

The Faculty of the Future A Transatlantic Dialogue

SAN MINIATO, ITALY
(hosted by
the University of Florence)

Madeleine F. Green
Lewis Purser



AMERICAN COUNCIL
ON EDUCATION



CRE: THE ASSOCIATION OF
EUROPEAN UNIVERSITIES

The Faculty of the Future A Transatlantic Dialogue

SAN MINIATO, ITALY
(hosted by
the University of Florence)

Madeleine F. Green
Lewis Purser



AMERICAN COUNCIL
ON EDUCATION



CRE: THE ASSOCIATION OF
EUROPEAN UNIVERSITIES

Copyright 2000



American Council on Education

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle NW
Washington, DC 20036-1193

Additional copies of this publication may be purchased from the American Council on Education for \$10 plus \$3.50 shipping and handling. Orders may be paid by VISA®, check or money order (made payable to the American Council on Education) and sent to:
ACE Fulfillment Service
Department 191
Washington, DC 20055-0191
(301) 604-9073
Secure fax line: (301) 604-0158

This report may be downloaded as a PDF file from ACE's web site at www.acenet.edu, or from CRE's web site at www.unige.ch/cre.

Foreword: A Shrinking Pond

“Rectorem te posuerunt; curam illorum habe.”

(“They have chosen you as Rector; therefore, take good care of them.”)

from the frescoes at the University of Pisa’s Interdepartmental Centre at Calci, a former Carthusian Monastery

While it is accepted without question in university circles that faculty members should be linked in a global dialogue with their research and teaching peers, relatively few opportunities exist for those in leadership positions to think about higher education in an international context. Since 1989, the Transatlantic Dialogue Program has provided some 150 North American presidents and European rectors with the opportunity to reflect jointly and in some depth about higher education and their institutions. The initiative challenges the unexamined cultural assumptions that define our map of “the way things are” and, at the same time, encourages leaders to place their own institutions (by necessity the center of their daily universe) in a much broader, worldwide context. Whatever their differences, higher education institutions on both sides of the Atlantic have a great deal in common in terms of tradition and mission. The importance of probing these commonalities and differences, and of fostering greater collaboration, forms the basis of the Transatlantic Dialogue, a bi-annual meeting of presidents, rectors, and vice-chancellors sponsored by the American Council on Education and CRE: The Association of European Universities.¹

In the ten years since the inception of this Transatlantic Dialogue, the world has

changed dramatically. The first transatlantic meeting occurred before the fall of the Berlin Wall, while the European Union was in the early stages of integration. These ten years have seen an explosion in technology on both sides of the Atlantic, a dramatic growth in higher education participation rates in Western and Central Europe, and a political sea change in the former Communist bloc. Discussions of the “market,” once heard only in the United States, are now part of daily European university life, as mass higher education evolves and as institutions compete for students and funding. Lifelong learning, borderless education, and a new array of providers are but a few of the common issues of debate for institutions in Europe and North America and for participants in the Transatlantic Dialogue.

These similarities and some projected differences for the future were highlighted in the opening discussion of the 1999 Transatlantic Dialogue, in which participants created a chart of several key indicators, present and future, that reflect institutional engagement with external constituencies. The three key indicators chosen were:

1. Serving adult/mature students.
2. The revenues derived from relationships with industry.
3. Service to the community.

Whatever their differences, higher education institutions on both sides of the Atlantic have a great deal in common in terms of tradition and mission.

¹ The first such Transatlantic Dialogue took place in 1989 at the University of Hartford, USA; followed in 1991 at the Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium; in 1993 at the College of William and Mary, USA; in 1995 at the Université de Lausanne, Switzerland; in 1997 at Brown University, USA; and in 1999 at San Miniato, hosted by the University of Florence, Italy.

Increased involvement with industry will raise major issues about intellectual property, who conducts what kind of research, and how faculty members spend their time.

