HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Institutional Transformation as Scholarly Activity : The Experience of Portland State University
Author(s)	Charles R, White; Judith A, Ramaley
Citation	高等教育ジャーナル, 特別, 13-22
Issue Date	1997
DOI	https://doi.org/10.14943/J.HighEdu.2S.13
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/29790
Type	departmental bulletin paper
File Information	Tokubetu_P13-22.pdf

Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers : HUSCAP

Institutional Transformation as Scholarly Activity: The Experience of Portland State University

Charles R. White and Judith A. Ramaley

Portland State University

Abstract — In American higher education, change is continuous but occurs most often at the margins, generally taking the form of piecemeal or isolated efforts and programs. Only rarely are change projects comprehensive in their scope and transformative in their effects. In this chapter we describe the context for comprehensive curricular change at Portland State University and offer a more general theoretical construct about institutional change in higher education.

That there are so few examples of comprehensive institutional change in American higher education is indicative of the complex mix of internal and external factors that constrain change efforts. We have found that while external factors provide an array of supportive and threatening messages, internal conditions determine whether the institution will choose to respond by creating an environment supportive of comprehensive change. From the Portland State experience we identify and discuss several factors which contributed to our decision to approach institutional reform in a comprehensive manner.

A hallmark of the Portland State approach is that institutional reform is understood to be a scholarly activity, not administrative work. As we progressed through the change process we have identified three sets of scholarly questions which guide our work. These have followed each other in a "generation" sequence as the institution has moved through the stages of change. Our discussion of these points to the interplay between the process of change and building a scholarly basis to inform that process.

INSTITUTIONAL TRANSFORMATION AS SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY: THE CASE OF PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Recently, William M. Sullivan asked "whether [American higher education] has the ability and the will to respond through leadership, institutional design, teaching, and research, in creating a new form of intellectual life for the public good" (Sullivan 1996). In this paper we discuss the case of one institution, Portland State University (PSU). PSU is in the midst of a transformation process that seeks to maintain the core values of the academy and connect those to fundamental objectives such as raising the achievement levels of students, expanding professional opportunities of the faculty, and providing service to the community. By committing itself to this strategy for institutional transformation, Portland State University is engaged in a process of change which responds to Sullivan's question with a resounding, "of course."

Reform in American higher education is not a defining characteristic of many U. S. institutions. Change most often takes place at the margins of these organizations, generally taking the form of piecemeal or isolated efforts that do not change the overall direction or culture of the institution. The "pilot program," the "experimental college," and isolated centers or institutes are often the identifiers of such marginal efforts which rarely become integrated within the mainstream of the institution. In addition to institutional inertia, the capacity to respond to the challenges confronting American higher education has also been affected by the nearly 20 year pattern of reduction in public financial support for higher education (AASCU Report to the States 1995). This reduction of public support has both increased the need for reform and reduced the means whereby it can be accomplished.

Policy-makers, employers, students, and families nevertheless continue to exert pressure on colleges and universities to place the student experience at the heart of institutional concerns, to become productively involved with the community, and to contribute to making America a society that encourages learning throughout life (Kellogg Commission 1996). In response, universities will be called upon to make choices--often painful choices.

The small number of institutions that are seriously engaged in comprehensive institutional transformation are important cases that can be examined in order to learn what conditions make comprehensive change possible and what must be done to sustain extensive change, once it has begun. That there are so few examples in American higher education of comprehensive institutional change, is indica-

tive of the reality that the conditions for change include a complex mix of internal and external factors.

We have found that while the external environment provides an array of supportive and threatening messages, it is the internal conditions which determine whether the institution will respond by committing to comprehensive change. Portland State University is unusual because it has chosen to respond to messages from the external environment not by piecemeal or marginal adjustments, but by committing the institution to comprehensive transformation, a transformation which is based upon a commitment to scholarship as the basis for defining issues, deriving and selecting among policy options, and as the foundation for examining the consequences of what we have done.

Our discussion of the changes taking place at Portland State University begins with a summary of the change context within American higher education. In this section we identify the importance of connections to the national conversation on institutional reform in higher education, faculty engagement with the change process, and need for coordinated institutional leadership at the highest levels. We then set forth a conceptual framework developed for understanding the transformational efforts at Portland State University. This is followed by a more in-depth discussion of the change experience and the importance of a constant focus upon the interconnectedness of change within institutional units. This discussion includes an examination of three generations of scholarly questions which have guided our change activities. Finally, we place the Portland State experience within the context of the challenges facing American higher education as we move into the next century.

