formidable.

With this as background, attention now turns to offering a set of principles that the committee, as a group, believes should guide the future of university outreach at Michigan State. These principles will be presented in Chapter 13, and will form the basis for the recommendations presented in our report to the Provost's Office.

## **Chapter 13**

### **GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR UNIVERSITY OUTREACH AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY<sup>21</sup>**

Universities are in the knowledge business. They generate, transmit, apply, and preserve knowledge. When they do these things for the direct benefit of extended audiences, they engage in outreach. As a public, land-grant institution, Michigan State University has a special responsibility to reach out to the communities of the state, the nation, and the world. Our goal should be to create a model university which is engaged in cutting-edge scholarship in service to society.

—Provost's Committee on University Outreach  
Michigan State University

#### **The First Guiding Principle: *Service to Society* (Reemphasizing the irrevocable feature of Michigan State University's institutional mandate)**

Michigan State University's academic mission statement makes it clear that ours is an institution dedicated to serving society. The preamble to the bylaws of the MSU Board of Trustees includes the following words:

[Michigan State University]...will be ever responsive to the increasing needs of a dynamic and complex society.... [by diffusing]...through all available media the knowledge and information that will contribute to the well-being and development of the people of our state, our nation, and our world.

These words frame our institutional distinctiveness as a land-grant university, and also make MSU unique among Michigan institutions of higher education. Despite this distinctiveness and uniqueness, the committee believes that our institution is not completely at ease with this basic feature of its mission.

The committee concurs with the comments expressed by Vice Provost Votruba in Chapter 4 of this report. Some on our campus seem to believe that programs and activities associated with the "land-grant side" of the university (as some would define it) impede our quest to become a world-class university. More than once during our deliberations, committee members heard the question posed this way: Should MSU emphasize its status as an AAU (American Association of Universities) institution or its status as a NASULGC (National Association of State Universities and Land-grant Colleges) institution? One campus visitor, an author of national repute, noted that he hears this question posed more at Michigan State than at any other AAU/land-grant institution.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Chapter written by Frank A. Fear with some text prepared by committee member Charles Thompson.

<sup>22</sup> Comment made to committee members by Dr. Ernest Lynton.

This committee believes that the question, as posed, offers a false choice and represents a false dichotomy. First, it is not possible to reject our institutional charter and mandate. It is certainly possible to "revitalize" the land-grant mission (Enarson, 1989), but to revitalize does not mean to reject or to minimize in importance AAU principles. Second, "land-grant" means more than extending knowledge to those who seek it. It includes the vital activity of generating knowledge on problems that are important in peoples' lives. For too long, and for too many, "land-grant" at Michigan State has meant the Cooperative Extension Service (now MSU Extension). Land-grant certainly includes MSU-E, but it is more than that...much, much more.

It is important, then, to view AAU/land-grant as mutually reinforcing options rather than as mutually exclusive alternatives. No other university in Michigan holds membership in AAU and, at the same time, was chartered as a land-grant institution. Fewer than 20 institutions nationwide carry this distinction.

The committee also believes that outreach should be a highly valued and prestigious university function for pragmatic and scholarly reasons. MSU cannot prosper financially or reputationally if citizens and their representatives feel that the university is not actively engaged in seeking to improve society's health and well-being. For scholarly reasons, outreach greatly enriches the teaching and research work done in disciplinary, applied, and professional fields. Indeed, MSU's special standing as a research-intensive university in the land-grant tradition means that it offers abundant opportunities for engaging in cutting-edge outreach. As the committee proposed earlier, cutting-edge outreach is the special responsibility of a university as compared to the outreach work of four-year and community colleges.

The committee's first guiding principle is perhaps the ultimate issue facing Michigan State University in the 21st century:

In its philosophy, programs, funding decisions, and reward systems, Michigan State University should demonstrate that it is committed to becoming a world-class institution, one that is dedicated to generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge in ways that serve society.

### **The Second Guiding Principle: *Rooting Outreach in Scholarship***

University outreach has as its distinguishing characteristic the combination of a scholarly basis and the university's effort to extend itself to meet audiences' knowledge needs. In seeking to serve these audiences, outreach sometimes involves transmitting and/or applying existing knowledge. In other cases, outreach involves generating new knowledge. Frequently, but not always, this new knowledge is created in partnership with those who need it. Even when outreach is restricted to solving problems with existing knowledge, it often inspires new research, thereby enriching and guiding the scholarly work of the university.