Participants marked both their current level of institutional engagement with these groups and their projected level of involvement by the year 2010. Once this was done, a number of interesting observations could be made:

- Both European and North American institutions recorded a “low to medium” current level of programming for adult students. Everybody expected that level to increase substantially by the year 2010.
- Greater differences were seen in relationships with industry. With respect to the percentage of revenue derived from relationships with industry, the current situation looks more similar now than in the projected future. North Americans indicated that the percentage of their revenues derived from these relationships was at present “low to medium,” and the Europeans “low.” While the North Americans saw a strong increase in the future, moving to “high,” the Europeans expected to move more modestly to “medium.”
- The differences were less pronounced with respect to service to the community. North Americans reported a higher level of current engagement than did the Europeans, but participants on both sides of the Atlantic expected increases in this area over the next ten years.

These projected institutional shifts, as reported by the university presidents and rectors, will have important implications for faculty work within universities. Greater emphasis on mature students will shape the curriculum, delivery modes, and pedagogy. Increased involvement with industry will raise major issues about intellectual property, who conducts what kind of research, and how faculty members spend their time. Increased service to the community may compete for faculty members’ attention to teaching, research, and participation in the governance of the institution, but also will require a fresh look at the traditional academic rewards system. In a nutshell, the projected changes in higher education will inevitably reshape faculty roles.

Thus, in selecting the topic for this Transatlantic Dialogue—the Faculty of the Future—both ACE and CRE assumed correctly that the gap between Europe and North America had also narrowed with respect to the heart of the matter, academic issues. Issues of how faculty members connect with new realities, with students, and with external communities, and of how presidents and rectors can lead in this swirl of change, resonated with participants from 16 countries, who in spite of their different national contexts, shared many of the same concerns.

A Different Future

A great deal of the two-and-a-half-day dialogue focused on the future scenarios for higher education that could shape the work of faculty members. The rapidity and intensity of change, as outlined by ACE President Stanley O. Ikenberry, place a powerful set of pressures on higher education institutions in Europe and North America, including:

- *Rising expectations of society* (lifelong learning, workforce preparation). In the United States especially, higher education is seen as an engine for economic growth.
- *The move to a knowledge society and economy.* This reality repositions universities, which continue to be valued as a principal (but not the sole) source of basic knowledge and discovery, and which increasingly are recognized by society for their value in promoting economic development and solving social problems.
- *The advent of the “global village,”* with a global economy, global politics, global communications, and global exposure to catastrophes. These all have serious implications for universities, not only in what they do, but also in how they do it.
- *The move from elite to mass higher education,* which is changing the role and mission of the university and increasing the university’s responsibility toward society. Universities also increasingly serve as repositories of knowledge with an important “certification” role, for instance, when instruction is provided by other players.
- *The growth of technology.* The traditional university is not well organized to exploit new technologies, even if some of these very same technologies originated within the university. The traditional university is very closely tied to place, designed to nurture a community of scholars who, while living and working in close physical contact, have intellectual lives that are independent of one another. New information and communication technologies have the potential to explode this traditional organizational model. Where the growth of technology will have taken us by 2010 is unforeseeable at this stage.
- *The explosion of knowledge.* Knowledge is the ultimate renewable resource. As the volume of knowledge continues to expand, the pressure to increase the capacity of higher education will rise commensurately, yet it will be impossible for institutions to do more and more of everything. Ultimately, the explosion of knowledge will force institutions to make choices, considering fundamental purposes and values in the process.
- *The end of higher education’s monopoly on the creation and dissemination of knowledge.* Industry is a major player in research, with far greater resources and capacity than higher education. On the dissemination front, the “new providers” are seeking to meet market needs by serving populations of students that are choosing them over traditional institutions. Increasingly, these are global institutions that cross national borders

In the United States especially, higher education is seen as an engine for economic growth.

and redefine how professors teach and students learn.

These reflections on the changing contemporary setting of the university and the need to prepare for a different and unknown future resonate on both sides of the Atlantic. However, H el ene Lamicq, president of the University of Paris 12, in her overview of European issues, pointed out some differences as illustrated by the specific case of French universities. She made a number of cross-cutting points which are crucial to the way the university relates with its external partners, including:

- *The need to involve non-university partners in the teaching and learning process.* Faculty are notoriously reluctant to allow non-academics to participate in curriculum development, and not enough students participate in external “stages” or internships during their university years.
- *The need for financial transparency.* Continuing education is a recent development in which many successful partnerships with non-university bodies have indeed been established. But the university is often incapable of knowing how much this service really costs and therefore for what price it should be sold. The same could be said for technology transfer.
- *Universities must develop institutional partnerships with their main stakeholders,* including public representatives at both local and regional levels. Such partnerships are mutually beneficial for both parties, but faculty tradition-

ally resist such moves and regard university matters as their exclusive responsibility, except where there is clear potential to support research activities.