THE NATIONAL CONTEXT

While change in American higher education has been continuous, it is within the last twenty years that the role, mission, and place of higher education within American society have been questioned, even challenged. The centerpiece for much of the criticism has been the curriculum and its relation to student learning. One of the major scholars of American higher education, Jerry Gaff, notes the following events as providing the impetus for serious consideration of curricular reform:

> The current revival of general education started in 1977 with the confluence of three widely publicized events. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching declared "general education is a disaster area," and that message was trumpeted across the country. The U.S. Commissioner of education and his assistants, Ernest Boyer and Martin Kaplan, called for a core curriculum in which students would study issues common to all members of society; their book carried the ominous title, Educating for Survival. And the Task Force on the Core Curriculum presented the Harvard college faculty with a proposal to overhaul the general education program. Each of these events highlighted the need for general education to be more than the loose distribution requirements that it had become at most colleges and universities (Gaff 1992:47).

The curriculum and its relationship to student learning has proven to be the continuing focus of institutional transformation. Institutional structures, resource allocation models, and faculty reward systems made it extraordinarily difficult for faculties to achieve even minimal consensus on what ought to be the content of the curriculum and how the curriculum will result in the achievement of student learning objectives. The absence of wide agreement or faculty commitment to university-wide objectives has resulted in what Arthur Levine has termed the junkyard curriculum, a metaphor for curricular trends in American higher education which in Levine's view threaten educational quality and the ability of institutions to effectively respond to the serious choices posed by reductions of resources:

> ...the curriculum at most colleges and universities has grown by accretion in a haphazard fashion for some fifty years. Today it is blurred and confused, misshapen and bloated. It has taken the appearance of a junkyard, littered with the reforms of five decades and the assorted legacies of 350 years of collegiate history. ...The real problem is that at many schools the curriculum lacks a purpose...the junkyard curriculum hurts. It is a liability to colleges in hard times. It is not only expensive but it lacks educational merit. A junkyard curriculum costs more to maintain than a leaner more carefully thought out alternative. A junkyard curriculum has a leveling effect on quality. It encourages mediocrity (l985:128).

It is both instructive and troubling that Levine's observations continue to be largely accurate descriptions of most institutions, even though he was writing in 1985.

In the influential report of the Wingspread Group on Higher Education, An American Imperative: Higher Expectations for Higher Education (1993), similar themes are voiced by the several contributors. The report sets forth three core issues which are considered to be common challenges to all colleges and universities:

- taking values seriously;
- putting student learning first;
- creating a nation of learners (Wingspread 1993:7).

There is little question that higher education must attend to these challenges. The issue is how to ensure that these challenges are addressed by institutional change process.

Some recent observations by Jerry Gaff support the overall contention that for most colleges and universities change does occur, but comprehensive transformation which is centered upon the curriculum continues to be found only in a very few institutions.

> Despite the substantial progress that has been made, the undergraduate curriculum is, in many respects, out of control. ....Too often the curriculum is designed by asking faculty members two questions: What do you want to teach next year? And are you making any changes from this year's courses? This is a supply-side approach driven by faculty interests rather than a considered analysis of what students need to be educated individuals....The United States offers over 500 different types of baccalaureate degrees. This very diversity begs the question of what *a single* degree means (Gaff 1996:1-2).

Gaff goes on to develop an important theme related to the present discussion which focuses attention upon the internal conditions supportive of comprehensive reform:

> Today we are seeing the confluence of two major reform agendas. We started with the educational improvement agenda driven by campus leaders who envision a better way to educate students. Today, this improvement initiative is being joined by another major initiative that seeks to improve management and accountability of colleges and universities. Until recently, these two efforts have operated on different tracks, and they have involved very different people. The improvement agenda has been led on campus by academic administrators and faculty members, and they have been supported off-campus by foundations and educational associations. The accountability reform movement has been led on campus by presidents, chief financial officers, planners, and assessors; off-campus they have been encouraged by governors and legislators, coordinating boards, and corporate leaders. Leaders of each of these reform agendas seldom talk with each other, read the same literature, or have the same ideas about how to change campuses. Experts in the improvement arena, almost universally, have little standing or credibility with leaders in the accountability arena, and vice versa (Gaff 1996:2).

Gaff's insights provide important clues to the difficulties experienced by many institutions as they attempt to engage the arduous tasks associated with institutional transformation. He is also pointing us to an important element necessary for understanding the Portland State experience.