Consequently, outreach exerts a continuous shaping influence on the character, orientation, and the activities of a university and its faculty, staff, and students. Policy analysis, program development and evaluation, off-campus courses, workshops associated with continuing profes-

sional education, technical assistance, nonformal educational experiences (e.g., exhibits), and conferences are examples of outreach.

If a university is in the "knowledge business," as the committee firmly believes, then the knowledge business is all about scholarship. Over the years, scholarship has become narrowly defined on American campuses. Recently, an expanded notion of scholarship has been championed, one that better fits the functions that faculty members perform and that universities must undertake.

In a very basic sense, scholarship is the fuel of the academy; it is what makes the academy the academy. However, over the years, outreach has been frequently viewed as nonscholarly activity. Indeed, some outreach has not been rooted in scholarship. One of the major differences between "good" and "bad" outreach, in the committee's estimation, is that good outreach is rooted in scholarship. It is also issues-based scholarship, i.e., it focuses on issues of importance to people as people define them.

The committee believes that the historic association of outreach with service is one of the reasons why outreach work has been generally devalued in the academy. Service as an individual citizen, service to the university, and service to the profession are important contributions made by faculty, staff, and students. None, however, is outreach. The key distinction between outreach and service is the scholarly basis of outreach—its connection to one or more of the four knowledge functions.

Although in previous chapters the committee has devoted attention to the issue of what is outreach, another important issue pertains to who does (and should do) outreach. It is the committee's opinion that outreach work emanates from all parts of the university. Faculty members frequently include outreach as part of their scholarly programs. Some of this work involves the extension of disciplinary or professional knowledge. Other work requires the integration of knowledge from multiple disciplines and professions. Students are involved in outreach when they participate in such experiences as internships and practica. During these efforts, they apply knowledge learned in the formal classroom and, at the same time, learn valuable lessons about the application of knowledge in real world settings. And staff from many units around the university make available their expertise to those outside the university. This work is important because many Michigan State staff are "scholar-practitioners," i.e., persons who have gained valuable experience in conjunction with their position-related responsibilities.

These observations can be summarized in the second guiding principle of this report:

**Outreach should be viewed as a fundamental part of Michigan State's academic mission. Its chief characteristic involves scholarship that is applied as the university extends itself to serve the knowledge needs of various audiences. It is distinct from service in that service does not require the scholarship that must accompany outreach. Because scholarship permeates a university, outreach should not be reserved only for the faculty. Students and staff should participate (and very frequently are involved) in outreach.**

### **The Third Guiding Principle: *Nurturing the Art and Science of Outreach Scholarship***

The committee has made a case for viewing outreach as scholarship. But there is another very important dimension to outreach as scholarship that must be addressed in this report: the scholarship of outreach. The scholarship of outreach refers to the array of issues associated with the art and science of engaging in outreach. These include, but are certainly not limited to, the following 10 issues:

- ▶ Determining when it may be appropriate for faculty, staff, and students to decline involvement in an outreach endeavor
- ▶ Deciding which problem or problems should be the focus of attention in an outreach endeavor
- ▶ Identifying which outreach process(es) and/or activity(ies) to use, given the circumstances
- ▶ Discovering which strategies are related to successful outcomes in different situations
- ▶ Being better able to predict the potential functional and dysfunctional consequences of an outreach intervention before the fact
- ▶ Learning how to avoid having clients become dependent on your scholarship
- ▶ Learning how to disengage successfully from an outreach endeavor so that disengagement will not negatively affect the capacity of off-campus audiences to maintain and sustain outreach gains
- ▶ Being better able to predict the amount of time it will take to successfully undertake an outreach endeavor
- ▶ Understanding the ethics of outreach
- ▶ Learning how to effectively collaborate with off-campus audiences through listening, not creating false expectations, playing appropriate roles in a team setting, and delivering work on schedule and as promised

One of the important messages that the committee wishes to convey in this regard is that outreach represents an area of academic inquiry in its own right. Outreach success is not predicated on "simply doing it." Indeed, "simply doing it" can lead to potential disastrous consequences for the university and those outside the university who experience (and live with) the results.

Most faculty, staff, and students have been neither educated nor trained in many of the complex, knotty dilemmas that are frequently confronted in outreach. For many, learning comes in the form of doing, and major lessons are often learned by making mistakes. There is much to be said for experiential learning. Yet, this approach—alone—has a limited, additive effect. In other words, one hopes the person involved learns from experience, and also conveys that learning to others (e.g., students). But we need to find ways to quicken the "learning curve" for those who participate in outreach. One way is to view outreach scholarship as legitimate academic work, and

then draw upon the results of that scholarship in outreach education and training. Put more simply, there is an art and science to outreach that must be nurtured and promoted.