- *Distrust of the “managerial university”* is even greater in Europe than in North America, and suspicion continues to surround the utilitarian conception of the university. However, change is clearly in the wind. French universities now receive funding from both the national government and regional councils. The latter emphasize regional economic development, and thus are pressing institutions and their faculty members to think about what they do and why.

In order to promote more open policies and change attitudes, Lamicq proposed an open-door policy of accepting all visitors to the institution and simultaneously sending university representatives to all external meetings. External professionals should be encouraged to cooperate with faculty on course delivery, and the criteria for faculty career promotion should also include external commitment. Students are often the best advocates to encourage faculty to become more active externally.

These new realities pose special challenges for European presidents and rectors, who are elected by the faculty and must learn on the job. Like their North American counterparts, however, they live with a different set of realities from that of their faculty colleagues. They are closer to the external stakeholders and serve as a link between the external community and the university.

New realities pose special challenges for European presidents and rectors, who are elected by the faculty and must learn on the job.

Changing Expectations: Serving Students and Society

These forces have a profound impact on institutional and government policies and behaviors. But, participants agreed, it is misleading to talk about the institution as if it were a monolith. The school (or “faculty,” in European parlance) of medicine lives in a world quite different from the school of arts and sciences or engineering. To further complicate matters, the faculty itself is not homogeneous. Even within the same discipline, academics have different interests and respond differently to the same set of environmental and institutional pressures.

In earlier, less complicated times, both institutions and individual faculty members could be more inwardly focused on teaching students and conducting research. Now, as society’s expectations regarding the university are growing, so are demands on faculty members. Participants discussed at length the relationships between institutional responses regarding linkages to society and the behaviors of individual faculty members. Given the historic autonomy of faculty members at institutions on both sides of the Atlantic, participants agreed that if institutions are to be more responsive to the needs of stakeholders, it will take more than simply hoping that individual faculty members will rise to the challenge. The size and complexity of higher education institutions, and the drive to maintain autonomy on the part of their faculty members, work against coherence and institution-wide strategies. Tension between the wishes of individual faculty members and the institutional agenda is ever present. The modern university struggles to reconcile the dual

characteristics of a loose confederation of scholars and a coherent, modern corporate organization. As one participant asked, “Will the faculty member of the future be an independent contractor or a full member of the staff?”

The seminar focused on two areas that are placing major new demands on faculty members: serving students and serving society. Serving students is not new, to be sure, but improving teaching and learning and shifting the balance from being faculty-centered to student-centered have risen to the top of the higher education agenda in many countries in the past decade. Becoming increasingly student-centered poses special challenges in this era of mass education.

Nor is serving society a totally new mission for higher education, either in the United States, with its strong tradition of land-grant universities and community colleges, or in Europe, where many universities were founded in order to contribute to the development of their regional society. As public investment in higher education grows, and as governments question their return on such investment, the topic takes on new urgency. Additionally, the expectation that higher education should play a role in economic development puts added pressure on institutions.

These new demands regarding students and society were explored in some depth, using a number of case studies to examine in practice how the roles and attitudes of faculty have changed as these topics grow in importance.

The seminar focused on two areas that are placing major new demands on faculty members: serving students and serving society.

Public pressure for institutions to provide a sound education and prepare students for the workforce has been an important factor in the drive for enhancing student learning.