In addition to the separate, sometimes conflicting educational improvement and institutional accountability movements, is a third issue which influences institutional transformation initiatives: faculty control over the curriculum. Faculty culture and professional reward structures encourage even demand faculty to be at the cutting edge of the discipline and, therefore, to develop curricula which support new research and transmit new knowledge. This has meant an ever expanding curriculum to include the newest intellectual developments without professional consideration of costs, the overall student experience, or other practical constraints. Gaff observes:

> Now we can see the bind that we currently are in. The administration is held *accountable* for the prudent use of resources. But administrators have *no authority* over the curriculum or the rest of the academic program. Indeed, after their bruising battles, faculty have guarded their prerogatives jealously and taught administrators not "to meddle" in the curriculum. It is a lesson administrators have learned well. Most are gun shy about even raising curricular questions. On the other hand, the faculty have *authority* but *no accountability* (Gaff 1996:4).

The observations of Jerry Gaff and Arthur Levine are echoed by colleagues throughout the literature on change in American higher education. Over the past two decades higher education has been severely and frequently castigated for being detached from our community, unconcerned about the education of our students, and unwilling to change in ways that will lead to meaningful responses to the demands, needs, and expectations of society. To accomplish and sustain comprehensive institutional transformation all components of the institutions must be committed to the direction and goals of the change. Portland State University is one of the few institutions which has been able to accomplish the alignment of the critical institutional components necessary for the comprehensive change process: faculty, academic leadership, finance and administrative leadership, and students. As such it provides an important site for understanding the foundations of successful change in higher education, identifying lessons which might be applicable to other institutions.

THE CONTEXT FOR CHANGE AT PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Prior to 1990, Portland State University saw itself as an institution of higher education which happened to be located in the largest urban center in Oregon. While providing solid academic experiences for its students and serving large numbers of persons in the metropolitan area, it did not have a sense of itself as an institution with an important and distinctive role. It was a university that was urban-located, not an urban university that was intentionally linked to its community in mutually beneficial ways. As such, the attempts of Portland State University to reform its curriculum led to piecemeal efforts and over time the curriculum aptly conformed to Levine's description of the *junkyard curriculum*. Finally, it was an institution that was not engaged in the higher education national discussions. It largely ignored those important conversations and was, not surprisingly, largely ignored by them.

Beginning in 1990, with the advent of significant leadership change which would put in place a new president, vice-president for finance and administration, and provost by 1992, the foundations for comprehensive reform were established. First, the new president led a strategic planning process which resulted in an institutional mission which stated:

> The mission of Portland State University is to enhance the intellectual, social, cultural, and economic qualities of urban life by providing access throughout the life span to a quality liberal education for undergraduates and an appropriate array of professional and graduate programs especially relevant to the metropolitan area. The University will actively promote development of a network of educational institutions that will serve the community and will conduct research and community service to support a high quality educational environment and reflect issues important to the metropolitan area.

At the same time, Oregon passed a property-tax limitation which resulted in a significant decline of state support. Thus, the institution was confronted with new leadership, a clear mission, and an environment which at the same time forced hard choices and was making increased demands upon the university. The response was to embark upon a course which committed Portland State to comprehensive change which was centered upon realizing its distinctive institutional mission.

JOINING THE NATIONAL CONVERSATION

Among the first strategies for change implemented by the new leadership was to place Portland State University into the national discussion of institutional reform. For example, 27 faculty attended the national conference of the Association of American Colleges and Universities in January of 1993. The University would also be among the first cohort of institutions participating in the institutional roundtable discussions sponsored by The Pew Charitable Trusts.

The conference event signaled change in and of itself. What had been an experience reserved for administrators was now extended to significant numbers of faculty. The impact was immediate and significant. Faculty were now aware of the national reform agenda and the research supporting those positions. This strategy made possible a reasoned, informed discussion among faculty and between faculty and administration.

The Pew Roundtable discussions had similar consequences, most importantly, providing a forum for faculty and administrators to enter a conversation about the institution and its future. Significantly, it also led to a sustained presence in this and other national discussions, a position never before open to PSU. Thus, the institutional impact of this participation extended far beyond the immediate content. Involvement in the national conversation resulted in the external validation of the institutional change strategies, an outcome which was and continues to be extremely important.

General Themes

Recently, the University of Pennsylvania's Institute for Research on Higher Education (1996) published a summary of the major themes that have been addressed in the first six years of the Pew Roundtables. These themes should sound familiar to many and have been embedded within the change process at Portland State University. Three general themes have emerged:

• The need to ensure continued financial viability and continued support from an institution's external constituencies. A common repertoire has emerged among the roundtable institutions. Most of us are: (1) achieving greater administrative and service efficiencies; (2) increasing student retention by providing more effective services and by changing our curriculum to promote a learning community; (3) providing educational access for an increasingly diverse student body; and, (4) serving the needs of the region more effectively through partnerships with other organizations and other means.

