

What makes academic leadership so challenging?

EVERY DAY, academic leaders make decisions that fly in the face of conventional management models. Rather than seeking greater efficiency and order, they are guiding their institutions toward activity that seems disorderly and hard to direct. They understand that today's academy must cultivate sometimes unruly intellectual passion to discover new directions for scholarship and real-world engagement.

Our research at thriving universities and colleges shows that leaders who favor such chaotic activity are using specific practices to uncover hidden strengths and create opportunities for those strengths to evolve. Rather than requiring more effort, the strategies they use free the university and its key actors to achieve a valuable degree of flexibility.

As a result, some top leaders now behave less as CEOs and more as academic partners or entrepreneurs. In fundraising campaigns, for example, they focus on programs the institution hopes to fund rather than capital improvements. These leaders tend to see the bigger institutional picture, know its narrative and communicate the story consistently.

Continue reading to explore this new model of academic leadership in CHAOS AND THE NEW ACADEMY. This work-in-progress illuminates our findings through analogies to concepts in other disciplines and examples of the ordered-disorder principle at work in actual institutions. We welcome your comments and suggestions to Susan Frost at sfrost@susanfrostconsulting.com.



CHAOS *and the* NEW ACADEMY

by Susan Frost *and* Aimee Pozorski

Something there is that doesn't love a wall

—ROBERT FROST, 1914

IN ROBERT FROST'S famous poem about two neighbors repairing a stone fence they share, the speaker reflects: "Before I built a wall I'd ask to know / What I was walling in or walling out." When his neighbor insists that "good fences make good neighbors," he is not so sure. Certain that there is something that does not love a wall—something exceptional, something rare—he wonders about the value of imposed boundaries. What is the danger of walling something out—of separating entities, ideas, lives? Fences may guard against chaos by imposing a border. But in warding off chaos, they may wall off much more. Friendship, collaborative opportunities, shared resources or knowledge may be lost.

Webster defines chaos as "any place or condition of total disorder or confusion." Contemporary scholars theorize, however, that an underlying order characterizes apparently disordered systems. Thinking about the potential of chaos, then, rather than its dangers, we ask in this article what the idea of chaos can offer leaders that the seemingly ordered management models of the last few decades have failed to provide. For the leaders of most universities, the very appearance of disorder is daunting, even if what produces it is as explicable as a mathematical formula or a cure for an ill. After all, we might ask, who among us is equipped to lead a university not *away from* chaos, but *toward* it?

As an attempt to answer these questions, this article discusses how leaders might use the notion of chaos to help their institutions advance. We challenge leaders to accept a kind of *ordered disorder* as an alternative to mending walls, a practice that is more likely to restrain such assets as passion and knowledge than to protect them. We draw on studies we have conducted for more than a decade featuring leading universities and colleges that have increased in quality and scope consistently, despite pressures to retain the status quo. We show, for example, how leaders of outstandingly progressive institutions take specific steps to help scholars push knowledge through traditional walls despite the potential for disorder. Their actions challenge the once-stark divides between

UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES THAT HAVE INCREASED IN QUALITY AND SCOPE CONSISTENTLY FOSTER OVERLAPPING INTERESTS, NEW ALLIANCES AND COMMUNAL SUPPORT FOR THE SOMETIMES CHAOTIC INTERACTIONS THAT CAN LEAD TO NEW IDEAS.



disciplines in order to foster overlapping interests, new alliances and communal support for the sometimes chaotic interactions that can lead to new ideas.

Since these trends challenge common assumptions, they are most readily understood not only through analysis of examples, but also through analogy. Concepts of the frontier, the global city and even cyberspace offer ways to understand how communities can work without (or despite) traditional boundaries. Historically, individuals formed communities by establishing borders or staking claims in a lasting fashion. But now communities are places where people move in and out—places defined less by fences, or structural boundaries, and more by dynamic interaction among the members and with other communities as well. In these places, the communal dismantling of fences, stone by stone, has resulted not in chaos and destruction, but rather in chaos and *construction*—the building not of walls, but of relationships that foster new work and ideas.