Serving Students

Although there are vast differences within Europe and across the Atlantic in the structure of higher education degrees and curricula, the preoccupation with improving learning is a common one. Most U.S. institutions have centers for excellence that provide professional assistance for teaching staff who wish to improve their teaching. The United Kingdom is taking the issue to a national level with its recently created “National Institute for Learning and Teaching,” which plans to accredit or certify university teachers in the art of teaching. The University of Oslo requires all new faculty members to take a formal course on teaching, learning, and student advising. Similarly, the University of Florence improved its graduation rate from 29 percent to 49 percent with a formal program that enables faculty members to help students and prospective students learn about the opportunities and expectations associated with university work and to guide them in their curricular choices. However, John A. DiBiaggio, president of Tufts University, pointed out that, despite such initiatives, there is in general much less time now for direct, informal contact between professors and students, because many aspects of student guidance have been professionalized and given to non-academic staff members.

The movement to improve teaching and learning grows out of several factors. Competition for students is a dominant force in the United States and, increasingly, in the United Kingdom. Public pressure for institutions to provide a sound education and prepare students for the workforce has been an important factor in the drive for enhancing student learning. Legislators are increasingly insistent about documenting results, making institutions more publicly accountable for the quality of their student “products.”

The “rampant market economy” of higher education in the United States, as one

Case Study: Arizona State University

Lattie Coor, president of the Arizona State University, described his institution’s process of refocusing on undergraduate education. The impetus for this reform agenda came from the legislature. Multiple strategies were devised. Colloquia for first-year students were instituted, providing opportunities for more personal engagement and intensive learning opportunities for all first-year students. More senior faculty members were assigned to lower level courses, addressing the common problem of many U.S. research universities that first- and second-year students are taught disproportionately by graduate teaching assistants. Another initiative was the establishment by the university’s Board of Trustees of a clear set of measurable goals.

New pedagogical techniques were introduced, such as increased use of active learning in the classroom. A large survey course in the humanities, with a poor rate of classroom attendance, was redesigned so that the reading materials were put on a CD-Rom. The 160 students worked in teams of four to discuss the material and respond to faculty members’ questions. Attendance and performance improved. Service learning was integrated into parts of the curriculum, and the involvement of undergraduates in research was expanded. Through these and other innovations, the Arizona State University was attempting to recreate the experience of a small undergraduate institution within a large research university, no small challenge for an institution with 32,000 undergraduates.

On the administrative side, the Arizona State University used the techniques of the Total Quality Management movement, which resulted in streamlining administrative procedures such as student registration.

These ambitious reforms present a series of challenges: How can such innovations be universalized and institutionalized? How can the university finance the additional costs of these innovations? How does the university reward faculty members for their investment in teaching and learning when the rewards traditionally have been weighted toward research productivity? How does an institution prepare faculty—current and future—to take on these new challenges?

participant put it, is another formidable pressure. Students have turned into consumers, and the pressures of the market create the risk that quality will be defined largely by the market. Interestingly enough, parents as a pressure group were present in the United States discussion, but not in the European one—perhaps because of the lower funding requirements asked of them.

In Europe, lower levels of competition and low or no student fees make market pressures less dominant in the drive to improve teaching and learning. Students, however, have always been a powerful political force in European universities, and they continue to exert pressure on their institutions, partly because of their presence on university and faculty governing bodies, but also because students often control a significant percentage of the votes in electing new university presidents or rectors. While the idea of the student as a consumer is still not as strong in Europe as in the United States, and the general absence of tuition fees plays a major element in this, students are very much considered participants in university life and constantly remind university leaders of this, demanding accountability and transparency in the teaching and administrative processes.

Serving Society

While North American institutions have a long history of active engagement with the local, regional, and national communities, European involvement is on the rise. Most U.S. institutions explicitly mentioned service to the community in their mission statements, although the level of intensity of the commitment varies greatly from one institution to another. Yet, on both sides of the Atlantic, these linkages raise difficult questions of mission, values, and purpose that yield no easy answers.

While being socially responsible to the surrounding community or to the economic

Case Study: Rutgers University

President Francis Lawrence outlined the multiple efforts of Rutgers to deepen its ties with the community. A recent campus study demonstrated that 20 percent of the faculty are engaged in public service based on their academic expertise and that 5,000 undergraduates participated in community service during one year.