• The need to focus on the enhancement of curriculum and pedagogy and on the fostering of successful student learning. This is being accomplished on various campuses by: (1) addressing changes in students' educational needs that

result from the expectations of employers and that relate to a broader range of educational backgrounds, student backgrounds, and learning styles; (2) introducing technology to extend and enhance the range of learning opportunities available to students on and off campus; (3) utilizing the curriculum, both the major and general education, to create opportunities for integration and application of knowledge; and, (4) supporting innovative approaches to teaching and learning, including ways to work both within and across academic department lines to promote collaboration.

• The need to foster an institutional culture that is more conducive to change and capable of overcoming barriers to action. Approaches to this task have included: (1) supporting campus traditions and core academic values while overcoming structural or cultural barriers on campus that make change difficult; (2) clarifying institutional missions to create a stronger foundation for decision-making; (3) increasing the awareness and understanding of changes occurring both in society at large and on the campus itself and opening up better communication on campus in order to promote a stronger sense of trust, shared identity and purpose; (4) rethinking faculty roles and rewards in the context of the specific institutional mission and campus priorities; (5) improving the quality of campus decision-making, including overhauling the structure of campus governance to make it simpler and less time consuming; and, (6) aligning budget decisions with departmental and institutional priorities.

Explorations of these general themes have led to growing support for reform in higher education over the past two years. Several foundations and associations have developed programs intended to build networks of colleges and universities that are actively pursuing change. Portland State University is a participant in projects, including:

- the American Council on Education-W. K. Kellogg Foundation two-year project on "Leadership and Institutional Transformation."
- the W. K. Kellogg Foundation Network for Institutional Transformation, which includes PSU, the University of Arizona, Olivet College, and Alverno College.
- the Pew Charitable Trusts Leadership Award for the Renewal of Undergraduate Education, which we share with Rennselaer Polytechnic Institute and Alverno College.
- the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities.
- the Pew Charitable Trusts and American Association of Higher Education-Education Trust K-16 reform initiative.

Throughout its comprehensive institutional transformation experience, the involvement of Portland State in the national discussion and participation in national change projects has been an important component of our success. The institution has benefited from the access to scholarly work, the experiences of others, and has contributed to the body of knowledge about institutional change in American higher education.

Our own process of reform has had a clear relationships to the national educational agenda. This relationship has been an important source of validation and encouragement for our faculty, staff, and students who have been willing to spend time on issues that are not generally rewarded in the academy, namely comprehensive educational reform. This participation has also brought together the two conversations about accountability and curriculum that are so often separate (Gaff 1996:4).

CHANGE AT PSU: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Transformational efforts at Portland State University can be described as a five stage process (Ramaley, 1996). The stages are: (1) making the case for change and choosing the first project; (2) expanding the scope of change; (3) making connections and sustaining the change process; (4) rebalancing the campus to support different ways of doing things that accompany the core changes; and, (5) reflection upon the significance of the changes that have taken place including the collection of evidence to demonstrate the impact of the work.

While the central and most visible component of our institutional transformation is the reform of the general education curriculum, the context for that effort was provided by the actions taken in the first stage of the transformation process. Guided by the recently completed strategic plan, the first project was the restructuring of administrative units, a process which included implementation of quality management practices and resulted in significant changes in organization and procedures within finance and administration units.

This proved to have consequences beyond those organizations immediately impacted. To use Jerry Gaff's terminology the accountability organizations on campus were in the midst of significant reform when the change agenda moved to focus upon transformation issues related to educational improvement. *A key factor contributing to the success at PSU is that administrative leaders responsible for educational improvement and those whose purview encompassed units related to institutional accountability learned to work together as a team. The result was that institutional leadership understood both agendas as integral to institutional transformation and that reform in both areas required*

the cooperation of all units to be successful.

The second stage, expanding the scope of the change, began in the Fall of 1992 when the Provost sought faculty volunteers to consider inter-disciplinary programs and to develop a purpose and curricular model for general education. The decision to study the undergraduate experience and to examine the general education curriculum resulted from what appeared at the outset to be a routine administrative question: "Why do so few of our entering undergraduate students graduate from Portland State University?" This question began a process of inquiry and scholarly examination of the curriculum and the student experience which has resulted five years later in a comprehensive, collaborative and deeply community-based change agenda that has brought fundamental transformation to the University.