The same is true of universities. Just as new cultures are redefining some communities, new forms of knowledge—and even new ways to produce that knowledge—are redefining some universities. This is especially true where scholars and leaders feel free to move in and out of marked territories in search of new ideas and methods. Scholars in these institutions are staking new claims across the sciences, arts and humanities. While those claims do not involve new lands, they do involve pioneering theories and new connections among existing fields. They also involve discoveries about how the world functions and how to apply this knowledge to the benefit of individuals and society.

How are claims like these taking hold? The leaders and institutions that foster them seem to look with favor on chaotic activity. They understand that, despite a breakdown in walls that have been maintained so carefully for so long, what emerges is a new kind of order that contains the shapes of the future.

New Sites, New Claims

We base our ideas about the relationship between chaos and the academy on three studies we conducted that show how some universities and colleges are making new claims—both by taking down the walls and by making new discoveries. In earlier arguments, we have

JUST AS NEW CULTURES ARE REDEFINING SOME COMMUNITIES, NEW FORMS OF KNOWLEDGE—AND EVEN NEW WAYS TO PRODUCE THAT KNOWLEDGE—ARE REDEFINING SOME UNIVERSITIES. THIS IS ESPECIALLY TRUE WHERE SCHOLARS AND LEADERS FEEL FREE TO MOVE IN AND OUT OF MARKED TERRITORIES IN SEARCH OF NEW IDEAS AND METHODS.



FIRST, IDEAS BUILD INSTITUTIONS, AND THE BEST IDEAS EMERGE FROM NEW DIRECTIONS WITHIN THE INSTITUTION RATHER THAN FROM EXTERNAL SOURCES. SECOND, NEW DEVELOPMENTS TEND TO THRIVE WHEN THEY RISE OUT OF ORGANIC GROWTH RATHER THAN BEING IMPOSED BY FORMAL STRUCTURES.

compared the development of universities to the evolution of some cities from village to metropolis to global city. Because the global city is characterized by an open culture, fluid mobility and flexible systems, we believe this model could benefit many universities that seem confined by unnecessary walls and rules, barricades and bureaucratic offices. Leaders who encourage openness and flexibility begin with two assumptions. First, ideas build institutions, and the best ideas emerge from new directions within the institution rather than from external sources. Second, new developments tend to thrive when they rise out of organic growth rather than being imposed by formal structures (Frost, Chopp and Pozorski, 2003; Frost and Chopp, 2004).¹

Leading Practices at Leading Universities

Now we argue that chaos provides a new way to understand these assumptions and use them to help new ideas develop and take hold. The first study draws on our qualitative examination of top research universities including Brown, Columbia, Harvard, Princeton, Stanford and others. Begun to reveal the university-building strategies those institutions use, the study consisted of comprehensive telephone interviews with leaders and site visits lasting several days. To set up the visits, we sought out leaders and scholars who seemed to be accomplishing important change and met face-to-face with twelve to twenty people on each campus. We also tracked university-level changes at the schools that compose the Association of American Universities (AAU). Made up of the top research institutions, these 62 schools in the U.S. and Canada set the pace for academic research in the world.

Although some consider these elite private institutions to be staid or even stale, we observed several outlooks or practices that contradict that view. These universities are taking steps to increase both their focus on strategic areas and their flexibility to act. Rather than developing academic programs incrementally or across the board, they have created programs to advance specific ambitions. Some, for example, are using income from patents and licenses to speed the development of faculty research because it is promising, whether or not complex internal requirements about supporting such projects have been met. Then they use the projects

¹ Throughout this paper we use the term *university* to apply to the full range of higher education institutions, from those granting doctorates to baccalaureate and community colleges.