Engagement with the community is central to Rutgers' strategic plan, and the \$12 million in core funding to support 75 projects that has been allocated from the university's budget has successfully leveraged \$96 million in external funding. Examples of these efforts are the Employment Policy and Workforce Development Center, the Institute for Urban Education, the Center for Health Policy, the State Council on Constitutional Studies, and an education initiative in South Africa. On the curricular front, service learning is incorporated in a number of courses. The strategic planning effort identified targets for investment; both the university and the community have reaped the benefits.

The emphasis on service is reflected in Rutgers' reward system. Recently, a merit pay system was instituted for the unionized faculty of its three campuses. A new category of professorship, the Board of Governors Distinguished Service Professorship, was established, providing \$10,000 for the rewarded faculty member to use for professional and academic work. To win this professorship, the faculty member must show extraordinary service over ten years.

These linkages raise difficult questions of mission, values, and purpose that yield no easy answers.

development needs of the region is laudable and useful, what costs are incurred? To what degree should the faculty be distracted from what it does best—teaching and research? Can universities be expected to replace the functions of the state structures, providing social services that are not truly within their mission or scope of responsibility? To what extent, queried one European, is the North American concept of service opportunistic? How many of these linkages ultimately will benefit the institution through enhanced political credibility or enhanced revenues? And, if the service functions are funded at the margins, and not as part of the core funding, is this proof that they are expendable?

Case Study: San Diego Community College System

The San Diego Community College System (SDCC) serves 115,000 to 120,000 students per year across several campuses. Half of the students are enrolled in credit programs. SDCC's mission includes lower division preparation for students who transfer to four-year institutions, technical training, and economic development support. Service to the community is integral to the college's mission, as is the case for all community colleges. The college's strategy is to engage with the community as a matter of course, not on an "as-needed" basis. These long-standing relationships have proved mutually beneficial over the long run. Chancellor Augustine Gallego provided multiple examples of SDCC's involvement with the community. The recent closure of a military base provided an opportunity for the college and the community to plan a joint venture to create an educational and recreational complex. The college sponsors one of six centers for Advanced Technology Development, helping companies transition from a defense to a market focus. Additionally, the college sponsors a High Tech Resource Incubator, providing low-cost services to 15 fledgling companies.

The college also serves as a catalyst and partner in improving social conditions, working with a public agency consortium of many organizations to improve housing and education and to feed the hungry.

The San Diego Community College defines its community not only as local and regional, but also as international. Situated on the Mexican border, the college is at the center of an important commercial crossroads. There are 1.4 million legal border crossings annually at the San Diego border; 42 percent of San Diego exports go to Mexico. Thus, providing opportunities for students and faculty to experience the global dimensions of their study and work is a priority for the college. It provides 17 sabbaticals for faculty to study and travel internationally and has active links with institutional partners around the world.

Case Study: The Erasmus University of Rotterdam

Mary O'Mahony, CRE deputy secretary general, presented the case of the Erasmus University of Rotterdam in its recent developments to serve society. Based in one of Europe's most heavily industrialized and populated regions, which recently has undergone profound restructuring as a result of changes in the economic climate, the university has played a key role in promoting the human resource development aspects of these changes. It has been a leader in linking with other educational providers, including adult and continuing education providers, to ensure that a large variety of needs are met in a rational way—resulting in the "Rotterdam Educational Square," a mechanism that shares both resources and information through an Internet linkup among all providers.

The university also has been instrumental in strengthening ties between educational management and the local municipal administration to ensure optimal collaboration between these bodies. This improved cooperation has led to the creation of the Rotterdam Sustainability Club, which links education, administration, and other players in civil society to contribute to the sustainable development of the region.

The result is that the university is now at the center of Rotterdam's development, and service and commitment to the community have become a central aspect of life at the university, a situation that is mutually beneficial to all players.

The Faculty of the Future: Levers for Change

By what process do changes occur? While there are those who argue that higher education is immutable and highly resistant to change, most agree that change is organic, ongoing, and often invisible except in retrospect. Much of the change that occurs in higher education institutions is either unintentional or highly reactive.