University Studies: The Reform of General Education

The general education working group began its work in January of 1993 and soon became aware of the national discussion and the significant body of research on student learning, curricular organization, and pedagogy. It also benefited from the scholarship of other groups examining issues of retention and the student experience at Portland State University. These simultaneous inquiries into student learning and the student experience were brought together by the working group which applied that work to the development of the new general education program (see White 1994).

The faculty group reviewed existing literature and changed their focus from considering change at the margins of the distribution requirements to a scholarly effort meant to place student learning at the center of the curriculum and its delivery. The traditional distribution model required students to sample courses from the humanities, sciences, and social sciences along with academic foundations courses which were unconnected to the rest of the curriculum. This outmoded curricular model was rejected as a meaningful approach to undergraduate education and replaced with a new model with a clear purpose and goals: the University Studies Program.

> The purpose of the general education program at Portland State University is to facilitate the acquisition of the knowledge, abilities, and attitudes which will form a foundation for life-long learning among its students. This foundation includes the capacity and the propensity to engage in inquiry and critical thinking, to use various forms of communication for learning and expression, to gain an awareness of the broader human experience and its environment, and appreciate the responsibilities of persons to themselves, to each other, and to community.

To accomplish this purpose the working group proposed a four-year course of study consisting of the following:

> Freshman Inquiry. A year-long thematic course focused on an interdisciplinary topic, taught by a team of five faculty members with small group work led by student "peer mentors." Freshman Inquiry introduces different modes of inquiry and builds the tools for success in college and lifelong learning.
> Sophomore Inquiry. A more advanced interdisciplinary course. Graduate student mentors lead small group sessions. Sophomore Inquiry provides a bridge to upper-division course work in a thematic area of the student's choice.
> Upper-Division Clusters. These consist of thematically linked courses designed to offer students an integrated educational experience growing out of the thematic area selected in Sophomore Inquiry and drawing upon multiple disciplines. The Clusters allow students to explore the chosen area outside their major in greater depth.
> Senior Capstone. Interdisciplinary student teams led by a faculty member conduct a community-based project over a minimum of two academic terms. The Capstone provides students the opportunity to apply what they have learned in their major to solve a "real life" problem, using a team approach that prepares them for post-graduate work or career entry.

As the working group conducted the research and developed its proposal, several open forums were held during the Spring of 1993. The full proposal was written over the summer and presented to the University community at an all campus forum in September, 1993. The process of continuous communication, ongoing scholarship as the basis for responding to questions and objections, and a constant focus on student learning resulted in the proposal being approved by the Faculty Senate in November 1993 by a vote of 37-9. In the Fall of 1994 the first Freshman Inquiry courses were offered.

With the implementation of the University Studies curriculum we moved to the third stage of the transformation process. To sustain comprehensive reform of the curriculum, it has been necessary to strengthen connections among campus organizations which previously had marginal or even antagonistic relationships. The new curriculum is based upon building learning communities of students, mentors, and faculty. It requires that student affairs personnel become involved with academic programs in new ways in order to support the students and to support the faculty who are establishing different relationship patterns with students. Information technology which had previously been focused more on administrative work became a key element of stu-

dent learning. The success of the curriculum required a new technology environment on campus and technical support for the faculty and students who utilize the new computing and information services.

The campus is also examining additional curriculum reform issues as we continue to focus upon student learning outcomes. One important issue concerns how the major field of study should related to the purpose and goals of liberal education and to the new general education curriculum. This issue poses a new set of research questions leading to possible new configurations of courses and faculty activity. The new clarity of the University Studies program has placed pressure on the major, which often suffers from the same *junkyard syndrome* and has stimulated a review of the goals, purposes, and design of the undergraduate major. Nothing less than full campus involvement with student learning is required to fully implement the curricular transformation and to create a coherent undergraduate experience.

The fourth phase of the change process involves rebalancing the campus to adjust to different ways of doing things that accompany the core changes. A thread that runs throughout the transformation is faculty support. Faculty are being asked to teach in new ways, to integrate technology, and to involve themselves and their students in community-based learning.

To sustain and support these efforts the Center for Academic Excellence (CAE) was established in 1995. The Center is charged with providing a range of faculty development activities including technology workshops, explorations of assessment strategies, and development of teaching portfolios. CAE is also charged with being the liaison between the University and the community and to provide partnerships as faculty seek to identify community partners and include community work across the curriculum.

