

***From the
Editor's Desk***

Barbara A. Holland

Recently, I heard a speaker point out that the '90s decade of each century has almost always been a time marked by anticipation or realization of major changes in world social, political, and economic structures. He spoke of how the coming change of the century and the next millennium serves to heighten individual and collective sensitivity to both fears and hopes about possible transitions and transformations. Reflecting on the enormous attention given to pressures for "change" in higher education during this decade of the 1990s, however one chooses to define change, I found it somewhat comforting to think of all this change activity as part of a larger historical pattern—an inevitable sign of the times, so to speak.

Change has come to *Metropolitan Universities* as well. With this first issue of the eighth volume, I assume duties as this journal's second Executive Editor. I approach this opportunity with both excitement and humility, given the extraordinary quality of Ernest Lynton's contributions as Executive Editor. All who are active in the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities hold a common understanding that the good reputation of this publication and the overall progress of the Coalition are largely attributable to the leadership and commitment Ernest has provided.

Recently, I sat and reviewed all the issues of the last seven years. I was impressed by the effective way he used both wisdom and humor in his Editor's columns to draw our attention to critical topics and to provoke us to think imaginatively about their implications for urban and metropolitan institutions. A review of the guest editors and authors of those years reads like a Who's Who list of higher education scholars and administrators. Their contributions are a testament to Ernest's own reputation as a scholar and leader in national and international higher education communities.

I count myself among the many who look to Ernest as an academic mentor and role model. He has always been out ahead of us, presenting challenging and thoughtful analyses of higher education issues that lead us to adopt new views and new strategies. A scholar who can move higher education leaders to take action is a rare creature indeed, and Ernest has used that talent to build *Metropolitan Universities* into an invaluable tool for those who seek to interpret and advance the performance of urban and metropolitan universities. He has been the most important and respected academic voice on issues

related to these institutions, and thus was uniquely prepared to make this journal successful.

Much to my relief, Ernest has accepted appointment as Executive Editor Emeritus, and will continue to provide editorial review and guidance. I hope he will also use emeritus status to produce some provocative essays and spark discussions within the journal. I am grateful for the opportunity to work in partnership with him during this time of change, and for his advice and assistance as I learn the many aspects of the editor's role. Always one to plan ahead, he has transferred the journal with several themes in advanced stages of preparation, so we will all happily find his voice and influence highly evident throughout future issues.

This issue is, in fact, a continuation of Volume 7, Number 4, on Faculty Roles and Rewards. Guest Editors Robert L. Caret and Joan D. McMahon produced such a substantial set of articles from their team of authors that space and capacity required us to divide the material into two sequential issues. Truly, they have done an excellent job as guest editors. They have produced in these two issues of *Metropolitan Universities* a significant and timely body of writing that will undoubtedly be a valuable resource to scholars and practitioners engaged in consideration of questions and challenges related to faculty work and recognition.

The articles included in Part II of Faculty Roles and Rewards can be grouped in two categories: the potential role of service in faculty work and issues of implementation and evaluation of service; and three diverse views of tenure and its impact on faculty careers and roles.

Hiley, Robbins, and Kennedy write of the actual experience of Virginia Commonwealth University in implementing a roles and rewards policy that has as a major feature a strategy for fostering and evaluating collective faculty work. Driscoll and Lynton give a valuable progress report on their work with a Kellogg-funded project that is based on 16 case studies of individual faculty across four different institutions. The faculty members are engaged in developing prototype portfolios that document their scholarly work in professional service and outreach activities.

In two separate articles, Howard Cohen and Barry Checkoway offer very different strategies for organizational changes that could lead to a stronger role for service as an element of faculty roles and scholarly work in research universities. Looking at the experience of the University of Wisconsin, Cohen explores how an understanding of the motives and perceptions of benefits expressed by faculty, the community, and the university may lead to increased attention and legitimacy for university-community service activities.

Checkoway regards service as a different way of considering the uses of knowledge, and he reviews organizational and cultural factors that influence efforts to strengthen the integration of service into other types of scholarship.

While the articles discussed so far focus on the role of service with the concept of rewards incorporated as a highly influential factor, the last three articles address tenure as a specific form of reward. Trower reports on the progress of a national research project involving several different research questions and approaches to studying the status and future of tenure. The project seeks to conduct research that fosters an open and national dialogue on tenure. The project team also explicitly seeks to make a case for greater variety in faculty career paths and employment agreements. The article concludes with a review of working papers available through the project.

Two separate essays are included as Forum articles in this issue. Greenberg holds the opinion that tenure has become a ritualized "article of faith." He presents each of the major arguments commonly given in support of tenure and offers his views on why none of them is sufficient justification to resist tenure reform. He offers five suggestions to modify tenure. Jensen's essay takes exception to what he describes as higher education's sense of "specialness" or "distinctive" status that is meant to establish immunity from the change pressures sweeping businesses and society. Focusing on the concepts of customer, competition, and change he presents his view that higher education cannot and should not claim any special status. Jensen believes that the pressures for change, including changes in tenure, are mostly organizational and structural issues that do not threaten the fundamental values of the academy. He suggests that the academy open itself up to the exploration of potential change in order to keep higher education closely linked to society and to avoid the risk of external imposition of change and loss of autonomy.

A review of the seven volumes produced during Ernest's watch over *Metropolitan Universities* demonstrates that this journal has never shied away from controversial topics, and this issue is no exception. The articles on tenure all take strong and different approaches to arguing that change is necessary. Clearly, there are other, quite different opinions on the future of tenure and its role in academic life. As always, the journal does not take official positions on such topics, but seeks to serve as a venue where divergent views on difficult questions of controversy can be shared and debated. We welcome and encourage your critical evaluation, and hope such reflection will lead to future articles and essays that explore additional perspectives on key topics such as tenure and its impact on faculty roles and rewards.

Which leads me to close with a statement about why I accepted this

appointment as Executive Editor. One of my favorites among Ernest's editorial columns was published in the Summer 1993 issue. He wrote succinctly of the national necessity to redefine faculty roles to better reflect diverse institutional missions. One of his key observations at the time was that the potential for achieving good fit between academic roles and institutional mission is perhaps most evident in the nation's metropolitan universities because they have long held a belief in a distinctive mission and sense of scholarship that gives emphasis to the integration of teaching, research, and service.

That column affirms my own belief that while metropolitan universities are still working hard to realize more fully the needed fit between academic roles and campus mission, these institutions are the most likely to become national models of successful and thoughtful organizational change. Metropolitan universities, individually and collectively, are the most experienced in understanding the role of professional service and the potential for implementing integrated scholarship in service to metropolitan communities.

By joining the team that supports this journal, I hope to contribute to the national visibility and understanding of metropolitan universities, and to their identity as models that may illustrate a new vision for higher education as we cross into the next century. I want to thank the Editorial Advisory Board, the Publications Committee, the Executive Committee, and general membership of the Coalition for offering me the opportunity to carry forward the high quality traditions that make the journal a valued resource for readers. Thanks also to Marilyn Mattsson for her support, flexibility, and willingness to answer my many questions during the transition.

The continued success of *Metropolitan Universities* will depend on a partnership among us all, and I seek your active participation and frequent communication.