Intentional change is the most difficult. Whose agenda for change should the university embrace—the rector’s or president’s, the government’s, the students’? Assuming that a leader can create a consensus about new directions (a very large assumption indeed), the challenge of how to mobilize energy in service of those innovations is daunting. Changes in the external environment do not translate automatically into internal energy for change. If people do not see the potential benefits of change, or deny the potential risks of maintaining the status quo, little will happen.

At the heart of institutional change lie new behaviors and roles for faculty members. The seminar participants continually returned to three important strategies: persuasion, incentives (of all sorts), and strategic allocation of resources. To a great extent, North American presidents have more latitude with respect to the latter two approaches than do their European counterparts. The art of persuasion, however, is key to the ability of all institutional leaders, who, in the final analysis, cannot successfully move in new directions unless accompanied by a critical mass of institutional members.

Several interesting examples of incentives were presented. Rutgers University has created a new category of professorship, rewarding professors for service to the community. In Italy, universities were granted autonomy ten years ago, permitting them by law to secure contracts and non-governmental research funding. While faculty cannot increase their salaries through external funding, they can purchase equipment. An increasing number of institutions are taking teaching excellence seriously in the awarding of promotion and tenure. Institutional grant programs to encourage the incorporation of new pedagogic practices and technology provide similar incentives. Innovative staff development strategies can also act as incentives for younger faculty members, as at the University of Florence. Rewarding the improved use of new technologies in promoting participatory and open teaching activities among the faculty members has proved successful at the University of New Brunswick, and the University of Paris 12 has a special innovation fund for encouraging exciting faculty developments.

Because so much of the budget in most institutions is devoted to personnel, flexible funding to allocate to strategic priorities is scarce. Yet even modest amounts of funding can have significant results, to improve quality, foster innovation, and assert priorities. As one president pointed out, no department or faculty member wants to be on the “low priority” list. Competition within institutions and among institutions for discretionary

Changes in the external environment do not translate automatically into internal energy for change.

At the heart of institutional change lie new behaviors and roles for faculty members.

funding can serve as a positive force for change.

Finally, the art of persuasion is a key lever for change. In this field, European presidents and rectors, who are elected by their peers, may have greater credibility among their colleagues to lead by persuasion. The distance of the North American president

(and the UK vice-chancellor) from the faculty, resulting from his or her selection by a Board or Council, works against his or her personal credibility to lead the faculty members by persuasion. In both cases, however, the president or rector needs a strong and reliable support network of staff in key positions.

The Leadership Challenge: Shaping Our Destiny

Higher education institutions are difficult ships to steer. The seas are rarely calm, and there are many would-be captains. One president likened leading in higher education to providing direction for a flotilla of ships, ideally all pointed in the same direction, but each boat navigating its own way.

These discussions revealed a wide range of views of the institution and the role of leadership—from collegium to organization. At some points, the cultural divide between continental Europe, with its elected rectors and highly autonomous faculties, and the more managerial model of the United States and the United Kingdom was visible. Continental European academics are sensitive about the concept of strong central leadership, and the tendency for university leaders to be more managerial. North American presidents were more likely to call for a strong center or the importance of seizing “destiny moments” to shape their institutions. Such moments come rarely, said John DiBiaggio, but they can be decisive in an institution’s history. Yet, observed one participant, these moments are best understood in retrospect.

At other times, the range of views was tied more to personal style and values. Robert Hemenway, president of the University of Kansas, led off the session on leadership with a reminder that leaders are not “in control” and that presidents and rectors should bring a certain humility to their work. Kenneth Edwards, former vice chancellor of the

University of Leicester and CRE president, observed that an important role of leadership is to provide focus, to make sense of the complex external forces to those inside the institution, and to interpret the institution to those outside. He stressed the importance of good listening and of balancing the need for speed in decision making with the importance of consultation.

At the end of the day, said Edwards, the quality of an institution depends on the creativity and dedication of its faculty. The role of leadership should be seen in this light. But he warned of the need for the leader to pursue a clear strategy, and not just favor the accumulation of individual ideas, especially when outside demands multiply and require focused action. Not surprisingly, as the discussion progressed, it sought an equilibrium between the extremes of grand leadership and historic moments and a more facilitative role. Issues of leadership and change are necessarily ambiguous, defying generalizations, although participants considered that the president’s or rector’s main contribution would be to optimize the conditions for individual faculty and staff to exploit fully their own potential. The mix of national and institutional cultures, personalities, and structures will always yield a complex and unpredictable set of circumstances and responses. Leaders have no choice but to try to be intentional about the change process, but the reality is always messy.