**STRONG PROGRAMS
ARISE OUT OF FACULTY
PASSION RATHER THAN
MARKETPLACE FACTORS
OR OTHER EXTERNAL
DRIVERS. RATHER THAN
FENCING IN NEW ENERGY
AND IDEAS, THE
STRUCTURES WE FOUND
FOSTERED THAT WORK IN
IMPORTANT BUT ALMOST
INVISIBLE WAYS.**

to increase the distinctiveness of the entire institution, presenting it as one university, not just a collection of schools.

Additionally the leaders of these institutions recognize that strong and sustainable programs arise out of faculty passion rather than marketplace factors or other external drivers.

At several universities, for example, scholars now compete for more kinds of seed funds to begin initiatives. With few formal restrictions, those funds encourage the trial-and-error exploration of new ideas. Once scholars take their ideas into the next phase of development, subtle structural support from the administration continues to nourish the work. We found no instance of structure leading the process. Rather than fencing in new energy and ideas, the structures we found fostered that work in important but almost invisible ways.

Perhaps the leaders are reacting to the fact that creative faculty members find resources to accomplish their own goals and to build interdisciplinary relationships with others. An example of this practice is a humanities council one university formed, not simply to coordinate management of the departments, but to enrich academic offerings.

Now some of the council's ventures attract external funds to the university on their own. The amount of support such a council deploys is important, of course, but faculty ownership is its central strength.

Another practice concerns reporting lines, which are less crucial to strong development than personal dynamics. Like other high-performing institutions, the universities we studied invest more in developing core areas directly than in articulating a comprehensive strategic plan, and they achieve their aims by emphasizing people more than organizational design. Although it can be chaotic, this form of development generates energy. The focus on individuals sustains partnerships among faculty and leaders that seem supportive and entrepreneurial at the same time.

**THE UNIVERSITIES WE
STUDIED INVEST MORE
IN DEVELOPING CORE
AREAS DIRECTLY THAN
IN ARTICULATING A
COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGIC
PLAN. THEY EMPHASIZE
PEOPLE MORE THAN
ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN.**

Fourteen Colleges, a Singular Department

Our second study expands this understanding of progressive practices by examining an innovative liberal arts program. Sunoikisis, a virtual classics department, offers collaborative



educational programs to fourteen liberal arts colleges that belong to a consortium, the Associated Colleges of the South (ACS). With support from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the consortium and the colleges founded Sunoikisis in 1995 to expand the scope and curriculum of small classics departments. A blend of on-campus teaching with inter-institutional instruction, the courses include a weekly on-line lecture from a faculty member, an on-line question-and-response session in which students share thoughts on lecture materials and a weekly on-campus tutorial with a classicist.

In 2002, ACS invited us to investigate the strengths and weaknesses of the program to help leaders improve it as it evolves (Frost and Olsen, 2005). Our study shows that Sunoikisis offers an effective combination of intellectual interaction, dedication to liberal arts learning and use of cutting-edge technology to advance that learning. As the first of four important gains, Sunoikisis increases the scope of classics education, accomplishing the purpose for which it was formed. Faculty and students clearly recognized the value the broader range of expertise brought to the courses and the resulting intellectual stimulation.

In addition, collaboration has led to a network that achieves more than planners set out to accomplish. Especially remarkable in a discipline that is more known for individual effort, the Sunoikisis network helps scholars blend ideas. It has influenced the way faculty have designed the program, taught the classes and conducted research. With some humor, one respondent noted: “Basically, we [classicists] are all cave dwellers: collegial but proprietary about what should be in our courses. . . .The reading list [for the Sunoikisis course] is not what any one individual would have done...the end result was good for everyone.” Describing their teaching style as seminar-like to engage the students as well as the other classicists in the virtual classroom, other respondents noted that teaching in the program also improved their teaching in more traditional classes outside Sunoikisis.