The scholarship of outreach offers three opportunities for Michigan State University. First, many issues associated with outreach scholarship cut across disciplinary and professional lines. This means that scholars from various fields can learn from one another. The teacher educator, for example, will likely have much in common with the health professional when each talks about their experiences associated with establishing collaborative relationships with community leaders and community-level practitioners.

Second, studying outreach has the potential of enhancing the sophistication of outreach work because it makes possible the systematic attempt to integrate learning with practice. All things being equal, this means that MSU might be able to do better outreach because it is learning from its outreach experiences (i.e., MSU becomes a learning organization; see Senge 1990). Finally, because outreach scholarship often involves cutting-edge work, it offers exciting study venues for faculty, staff, and students. The resulting scholarly products and outputs can thereby enhance the scholarly reputation of our University and the scholars involved.

The Vice Provost for University Outreach (representing the Provost's Office), deans, chairs, and directors must work together to promote and nurture outreach scholarship. For example, the VPUO can make funds available for outreach scholarship (e.g., travel to conferences). Deans and chairs can help by supporting outreach scholarship as work "that counts" during the faculty performance review process.

The third guiding principle is:

**Outreach scholarship addresses the array of issues associated with the art and science of engaging in outreach. Many of these are thorny and complex in nature, including selecting outreach problems, disengaging from outreach projects, sustaining outreach efforts following MSU disengagement, and participating ethically in outreach. Outreach scholarship represents an exciting opportunity for Michigan State because it has cross-disciplinary relevance, the results can be used for outreach education and training, and this cutting-edge scholarship advances the reputation of the institution and those involved. A collective, coordinated effort involving the Vice Provost for University Outreach, deans, chairs, and unit directors is required to promote and nurture outreach scholarship at MSU.**

**The Fourth Guiding Principle:  
*Planning across the Breadth of the Academic Mission—  
The cross-cutting nature of outreach  
contributes to the goal of multidimensional excellence***

Effective organizations, be they businesses or universities, have at their core a set of beliefs and values to which their members are committed and around which all their principal activities are organized. Low performance often can be traced to a withering of those beliefs or of the member's commitment to them. A first step in addressing a concern about enhanced effectiveness at MSU is to focus on how the University can

better perform its mission of teaching, research, and service. In the past, the three-fold mission implied that each activity was conceptually distinct, and was conducted largely separately. That separation often permitted the dedicated pursuit of excellence in each area. Today, however, there is reason to believe that faculty members' commitment to, and even understanding of, each of the three parts of the mission is not as clear or as strong as it must be if MSU is to remain effective and vital.

—MSU Professor K.M. Moore (1991:3)

The committee believes that Michigan State University, as a world-class institution, should seek excellence in all of its mission-related obligations. One of those obligations is outreach; outreach is one means by which our University serves society.

Vice Provost Votruba described the quest for excellence in mission-related obligations as multi-dimensional excellence (Chapter 4). Multidimensional excellence does not mean that every faculty member should be expected to be multidimensionally excellent. It does mean that, at the institutional, college, and unit levels, Michigan State should seek excellence in the multiple dimensions that frame its mission. It also means that Michigan State must dedicate itself to excellence across the knowledge spectrum—from generating knowledge to preserving it.

However, the committee believes that certain planning approaches undermine the quest for multi-dimensional excellence. No university, college, or unit can afford to "pit" undergraduate teaching excellence against research excellence, or research excellence against outreach excellence, for example. This is destructive, not constructive, planning because a "win" in one area, coupled with a "loss" in another area, means that we have decided against multidimensional excellence.

But how can multidimensional excellence be achieved in a very stressful budgetary environment? No institution or unit can afford to be "all things to all people." Strategic choices have to be made so that MSU can "deliver." The issue of what it means "to deliver" is so important that the committee sought to explore its dimensions during the on-campus interviews. The committee asked different respondents what it means for faculty "to deliver" and for MSU "to deliver."

A concern was expressed by many faculty that one outcome of our committee deliberations might mean that, in the future, faculty members would be expected to do more outreach during a time when they were already feeling under-funded and overworked (the proverbial "doing more with less"). If that were to occur, committee members were told, then it would mean some faculty would do less teaching and/or less research. Many campus administrators, too, informed the committee that the cost of doing more outreach would mean doing less teaching and/or research in their departments, schools, or colleges.