An important role of leadership is to provide focus, to make sense of the complex external forces to those inside the institution, and to interpret the institution to those outside.

Post-Script: The Declaration of a European Area of Higher Education

As if proof were needed of the fast-changing environment of higher education, Andris Barblan, secretary general of CRE, reported on the June 1999 Bologna agreement signed by the ministers of education from 29 European countries. In the document, these leaders recognized that “a Europe of knowledge is . . . an irreplaceable factor for social and human growth and an indispensable component to consolidate and enrich the European citizenship, capable of giving its citizens the necessary competence to face the challenges of the new millennium, together with an awareness of shared values and belonging to a common social and cultural space.”

This shared recognition of the strategic importance of higher education is followed in the declaration by a series of objectives, which the ministers collectively consider to be of primary importance. They commit themselves to coordinating policies in order for these objectives to be reached within a ten-year period. The main objectives, including the adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees, the adop-

tion of a system based on undergraduate and graduate cycles, the establishment of a credit transfer or accumulation system, and the promotion of student and staff mobility, are all clearly aimed at promoting the employability and international competitiveness of the European labor market. These main objectives are backed up by the ministers’ promotion of the need to develop European cooperation in quality assurance, curriculum development, and research.

It is clear that these objectives will have serious implications for the European faculty of the future regarding the way most aspects of teaching and research are undertaken. Such initiatives could easily also affect, directly or indirectly, the role of the faculty on the western shores of the Atlantic. The faculty of the future will have an increasingly important role to play in the development of a knowledge society on both continents, and thus in fueling and guiding the engines of this new knowledge society—a future of increased potential, and increased responsibility.

The faculty of the future will have an increasingly important role to play in the development of a knowledge society on both continents.