Building on collaboration across institutions, Sunoikisis produces gains for the colleges that go beyond its disciplinary span. For example, Sunoikisis has helped faculty form close professional ties, not across one campus, but across fourteen campuses, and has provided professional development opportunities that individual departments could not support. One respondent commented that team teaching led to more publishable papers by “raising the bar in preparation,

SUNOIKISIS USES TECHNOLOGY TO BLEND IDEAS, EXPAND INTERESTS AND ENRICH COLLABORATION. BY POOLING INTELLECTUAL RESOURCES, THE PROGRAM BROADENS SCOPE WITHOUT DIVERTING FACULTY OR STUDENTS AWAY FROM LIBERAL ARTS APPROACHES TO LEARNING.



presentation and thought.” For their part, the students enjoyed taking more responsibility for learning. As one student said, “The professor is not intervening and telling me what to do, so it was really cool. I did things when I wanted to.”

Like the faculty and students, leaders saw the benefits of this collaboration. Some were surprised, though, that formerly competitive colleges could collaborate so well. “I was skeptical at first,” said one dean, “because we compete hard for students and for faculty. This academic collaboration allows us to improve our program, however, and I hope we can find other topics for collaboration as we move along.”

Finally, Sunoikisis uses technology to blend ideas, expand interests and enrich collaboration, rather than merely to make instruction more efficient. To reduce costs, some institutions use a technique called *unbundling*, or assigning some technology-related teaching tasks to less qualified staff. Sunoikisis also unbundles some instructional components, not to reduce costs, but to allow scholars to teach in their special areas of expertise. By pooling intellectual resources, the program broadens scope without diverting faculty or students away from liberal arts approaches to learning.

A Close Look at One Case

A third study of progressive practices describes a cumulative project to advance Emory, a research university that has increased its national prominence steadily over the last 20 years. Leaders used two approaches to guide Emory’s development from 1990 to 2003: multi-year collaborative projects for faculty and analyses of strategies the faculty used to collaborate on academic work. By working from the center to increase faculty strength while investigating the grass roots methods the faculty devised on their own, the leaders hoped to accelerate the rate of change the community could achieve.

The projects took three forms: a seminar series to encourage cross-disciplinary discourse, research and teaching; conversations among several hundred faculty members about major issues and how leaders might use them to help Emory evolve; and faculty-led planning committees to study the university’s teaching and research missions and recommend ways to strengthen them. Although their purposes varied widely, the projects shared a few key traits. When designing the efforts, university leaders took special care to involve faculty in every step, from refining the topic to selecting the scholars to be involved. Then project leaders established a work culture that was more like an academic endeavor than an administrative exercise.

**PROJECT LEADERS
ESTABLISHED A
WORK CULTURE THAT
WAS MORE LIKE AN
ACADEMIC ENDEAVOR
THAN AN
ADMINISTRATIVE
EXERCISE.**



They adopted a casual work style to accommodate changing schedules and irregular collaboration hours, used graduate students to manage details and revised documents extensively to include as many points of view as possible. These practices increased the faculty’s influence on the outcomes and began the process of weaving new practices into the cultures that helped produce them.

When collaborating pushed participants to consider new methods or approaches, they worked hard actually to learn those methods and allow them to influence the project. Although some resisted at first, most persisted until they found a mutually acceptable new approach. One scholar noted that working with scholars in other disciplines had changed his professional life. “I saw it as a benchmark in my intellectual development,” he said, adding that it gave him more confidence as a teacher and citizen of the community (Frost and Jean, 2004, p. 1).

The analyses, which were designed to reveal successful collaborative practices, focused on intellectual initiatives and how they form and flourish in the Emory environment. One looked, for instance, at scholarly interest in religion by faculty members who were not formally in that field and at the benefits of faculty research in the university’s metropolitan area of Atlanta. These investigations showed that vibrant academic programs tend to have a problem-based mission and depend on the leadership of one or two scholars who have vision, political skill and the ability to draw on existing collegial networks. The practices the scholars naturally developed to manage the programs tended to expand the networks as the programs evolved. Most programs had small formal structures, for example, but swept in larger numbers of collaborators to help accomplish the academic gains. Although

VIBRANT ACADEMIC PROGRAMS TEND TO HAVE A PROBLEM-BASED MISSION AND DEPEND ON THE LEADERSHIP OF ONE OR TWO SCHOLARS WHO HAVE VISION, POLITICAL SKILL AND THE ABILITY TO DRAW ON EXISTING COLLEGIAL NETWORKS.