The change process also necessitated a review of promotion and tenure guidelines. Because faculty had been asked to assume new roles and to contribute to the mission of the University in different ways, it was essential to make corresponding changes in the institutional reward and recognition structure. New promotion and tenure guidelines were adopted by the Faculty Senate in Spring, 1996, and are being implemented during the current academic year. These guidelines expand the definition of scholarship to include work in areas outside one's discipline including the scholarship of teaching.

Clearly, many adjustments and realignments have already been necessary and many more remain in the rest of the undergraduate curriculum and in graduate education. In particular, faculty and students who have explored new instructional perspectives and cross-departmental collaboration in University Studies will be returning to traditionally structured academic programs and departments with desires for continued reform. These students and faculty will have new expectations. The learning communities that we have created at both the undergraduate and graduate levels are placing new demands on our campus infrastructure and our budget. Every aspect of this campus is slowly adjusting in response to the changing ways in which faculty, staff, students and community participants now interact.

The pressures created by organizational restructuring require that we demonstrate the significance of what we have accomplished and that we begin to understand the intended and unintended consequences of the genie we have unleashed. This reflection, the fifth stage of the change process, is now a critical set of activities necessary for the continued sustainability of our institutional transformation.

Beginning in 1995 groups of faculty working with the Center for Academic Excellence developed the framework for addressing issues related to the assessment of student learning and the student experience. We are evaluating the impact of our new curriculum on faculty, students, community participants, and the university as a whole. By holding ourselves to high standards of evidence, we hope to convince ourselves and others that these curricular changes are really working.

We have learned, for example, that students describing their reactions to community based learning tend to emphasize its strong and long-lasting impact. They also describe a sharp contrast between their other classes and these inquiry-based and community-based courses. One student stated, "In school it always seems to be a solitary experience. You, the teacher, the test, the project. This was a good learning experience for me!" Another student reported, "...last year, I came to class for two hours and 50 minutes and then I left it in class. But this stays with you and I'm always thinking about it, as I ride the bus to school."

Our faculty experience the differences also. One faculty member said, "I am struck and impressed and moved by what [the students] come away with, what they learned." After the extraordinary experiences of University Studies, our first group of faculty participants will clearly not be satisfied to return to business as usual.

As Portland State has moved through the stages of the change process it has become apparent that we are never completely finished with any of these stages. Rather, as we become more deeply involved, the issues may change, the connections clarified, the need to rebalance and shift to another institutional issue, and our reflection may cause us to examine our premises and begin anew. What has not changed is the commitment to student learning and to engaging the University with the community.

CHANGE AS A SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY: NEW ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS

A hallmark of the institutional transformation of Portland State University is that change is understood to be a scholarly activity, based upon inquiry, research, evidence, and analysis. By this we mean that organizational challenges are best understood by examination through a scholarly research process. The role of administration is to ask key questions and point to policy directions. The exploration of the problem and recommendations for change are the responsibilities of faculty and staff. During the five years that have passed since we initiated our change process we have dealt with two generations of scholarly questions and are beginning to address a third.

The first generation of questions centered on whether we needed to change our curriculum, and if so, why (White 1994). This work began with an administrative question related to the graduation rates of Portland State students. This spawned research on student retention by one group of faculty. These researchers compared student retention rates at PSU with those from institutions with similar urban profiles. They asked whether our retention rates were generally characteristic of these urban institutions or were more a distinctive characteristic of PSU. The discovery that PSU was unlike other urban institutions spurred further inquiry into the student experience to find possible explanations.

Another group of faculty was sent by the University to attend the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges (AAC), now called the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) where they were able to interact with scholars whose research focused upon student learning, the student experience, and curriculum. The combination of these efforts shifted an administrative question to a scholarly question: "What will promote student success at Portland State University?" In fact, this research continues as we understand more deeply the interrelationships among the curriculum, student experience, and student success. The product of this combination of elements was the beginning of a distinctive feature of change at PSU--change is scholarly work, not administrative work and, if it is to be comprehensive, it must be centered in the student experience and in the curriculum (Reardon & Ramaley 1996).

The second generation of questions had to do with how to launch the restructuring process, first in our administrative units and then within our academic programs. During this phase we have created support for new faculty and staff development activities and are evaluating the consequences of introducing faculty to new technologies and new pedagogical techniques and curricular designs, from both the faculty and the student perspectives. We are also examining the support requirements of our increasingly community-based curriculum clarifying what faculty and students need to be successfully engaged in research and learning in the community.