This feedback reminds the committee of a three-part pie with the three parts being teaching, research, and outreach. If an attempt is made to increase one slice of the pie (say, the teaching slice), that means there must be a corresponding reduction in at least one other slice of the pie (the outreach slice, for example). This is an example of zero-sum thinking. But is zero-sum thinking applicable in our case? We think not. In Chapter 10, the committee presented the idea that outreach is a cross-cutting enterprise, i.e., outreach activities involve teaching, research, and service. A zero-sum conception does not apply because there is no slice of the pie with an "outreach" label; outreach cuts across the pie.

In light of this discussion, the fourth guiding principle pertains to a way of achieving multiple, but seemingly incompatible, goals: integrating outreach into the University's academic mission, seeking multidimensional excellence at a time of increasing fiscal constraints, and avoiding zero-sum thinking and planning:

*University Outreach at Michigan State University*



The cross-cutting nature of outreach represents an optimal solution when academic units at Michigan State plan for multidimensional excellence. Because outreach involves teaching, research, and service, outreach can be viewed as a "value added" activity in that it contributes to the teaching, research, and service agenda rather than becoming a separate agenda.

**The Fifth Guiding Principle:  
Central Guidance with Unit Responsibility—  
Planning outreach at Michigan State University**

In reviewing the current thinking of Michigan State's peer institutions (reported earlier in this report), it is clear that many of the institutions have a well-developed sense of what they want to accomplish, why they want to accomplish it, and how they want to accomplish it. Some institutions have even identified important societal problems and needs and then declared those areas as priorities for their outreach programs.

Michigan State is no different from its peers in many respects. But MSU is significantly different from some of them in two important ways. First, our institution has a longstanding tradition of expecting strong leadership at the unit level and, second, faculty are generally given a considerable amount of flexibility in organizing their programs of study.

Without question, college and unit missions must coincide with the values and goals articulated in a university's mission. Yet, there is always a considerable amount of latitude in how lower-level units in an organization interpret and eventually apply institutional-level values and goals in their plans and programs. This is especially the case in a collegially oriented institution, such as a university, as compared to a more bureaucratized setting of a large corporation (Birnbaum 1991). In addition, the committee concluded that MSU is an institution with a variety of different outreach cultures. The cultures differ in terms of a variety of basic issues associated with outreach. In this environment, central-level planning is even more problematic.

Consequently, the committee strongly believes that outreach cannot be planned and implemented exclusively at the central level at our University. Certainly central administration can, and must, play many important roles. It can nurture, stimulate, facilitate, and reward outreach excellence throughout the University. But, at the same time, important planning efforts must take place at the college and unit level—with special emphasis at the unit level. At Michigan State, a relatively decentralized institution, it is ill-advised to talk about excellence at the institutional level when the work of the university takes place at the unit level—in the work done by faculty, students, and staff. This means that the desire to be multidimensionally excellent is both a unit-level topic and a unit-level responsibility.

These observations lead to the fifth guiding principle of this report:

Based on an assessment of external needs and opportunities, internal strengths, and other factors commonly associated with strategic planning, it is a college and unit responsibility to plan and program for multidimensionally excellence in accordance with MSU's academic mission. Outreach must be included in these plans. The central administration's

role is to nurture, stimulate, and facilitate college and unit planning processes and programs.

**The Sixth Guiding Principle:  
*Rewarding Performance—Reforming the faculty  
reward system to accommodate outreach as scholarship***

In many parts of the university, outreach is under-valued, under-funded, and under-rewarded. Outreach is not generally seen as a high priority activity in the eyes of some administrators or faculty despite the fact that it is emphasized by many university officials and honored rhetorically.

The true status of outreach within the academy is expressed unequivocally through the faculty reward system. It is here that the divergence between scholarship and outreach often comes into play. Junior faculty, in particular, expressed concern during the committee interview process about engaging in outreach because "it won't count for much" at merit increase, reappointment, and tenure/promotion times. The committee also spent a considerable amount of time discussing a comment made to us by a senior-level administrator to the effect that outreach should be undertaken after a faculty member has established their scholarly credentials (i.e., only after a faculty member has been promoted to associate professor with tenure).

The committee fully expected to find the faculty reward system topic among the priority discussion items for on-campus audiences. But, we did not expect it to be a recurring theme during our discussions with off-campus stakeholders, particularly since we did not bring this topic to the table. We engaged the off-campus interviewees in a general discussion of outreach issues that were important to them. Yet, regardless of interview site, the same message was communicated to us: Don't expect significant progress in advancing university outreach until and unless the faculty reward system is reformed.