FACULTY WHO MIGHT NOT FIT WITHIN TRADITIONAL BORDERS FLOURISHED IN PROGRAMS THAT CROSS THOSE LINES.

governance practices varied, when committees rather than individuals made decisions, the programs seemed more likely to thrive (Frost et al, 2004).

Such collaborative programs not only produced collective gains, they benefited individual scholars as well. Program leaders reported, for example, that faculty who might not fit within traditional borders flourished in programs that cross those lines.

Some leaders even described their program as a “refuge” for intellectual refreshment. One scholar from the humanities said: “It’s just great fun. . . . People tell me that they look forward to this more than anything each week. . . . My whole academic life has been radically enhanced



by the opportunity to talk with physicists and medical doctors” (Frost et al, 2004).

The three studies we have described originated separately. When we reflected on the findings, however, we were struck by similarities and common refrains, especially the important roles played by those who navigate borders and networks well. Ultimately, opening walls that divide an institution has real effects not only on the work of leaders and scholars at these schools, but also on the outcomes they produce.

Leading toward Chaos

Our studies show that new claims arise when leaders look for hidden strengths purposefully and push them forward to evolve into something new. They know the academy can advance, for example, when apparently disorganized groups of faculty pursue unrelated work or when unconnected coalitions of people and projects shape the future in seemingly random ways. Beneath this chaotic activity we found the quiet (or sometimes noisy) churn of productive action and a determined order that emerges, it seems, despite itself.

We also found scholars who are working hard to open walls and leaders who are using those openings as assets to help the institution mature. Rather than requiring more effort, such strategies free the university and its key actors to achieve a valuable degree of flexibility. This is not to say that the leaders are discussing the merits of chaos in their planning sessions! But it *appears* as if they are, and this is what interests us. How are they moving forward? Rather than encouraging disorder directly, we believe that certain strategic exchanges are taking place.

Using Chaos, Opening Walls

To advance academic achievement, some leaders exchange the mending of walls for the construction of openings in them. At Sunoikisis, for example, technology makes reliance on fixed borders not only impractical, but also impossible, and so leaders exchanged fixed borders and discrete work for open borders and shared work. They underscore our previous findings that vibrant intellectual work depends more on the passions of scholars than on the structures institutions have built to organize knowledge. When those structures become confining, scholars go around or even through them to accomplish their original goals and more. Colleagues who meet when they join a network to pursue one question may go on to compete for grants in other new areas, team teach new classes or write articles or books together.

**THE ACADEMY
CAN ADVANCE WHEN
APPARENTLY DISORGANIZED
GROUPS OF FACULTY
PURSUE SEEMINGLY
UNRELATED WORK.
BENEATH THIS CHAOTIC
ACTIVITY WE FOUND
A DETERMINED ORDER
THAT EMERGES, IT SEEMS,
DESPITE ITSELF.**



A UNIVERSITY GROWS WHEN FACULTY AND RESOURCES CAN CIRCULATE FROM DEPARTMENT TO DEPARTMENT, CENTER TO CENTER AND UNIVERSITY TO UNIVERSITY. THIS CAPACITY TO MOVE FREELY MARKS A PROGRESSIVE INSTITUTION.

The open-ended design of the networks can produce myriad combinations of knowledge and skill.

Now we see how a leader who welcomes potentially chaotic activity can help the academy advance despite pressures to retain the status quo. A university grows when faculty and resources can circulate from department to department, center to center and university to university. This capacity to move freely, so like the movement in and out of the global city, marks a progressive institution.