The third generation of questions relate to how we can sustain and support the campus-wide change and understand the consequences of what we have begun. The answers to these questions will require the invention of new assessment strategies (Driscoll, Holland, Gelmon & Kerrigan 1996), the creation of a new approach to managing the campus budget, and new definitions of faculty and staff roles and responsibilities (Johnson & Wamser 1996). We also need to design and maintain new infrastructure to support different working relationships and the exchange of information and resources across traditional campus boundaries. The Center for Academic Excellence and the University Studies faculty teams have initiated systematic analysis of these issues.

Our approach depends upon a deep respect for diverse scholarly work, including the application of scholarship to the study of our change process itself. In our definition of scholarship as a component of our promotion and tenure guidelines, we have studied the effect of five elements of scholarship that interact with each other (Johnson & Wamser 1996). These critical dimensions of scholarly work include: scholarly activities (what faculty and students do), the expression of scholarship (how faculty and students approach their scholarly work), the motivation of scholarship (why faculty engage in scholarship), quality (how well is the scholarly work done), and significance (who benefits from the work).

Each of these components is essential as we begin to ask the third generation of questions related to the impact of what we have done and the necessity of beginning to trace the longer-term consequences of what we are doing. Although individual conversations strongly suggest that our experiment is working, we need to test our assumptions much more thoroughly.

Our scholarly habits can also contribute to our ability to sustain our change efforts. Peter Senge (1990) has described the effects of a creative tension between a clearly articulated vision and a strong grasp of reality. As he puts it, "Creative tension comes from seeing clearly where we want to be, our 'vision,' and telling the truth about where we are, our 'current reality'. " Senge points out that "the most powerful learning comes from direct experience" but the "core learning dilemma that confronts organizations" is that "we learn best from experience but we never directly experience the consequences of many of our most important decisions." The third generation of questions which we have begun the process of answering are important precisely because they are directed toward understanding and defining the consequences of the most important decisions.

CLOSING THOUGHTS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

In our reflection upon the PSU experience we have identified a number of internal requisites and external supports for the institutional transformation we have undertaken. The importance of unity at the highest levels of institutional leadership (collaboration of the education reform and accountability leaders); the participation in the national conversation; and the scholarly foundation of change emerge as dominant themes. It is also clear that we are in the midst of a process that will continue well into the next century.

To be successful, this institution must continue to be committed to the notion that change is not self-contained. The Aspen Institute Forum on Communications and Society recently outlined the elements that must be in place if we are to reform education to address the needs of our rapidly changing world. We must rethink the role of "education"--the institutionalized system that we have designed to promote learning--and recognize that learning takes place in many environments both within and outside our formal educational institutions. To create a learning society where learning occurs throughout life, we must place learning at the center of our thinking, rather than educational systems or our own particular institution per se, and establish a learning environment created by "the effective collaboration of individuals and organizations in government, business, foundations, the nonprofit sector, communities, and educational institutions" (Garmer & Firestone 1996).

It is becoming clear that deep change requires a loosening of role constraints and a blurring of boundaries of responsibilities and control. This will not be an easy task in our universities, where faculty culture and expectations often make collective action and responsibility difficult and limit the impact of any centrally exercised leadership. The keystone concepts of the change strategy at PSU--collaboration, innovation, and partnerships--have implications for how work gets done and the roles that each of us play and require the development of a new repertoire of collective activities that are not commonly found in university traditions where "the departmental curriculum committee, the search committee for the vacant billet in Biology, the School appointment and promotion committee are the critical organs of choice for the modern research university" (Kennedy 1994).

We have spent a great deal of creative time and energy thinking about faculty roles and the development of broader definitions of scholarship that can support the complex range of work associated with an urban university. We have not yet begun to address the equally far-reaching implications of the urban mission for administrative and staff roles and how faculty and administration will interact with each other. Perhaps these issues will form the core of the fourth generation of questions to be addressed as we continue our institutional transformation.

Donald Kennedy (1994) predicts that the scale of change necessary to respond to the challenges of the 21st century will require new coalitions between effective campus leaders and their faculties. The recent work of Jerry Gaff (1996) argues even more forcefully for a rethinking and reconstituting of the authority and accountability relationships between faculty and administration. From the early experience of Portland State University, we can predict that these powerful coalitions will be possible if change is treated as scholarly work and if faculty and administrators engage in exemplary scholarship together, supported, as Donald Kennedy suggests, by unusually sensitive governing boards who are willing to encourage the kind of "deep reconstruction" that fundamental change will require.