It is the committee's belief that it is time—the topic has been discussed for years—to reform the faculty reward system so that what we reward coincides with what we expect faculty members to do (Boyer 1990; Lynton 1992). And what we expect faculty members to do should be consistent with what we expect the institution to accomplish. Put more simply, everything must link to the academic mission statement.

In proposing this, the committee also believes that mechanisms must be established to evaluate outreach in terms of its scholarship. The goal should not be to encourage faculty to "do more outreach." The goals should be to encourage "good" outreach (i.e., outreach rooted in scholarship), to stimulate cutting-edge outreach (i.e., outreach that advances the frontier of knowledge), and to nurture and promote outreach scholarship (described in guiding principle #3).

Therefore, the sixth guiding principle is:

No program to enhance the standing of university outreach at Michigan State should be undertaken without including, at its core, faculty reward system reform. This does not mean that faculty should be given "credit" for doing outreach (when they might not have received credit before). It means that outreach productivity should be evaluated in terms of the highest standards of scholarship.

**The Seventh Guiding Principle:  
Transforming Michigan State University  
as the "Connected" University of the 21st Century**

In Chapter 3, former Provost Scott describes the three-century metamorphosis of the university in America: from *university* to *multiversity* to, finally, *transversity*. The university, Scott writes, is distinguished by its uniformity of purpose and structure, whereas the multiversity is at least partly characterized by its multiple structures. The transversity, on the other hand, is best understood in terms of its *connections*, rather than by its structures.

The committee concurs with Scott's perspective. We believe that the university of the future will be redesigned to emphasize connections—new and more vibrant connections across campus, and between campus and off-campus audiences and constituents (Fear 1992). Morgan (1986) views these connections in organizations in ways similar to that which enables the human brain to function at an optimal level.

Thinking of the university in this way is not dissimilar from the way that other institutions are learning to operate. At the local level, for example, public, private, and nonprofit partnerships are being created to advance community development. Connections among multiple partners in industry are enabling firms to become globally competitive. Industry also understands that competitiveness requires better connections between and among the units in a firm (e.g., connections between the engineering and marketing divisions). And professionals in many fields are redefining their work in terms of connections. Educators, for instance, understand that problems associated with the schools are embedded in the problems being experienced in families and in communities.

In thinking about MSU in terms of multiple connections, the committee does not seek to diminish the importance of the disciplines. Quite the contrary, our University is enriched by strong disciplines. But, at the same time, it is the committee's belief that we must stimulate cross-disciplinary connections, as well as promote connections with partners and collaborators outside the academy. For example, solving the complex set of problems associated with youth-at-risk in this country will require the expertise and cooperation of psychologists, economists, criminal justice professionals, health professionals, education specialists, family specialists, and sociologists, to name only a few. Some of these actors will be affiliated with universities, and many more will be practitioners who are on the "firing line."

In the *connected university* (as the committee refers to it), many functions and activities are redefined, modified, and reconceptualized. In essence, the connected university "reaches in" (the INTERNAL coupling mechanism that links faculty, staff, and students, and different campus units with each other) as a means to more effectively "reach out" (the EXTERNAL coupling mechanism) to those who seek knowledge resources.

The university's internal coupling mechanism encourages all members of the academy—not just faculty—to participate in outreach. For example, students—both undergraduate and graduate—represent knowledge resources for outreach. Student participation may occur through such venues as internships, volunteer efforts, practica, field study courses, and applied research projects.

The external coupling mechanism often results in mutual learning experiences for faculty, staff, and students (on campus), as well as for those external to the university. In addition, decisions about what and how outreach will be conducted, and by whom, will emerge from a collaborative

relationship between and among outreach partners. The external (to the university) partners will want those from the university to listen to them, and to establish partnerships on co-equal terms, not just on our terms.

The connected university is not just a place that seeks connections among people and units. It is also important to connect the knowledge functions—where multiple knowledge functions are sought in the same effort or project. For example, cutting-edge scholarship in some fields currently involves integrating knowledge generation with knowledge application (see Lerner 1991). Still another connection involves merging expert knowledge systems (from within the academy) with indigenous knowledge (from outside the academy) to better understand phenomena. Cogenerated knowledge then comes affirmed as an acceptable and valuable knowledge generation alternative.