In earlier work we compared the development of universities to the evolution of some cities from village to metropolis to global city (Frost and Chopp, 2004; Frost, Chopp and Pozorski, 2004). While the village represents a close-knit enclave where stakeholders share basic values and engage in civic debate, and the metropolis features a strong bureaucracy and central leadership, the global city relies on networks, blurred borders and strategic projects to move forward (Sassen, 2000). This model could benefit many universities.

At a university that resembles the metropolis, structures are fixed, and over time, they determine its culture. Conversely, a university that resembles a global city privileges the essence of its mission over the strict arrangements that define a more regularly-ordered place. Like other strong institutions, it is defined by its culture, which, in turn, influences how good work is rewarded, leaders are named, funds are allotted and how other more bureaucratic aspects of everyday life are managed. An institution that encourages departments to share faculty, resources and credit, for example, resembles the global city itself.

Other gains include the symbolic value faculty assign to an institution's support for specific networks and opportunities. Time and opportunity to pursue questions through a new lens "purely for the sake of doing it" are two commodities scholars seek (Frost and Jean, 2004). Because they are accustomed to collaborating across departments on top of their internal duties, scholars in one study gave clear credit to the institution or leader who supported their collaboration, especially when the usual evaluation metrics did not recognize those contributions.

Pursuing work through open walls also poses potential obstacles, especially when leaders value orderly management. When we talk about the new, even diverging values of scholars, we are talking about interdisciplinary coalitions among faculty that run counter to traditional organizational models. While budgets, dates, deadlines and other requirements drive the management of these programs, the rigor of most departmental structures is missing. A scholar's need to advance through the faculty ranks presents a special barrier because



promotion and tenure rely on the judgment of one's departmental peers. When evidence of sound work remains one step removed from the core, insightful decisions about its worth and importance may be harder to achieve.

Leaders as Academic Partners and Entrepreneurs

Asking how progressive leaders encourage chaos led us to recognize a second exchange—the leader's transition from CEO to academic partner and entrepreneur. Whereas their predecessors might have functioned comfortably in a web of bureaucracy, the leaders we studied allow themselves and their constituents to move freely among their areas of interest or expertise. They seem to defy those observers who note frequently that presidents' roles have changed over the last 20 years to concentrate almost wholly on fundraising duties and leave little time for hands-on leadership inside the institution.

**NOW SOME PRESIDENTS
ADVANCE THEIR
INSTITUTIONS
FROM THE INSIDE OUT,
WORKING MORE AS
ACADEMIC PARTNERS
OR ENTREPRENEURS.**

Our evidence suggests that some top leaders are not relinquishing their role as university builders, but exchanging one form of advancement for another. Presidents once worked from the outside in—building the strength of the faculty mainly through development campaigns, for instance. Now some presidents advance their institutions from the inside out, working more as academic partners or entrepreneurs. For example, many fundraising campaigns currently list academic programs along with buildings as fundraising targets

or even replace the usual capital improvements with programs the institution hopes to fund. Our studies suggest that leaders who use a campaign to build faculty strength tend to see the bigger institutional picture, know its narrative and communicate the story consistently.

They seem to be forming a new generation of presidents, provosts and deans who join with entrepreneurial program leaders and other coalition-building scholars to bring together various aspects of the institution rather than allowing traditional academic structures to continue to fence off the parts. They are challenging not the values of the academy, but the value of its structures, which have become so embedded that they have taken on the quality of a value.

But more than that, using chaos successfully means recognizing that new claims can emerge only if they have the freedom to grow organically, rather than from more internally focused bureaucratic impositions. We saw this when one

**THEY ARE CHALLENGING
NOT THE VALUES OF
THE ACADEMY, BUT THE
VALUE OF ITS STRUCTURES,
WHICH HAVE BECOME SO
EMBEDDED THAT THEY
HAVE TAKEN ON THE
QUALITY OF A VALUE.**