Administrators, in turn, will have to overcome "a form of isolation that is difficult to avoid, putting in its stead a new level of trust in joint planning processes with faculty." These joint planning processes, we would add, are based on a genuine culture of evidence and excellent scholarship about the change process itself and its consequences. "And for the faculty, it will mean surrendering some important traditions of autonomy and collegial comity" (Kennedy, 1994). Institutions that undertake this task may experience difficulties, but they will have created the conditions that will place them in the lead of the transformational change movement. Institutions that hold themselves to high standards of honesty and that are able to make the difficult choices that will distinguish the important from the merely desirable, will outdistance the rest, but, we hope, will lead the way for others to join them.

REFERENCES

AASCU Report of the States. (1995), R. M. Sweeney, Editor. Washington. DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Driscoll, A., Holland, B., Gelmon, S. & Kerrigan, S. (1996), "An assessment model for service-learning: Comprehensive case studies of impact on faculty, students, community, and institution," *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, **Fall**, 66-71.

Gaff, J. (1992), "The rhetoric and reality of general education reform: An overview.," *Perspectives*, **Fall**, 47-57.

Gaff, J. (1996), *The changing roles of faculty and administrators*, Paper presented to the annual conference of the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education. Salt Lake City, Utah.

Garmer, A.R & Firestone, C.M. (1996), *Creating a learning society: Initiatives for education and technology*. Wash-

ington, DC: The Aspen Institute, Communications and Society Program.

Institute for Research on Higher Education, University of Pennsylvania. The landscape. Leaving hats at the door: Themes from the Pew campus roundtables. *Change Magazine*, **28(3)**, 51-54.

Johnson, R., & Wamser, C. (1996), "Respecting diverse scholarly work: The key to advancing the multiple missions of the urban university," *Metropolitan Universities*.

Kellogg Commission. (1996), *Taking charge of change: Renewing the promise of state and land-grant universities.* (Pamphlet).

Kennedy, D. (1994), "Making choices in the research university," In J.R. Cole, E.G. Barber, & S.R. Graubard (Eds.), *The research university in a time of discontent.* Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Levine, A. (1985), "Program: A focus on purpose and performance," In A.M. Levine & J. Green (Eds.), *Opportunity in Adversity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ramaley, J. (1996), "Large-scale institutional change to implement an urban university mission: The Case of Portland State University," *The Journal of Urban Affairs*, **18**, 139-151.

Reardon, M., & Ramaley, J. (1996), "Building academic community while containing costs." In J.G. Gaff & J.L. Ratcliff (Eds.), *Handbook of the Undergraduate Curriculum*, 513-532. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Senge, P. (1990), *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Doubleday Currency.

Sullivan, W. (1996), "The public intellectual as transgressor," *Higher Education Exchange*, 17-22. New York: The Kettering Foundation,

White, C. (1994), "A model for comprehensive reform in general education: Portland State University," *The Journal of General Education*, **43**, 168-229.

Wingspread Group on Higher Education. (1993), *An American imperative: Higher expectations for higher education*. Racine, WI: Johnson Foundation.

〈要　約〉

学術的過程としての包括的な機構改革

アメリカの高等教育における改革は, 一般に小さく, 孤立した努力とプログラムの形をとって連続的であるが，中心からはずれたところでもっとも頻繁に起こる。改革のプロジェクトが, その見方において包括的であり, その効果において画期的であったことはほとんどない。この論文ではポートランド州立大学においてどのような内容で包括的なカリキュラム改革が始められ, 継続されているかを述べ, 高等教育における制度改革についていっそう一般的, 理論的な概念を提供する。

アメリカの高等教育に総合的制度改革の例がほとんどないことは，改革の条件が大学内部と外部の要素の複雑な混合物であるという現実の現われである。大学の外からは支持する声も反対する声もあり，これに応じる総合的改革を支持する内部条件をつくりだすことによって，制度が動き出すか否かが決定される。ポートランド州立大の経験から，総合的方法で制度改革を始めることが可能となったいくつかの要因を明らかにして議論する。

ポートランド州立大のアプローチが適切であったという立派な証拠は，制度改革が管理上の仕事ではなく，学問的な活動であると理解されているところにある。改革を推し進める際に，その指針となった 3 つの学問的な問題（編者注：コミュニティーと大学の連携，教授・学習エクセレンス，評価）をはっきりさせることができた。非常に現実的な意味で，これらは，発生の過程で一定の「発生順序」に従って次々と進行していった。これに関して，改革の過程とその過程を特徴づける学問的な基礎構築との間に相互作用があることを議論する。

(Charles R. White and Judith A. Ramaley)