Others share the vision of the 21st century university as a connected (internally and externally) institution. James Duderstadt, president of the University of Michigan, refers to it as the "collaboratory":

Suppose we were to create within the University a "laboratory" or "new" university that would serve as a prototype or test bed for possible features of a 21st century university....We would see this as a highly interdisciplinary unit with programs organized around such overarching themes as global change, social infrastructures, and economic transformation. It would span undergraduate, graduate, professional, and continuing education, bringing together students, faculty, and alumni to pool knowledge, work in teams, and address real problems. It would be a crucible for evolving new disciplines through interdisciplinary collaboration. Its programs would promote the transfer of knowledge to society through collaboration, internships, and exchanges of students, faculty, staff, and professionals.

The "New U" would also be a place to develop new structural models for the university, to experiment with lifelong education, new concepts of service, faculty tenure, leadership development, and community building (Duderstadt 1992: 7).

"Connected" universities will also need to connect with each other, as well as with other knowledge providers (e.g., community colleges) so that each can make its unique and special contribution in a partnership arrangement. One of the major challenges, in an era of scarce resources, will involve the ability of universities to collaborate, not compete, with each other in their outreach efforts. For example, our off-campus interviewees made it clear that they are not well served when institutions of higher learning compete for off-campus credit hours.

This discussion leads to the seventh, and final, guiding principle:

To be a leading university of the 21st century, Michigan State must become a "connected university." This means finding new and vibrant ways to connect knowledge resources across the campus. It also means establishing collaborative relationships with off-campus partners, and collaborating with other institutions of higher education in making available knowledge resources to those who can benefit from it.

## Summary

In summary, the guiding principles associated with this report are:

- 1. "Service to Society": Reemphasizing the irrevocable feature of Michigan State University's institutional mandate**  
In its philosophy, programs, funding decisions, and reward systems, Michigan State University should demonstrate that it is committed to becoming a world-class institution, one that is dedicated to generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge in ways that serve society.
- 2. Rooting Outreach in Scholarship**  
Outreach should be viewed as a fundamental part of Michigan State's academic mission. Its chief characteristic involves scholarship that is applied as the university extends itself to serve the knowledge needs of various audiences. It is distinct from service in that service does not require the scholarship that must accompany outreach. Because scholarship permeates a university, outreach should not be reserved only for the faculty. Students and staff should participate (and very frequently are involved) in outreach.
- 3. Nurturing the Art and Science of Outreach Scholarship**  
Outreach scholarship addresses the array of issues associated with the art and science of engaging in outreach. Many of these are thorny and complex in nature, including the topics of selecting outreach problems, disengaging from outreach projects, sustaining outreach efforts following MSU disengagement, and participating ethically in outreach. Outreach scholarship represents an exciting opportunity for Michigan State because it has cross-disciplinary relevance, the results can be used for outreach education and training, and this cutting-edge scholarship advances the reputation of the institution and those involved. A collective, coordinated effort involving the Vice Provost for University Outreach, deans, chairs, and unit directors is required to promote and nurture outreach scholarship at MSU.
- 4. Planning across the Breadth of the Academic Mission: The cross-cutting nature of outreach contributes to the goal of multidimensional excellence**  
The cross-cutting nature of outreach represents an optimal solution when academic units at Michigan State plan for multidimensional excellence. Because outreach involves teaching, research, and service, outreach can be viewed as a "value added" activity in that it contributes to the teaching, research, and service agenda rather than becoming a separate agenda.
- 5. Centralized Guidance with Unit Responsibility: A strategy for outreach planning at Michigan State University**  
Based on an assessment of external needs and opportunities, internal strengths, and other factors commonly associated with strategic planning, it is a college and unit responsibility to plan and program for multidimensionally excellence in accordance with MSU's academic mission. Outreach must be included in these plans. The central administration's role is to nurture, facilitate, and evaluate college and unit planning processes and programs.

6. *Rewarding Performance: Reforming the faculty reward system to accommodate outreach as scholarship*

No program to enhance the standing of university outreach at Michigan State should be undertaken without including, at its core, faculty reward system reform. This does not mean that faculty should be given "credit" for doing outreach (when they might not have received credit before). It means that outreach productivity should be evaluated in terms of the highest standards of scholarship.

7. *Transforming Michigan State University as the "Connected" University of the 21st Century*

To be a leading university of the 21st century, Michigan State must become a "connected university." This means finding new and vibrant ways to connect knowledge resources across the campus. It also means establishing collaborative relationships with off-campus partners, and collaborating with other institutions of higher education in making available knowledge resources to those who can benefit from it.