ALTHOUGH
COLLABORATIVE
NETWORKS CAN BE
DIFFICULT TO MANAGE,
WE HAVE SEEN THEM
INCREASE INSTITUTIONAL
PRESTIGE, ADVANCE
COMMERCIAL
RELATIONSHIPS,
ENCOURAGE NEW
DESIGNS IN TEACHING
AND LEARNING AND
INTRODUCE HUMANISTIC
VALUES INTO
PUBLIC DEBATE.

progressive university in our study referred to its central structures not as buildings, but as *faculties*, where *people*—not the places that house them—worked deliberately and passionately together. We saw this when studying Sunoikisis, with the vibrant connections that electronic media have to offer. And we saw this at Emory, where leaders did not require scholars to work together toward a common cause, but noticed when they did and supported those natural efforts.

Leaders at other institutions, however, may not be using the idea of chaos to full advantage. Although the collaborative networks we have investigated can be difficult to manage, we have seen them increase institutional prestige, advance commercial relationships, encourage new designs in teaching and learning and introduce humanistic values into public debate. Institutions are more productive when a leader amplifies the best ideas emerging from many different directions rather

than making limiting choices between competing goods.

We have seen leaders use the assets we are describing to produce gains in research universities, liberal arts colleges and community colleges as well. Rather than viewing new claims as a daily distraction or worse, they are using the energy those claims produce to encompass the core and programs once relegated to the margins. In some cases, the leaders' outlooks are so different from previous generations that we believe they are encouraging a third exchange—from institution as ivory tower to institution as problem-solver with the world.

University in the World

During a time when leaders, particularly presidents, feel pressure to translate academic work to the community, to boards of directors and to donors who expect academia to address real-world problems, the third exchange seeks to recast the relationship between the academy and the larger world. In many ways this intention is not new. Universities have always been aware of the need to have a mission in the world. Some help neighborhoods in their areas to develop economic strength; others address more wide-reaching regional needs. Except for land grant universities, which have a specific mission to help their states develop strengths, many institutions traditionally advance these external missions more as corporate bodies than as academic institutions.



The new claims we see are enabling scholars to serve the region, the nation or the globe as *academics*, which is their more logical role. One visible example concerns the AIDS crisis and the many ways scholars and institutions are trying to ease the problem medically, sociologically and economically. Working with significant support from President Bush's Emergency Fund for AIDS Relief, a \$17 million federal grant in February 2004 with another \$90 million to follow over five years, researchers from Harvard, Columbia and other universities have accepted the task of easing the plight of AIDS in several countries in Africa. Although Nigerian physicians have criticized Harvard for delaying a program to treat AIDS patients, we are impressed that top scholars and research institutions have exchanged some of the time and attention traditionally devoted to discovery and teaching for work that seems more like a form of service. Universities that resemble the global city, however, are more likely to expand definitions of academic claims.

An international community of graduate business students, professionals and faculty known as Net Impact provides another example of the crucial exchange between the university and the world. Seeking ways to use the power of business to create a better world, Net Impact addresses corporate social responsibility, environmentally sustainable business and social enterprise—topics often forgotten in conventional coursework but essential to modern business practice. Now some Net Impact chapters are helping the United Nations advance the International Year of Microcredit. Their goal is to help micro-entrepreneurs, especially in developing countries, use small loans (\$100 in some cases) to develop thriving businesses that contribute to stronger local economies.

**SUCH PRACTICES
DEMONSTRATE THAT
IT IS NO LONGER USEFUL
TO SAY THAT THE
CONTEMPLATIVE
APPROACH OF ACADEMICS
IS DIVORCED FROM THE
TANGIBLE NEEDS OF THE
REST OF SOCIETY.**

As both examples demonstrate, scholars and their work in the world lie at the heart of this exchange. Now some institutions are foregrounding the unique assets their scholars can offer. For example, some are systematically reducing the lag between the development of findings and public awareness of that knowledge by providing editing support for junior faculty who need publications in time for tenure decisions, press briefings that translate research reports into more readily usable forms and investments in research pipelines that address immediate needs of specific populations without interruption. Such practices demonstrate that it is no longer useful, or even

accurate, to say that the contemplative approach of academics is divorced from the tangible needs of the rest of society.