List of Participants

North American Participants

John T. Casteen III, President
University of Virginia

Lattie Coor, President
Arizona State University

Lois B. DeFleur, President
State University of New York
Binghamton

John DiBiaggio, President
Tufts University

Edward T. Foote II, President
University of Miami

**Augustine P. Gallego,
Chancellor**
San Diego Community
College District

Robert Giroux, President
Association of Universities
and Colleges of Canada

**Madeleine F. Green, Vice
President**
American Council on
Education

**Robert E. Hemenway,
Chancellor**
The University of Kansas

Emita Hill, Chancellor
Indiana University Kokomo

Stanley O. Ikenberry, President
American Council on
Education

Shirley Strum Kenny, President
State University of New York
at Stony Brook

**Claude Lajeunesse, President
and Vice-Chancellor**
Ryerson Polytechnic
University

Bette E. Landman, President
Beaver College

Fran Lawrence, President
Rutgers, The State
University of New Jersey

**Rev. Edward A. Malloy, C.S.C.,
President**
University of Notre Dame

**Ian D.C. Newbould, President
and Vice-Chancellor**
Mount Allison University

Julio S. León, President
Missouri Southern State
College

Robert A. Scott, President
Ramapo College of New
Jersey

Allen Lee Sessoms, President
Queens College

**Elizabeth A. Zinser,
Chancellor—Lexington
Campus**
University of Kentucky

European Participants

Alberto Amaral, former Rector
Universidade de Porto

**Andris Barblan, Secrétaire
Général**
CRE: The Association of
European Universities

Paolo Blasi, Rector
Università degli Studi di
Firenze

Elie Cohen, Président
Université Paris IX
Dauphine

**Michael Daxner, former
President**
Carl von Ossietzky
Universität

Pierre Ducrey, Président
Réseau UNICA, ancien
recteur, Université de
Lausanne

**Kenneth Edwards, Vice-
Chancellor**
University of Leicester

Hélène Lamicq, Présidente
Université de Paris 12–Val
de Marne

Daniel O'Hare, President
Dublic City University

**Mary O'Mahony, Deputy
Secretary General**
CRE: The Association of
European Universities

**Lewis Purser, Programme
Officer**
CRE: The Association of
European Universities

Lucy Smith, former Rector
Universitet I Oslo

Luc Weber, ancien Recteur
Université de Genève

Vera Zobotkina, Vice-Rector
Kaliningrad State University

ACE Board of Directors

Officers

Michael F. Adams, President
University of Georgia
Chair

Janet L. Holmgren, President
Mills College
Vice Chair/Chair-Elect

John A. DiBiaggio, President
Tufts University
Immediate Past Chair

Augustine P. Gallego, Chancellor
San Diego Community
College District
Secretary

Molly C. Broad, President
University of North Carolina

Freeman A. Hrabowski III, President
University of Maryland,
Baltimore County

Francis L. Lawrence, President
Rutgers, The State
University of New Jersey

William E. Troutt, President
Rhodes College

Stanley O. Ikenberry, President
American Council on
Education

Class of 2000

Robert M. Berdahl, Chancellor
University of California,
Berkeley

Molly C. Broad, President
University of North Carolina

Philip R. Day Jr., Chancellor
City College of San
Francisco

John A. DiBiaggio, President
Tufts University

Vera King Farris, President
The Richard Stockton
College of New Jersey

Freeman A. Hrabowski III, President
University of Maryland,
Baltimore County

Neil Rudenstine, President
Harvard University

William Segura, Chancellor
Texas State Technical
College System

Class of 2001

Michael F. Adams, President
University of Georgia

David G. Carter, President
Eastern Connecticut State
University

Augustine P. Gallego, Chancellor
San Diego Community
College District

E. Gordon Gee, Chancellor
Vanderbilt University

Peter Ku, Chancellor
Seattle Community College
District

Jerry Sue Thornton, President
Cuyahoga Community
College

William E. Troutt, President
Rhodes College

J. William Wenrich, Chancellor
Dallas County Community
College District

Class of 2002

Nancy S. Dye, President
Oberlin College

James A. Hefner, President
Tennessee State University

Janet L. Holmgren, President
Mills College

Gladys Styles Johnston, Chancellor
University of Nebraska at
Kearney

William E. Kirwan, President
The Ohio State University

Michael S. McPherson, President
Macalester College

Peggy R. Williams, President
Ithaca College

Elected Officers of Associations—Ex-Officio for Three-Year Terms

American Association of Community Colleges
Carolyn Williams, President
Bronx Community College

American Association of State Colleges and Universities
Julio S. Leon, President
Missouri Southern State
College

**Elected Officers of
Associations—Ex-Officio for
Three-Year Terms, *continued***

**Association of American
Colleges and Universities**

Thomas F. Flynn, President
Millikin University

**Association of American
Universities**

Francis L. Lawrence,
President
Rutgers, The State
University of New Jersey

**Association of Catholic
Colleges and Universities**

Thomas Scanlan, FSC,
President
Manhattan College

**Association of Jesuit Colleges
and Universities**

Harold Ridley, SJ, President
Loyola College in Maryland

**Council of Independent
Colleges**

Margaret A. McKenna,
President
Lesley College

**National Association for Equal
Opportunity in Higher
Education**

Shirley A.R. Lewis, President
Paine College

**National Association of
Independent Colleges and
Universities**

Lawrence J. DeNardis,
President
University of New Haven

**National Association of State
Universities and Land-Grant
Colleges**

Lattie F. Coor, President
Arizona State University

**Elected Officers of
Associations—
Ex-Officio for One-Year
Terms**

**Council for Advancement and
Support of Education**

Walter Harrison, President
University of Hartford

**University Continuing
Education Association**

Michael J. Offerman,
Dean/Executive Director
University of Wisconsin
Learning Innovations

**Washington Higher Education
Secretariat**

Judith S. Eaton, President
Council for Higher
Education Accreditation

Executive Secretary

Irene L. Gomberg,
Vice President
American Council on
Education



American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle NW
Washington DC 20036-1193
(202) 939-9418
Fax: (202) 785-8056
www.acenet.edu