Introducing external audiences to academic work also brings other, more internal, gains. Some programs attract major donors who are more interested in the problems their investment will address than in previous institutional ties. These entrepreneurial donors are more likely to invest in the right academic expertise or location than honor their own undergraduate connections. The ties donors form with individual scholars can also be key, encouraging leaders and scholars to approach donors as a team.

While the dynamics that define these three exchanges are positive, they can also have dampening effects. As we said earlier, these programs question traditional academic structures, and they may question administrative lines as well. Whereas provosts and deans have been charged to plan academic programs, now presidents are joining scholars across departments and schools to move on those fronts. Whereas presidents and their heads of external relations once raised funds, now scholars are joining those teams. These new behaviors argue for team approaches that do more than merely duplicate the work individuals have performed in the past.

Taken together, these exchanges suggest that the very absence of long-trusted boundaries signals a transformation to an academy where creative leaders are helping scholars solve contemporary problems and collaborate across boundaries to define new routes to knowledge production. When chaotic activity and not the appearance of order becomes the goal, leaders are free to advance ideas rather than build fences to contain them. Instead of attempting to mend the walls of bureaucracy, they are backing dynamic forces that allow new claims to benefit not only scholars and disciplines, but also universities themselves and the vibrant global village they both resemble and serve.

**THESE NEW BEHAVIORS
ARGUE FOR TEAM
APPROACHES THAT
DO MORE THAN MERELY
DUPLICATE THE WORK
INDIVIDUALS HAVE
PERFORMED.**

SUSAN FROST IS A VISITING PROFESSOR IN THE GRADUATE INSTITUTE OF THE LIBERAL ARTS AT EMORY UNIVERSITY, A SENIOR FELLOW AT THE INSTITUTE OF HIGHER EDUCATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, AND A CONSULTANT TO HIGHER EDUCATION LEADERS. FROM 1991 TO 2004, SHE LED INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING EFFORTS AT EMORY UNIVERSITY DURING ITS RISE TO NATIONAL PROMINENCE AND IN 2001 WAS NAMED VICE PRESIDENT FOR STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT. SHE CAN BE REACHED AT sfrost@susanfrostconsulting.com.

AIMEE POZORSKI IS AN ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH AT CENTRAL CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY. SHE CAN BE REACHED AT pozorskia@mail.ccsu.edu.

THE AUTHORS THANK AMY BENSON BROWN, ELEANOR HUTCHENS, HAL JACOBS AND CLAIRE STERK FOR THEIR ENCOURAGEMENT AND IDEAS. EACH HAS HELPED ADVANCE THE CONCEPTS WE DISCUSS AND IMPROVED THIS PAPER IMMENSELY. WE ALSO THANK DARRYL MOLAND OF MAN AND CAT OMNIDESIGN FOR HIS INSPIRED DESIGN.



References

- Frost, S. and Chopp, R. "The University as Global City: A New Way of Seeing Today's Academy," March/April 2004. *Change*, 44-51.
- Frost, S, Chopp, R, and Pozorski, A. "Advancing Universities: The Global City as Guide for Change" (2004). *Tertiary Education and Management (TEAM)*, 10, 73-86.
- Frost, S, Jean, P., Teodorescu, D. and Brown, A. "Intellectual Initiatives across Disciplines: Genesis, Evolution, and Conflict" (2004). *Review of Higher Education* 4, 461-479.
- Frost, S. and Jean, P. "Bridging the Disciplines: Interdisciplinary Discourse and Faculty Scholarship" (2001). *Journal of Higher Education*, Mar/Apr, 74 (1), 119-149.
- Frost, S. and Olson, D. "Sunoikisis: Program Evaluation and Model Design" (2005), <http://www.colleges.org/techcenter/Archives/reports.html>.
- Sassen, S. (2000). *Cities in a World Economy*. 2nd ed. Sociology for a New Century. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.