

# **THE FACULTY OF TOMORROW'S RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES**

**John Sexton**

Paper based on the author's presentation at the TIAA-CREF Institute Conference  
*The New Balancing Act in the Business of Higher Education*

New York City, November 3 - 4, 2005

## 9.1 Introduction

I am pleased to be a contributor to this volume because the themes that are examined in this volume are ones that have been my focus since I was installed as New York University's president three years ago. At that time I began to articulate a vision of what I call a common enterprise university. Key to that notion was the role of faculty in such a university and I have continued to elaborate on that fundamental issue ever since. This chapter provides me with an opportunity to share and deepen my reflections on the role of faculty seen primarily from the perspective of large urban research universities.

It is no surprise that the issues confronting my university and universities generally are the same issues that concern TIAA-CREF. As the principal retirement system for the nation's education, research and health care communities—including some 3200 current employees and over 9000 retirees of New York University (NYU)—TIAA-CREF and the TIAA-CREF Institute are deeply involved in our business and serve as our partners in addressing the challenges we face.

TIAA-CREF and NYU also share other similarities; we each trace our founding to immigrants to the United States who went on to achieve spectacular success in their chosen fields and lent their talent and treasure to the creation of institutions that have enabled millions of people over the years to realize their own dreams.

It was Albert Gallatin—of Swiss descent and Secretary of the Treasury for both Thomas Jefferson and James Madison—who founded NYU in 1831. He was on a special mission. He saw the great universities of the day, Oxford and Cambridge in England and the Ivy League here in the United States, and recognized that they were built on a model

of withdrawal from the world and service to the privileged in a bucolic setting. He rejected that model and saw great cities as potentially great centers of learning. With several other notable New Yorkers, he established New York University as a place that would be ‘fitted for all and graciously open to all’, a university ‘in and of the city’.

So, too, TIAA-CREF was founded by someone born into a weaver’s family in a little Scottish town. Andrew Carnegie came with his family to the United States in 1848. A giant of the industrial revolution, he was also a larger-than-life philanthropist who literally established the public library system across America, from sea to shining sea. In 1918 he was shocked to discover that many academics were destitute in retirement. Through the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, he created the company that for almost a century has been a careful steward of the finances of our colleagues in the academy: TIAA-CREF.

## **9.2 An era of hyperchange**

Let me begin with this observation: it is an undeniable reality that powerful forces—good and bad—are reshaping our society, our times and (inevitably) our universities. What we confront is not just change, but hyperchange—and most importantly, hyperchange in the very province in which universities live and operate, the domain of knowledge and of ideas. Today universities confront the collapse of traditional boundaries—in time, in space, in disciplines and in culture. And this collapse is compounded by the financial pressures— what this volume has captured in the phrase

‘the new balancing act in the business of higher education’; we are witnessing a tectonic shift in the ground on which our universities stand.

Such hyperchange compels dramatic adaptation within higher education, rooted in serious reflection on the nature of who we are, what we do and how we do it. Research universities—those that operate at the frontier of knowledge—are at a critical threshold, and the chapters in this volume quite properly focus on the emerging paradigm shift in our understanding of the nature, needs and day-to-day operations of higher education.

In Chapter Eight, Ron Ehrenberg lays out several of the economic and demographic dimensions of this period of change and challenge, and points to strategies of adaptation that some institutions may pursue to relieve the pressures upon them. I am fortunate to lead an institution that has not felt forced to tailor its strategic thinking to financial considerations alone. Nonetheless, you will see that the themes of my chapter press in many of the same directions as his; the difference is that mine are driven mainly by academic imperatives as we at NYU strive to position ourselves for the twenty-first century.

Each university will have its own version of change and each successful university will shape its future through an explicit articulation of mission. Thus, great universities are in a race, not with each other, but to reach their own distinct vision and ideals, and the journey will require us to apply to our study of institutional self the same principles of continuous, rigorous examination and inquiry that guide our academic research and dialogue.

### **9.3 The research university**

The research university is designed to provide the broadest, deepest, and most immediate forum for conversation and criticism. We both observe and enforce the established norms of the disciplines and offer a rebuke to those who view those norms as beyond question.

Above all I reject the idea that changes in the business of higher education can or should mean a denigration of the central role of the research university; instead the changes have to be compatible with that role and if possible move it forward.

And what is that role? As one privileged to have studied with those who were creating the next version of the subjects they taught, I can attest to the magic that permeates such a learning environment. The foundation blocks of that environment are faculty whose research makes a difference in their fields and in the world—and the infrastructure of support, which their work requires. Only after setting and securing this foundation can we successfully integrate the process of educating our students with the imperative of advancing knowledge. This integration—an explicit connection of the great researchers to students at all levels—characterizes and nourishes the research university. The students who choose to study at a place like NYU expect to be engaged in a field, in a frame of mind, in a spirit of inquiry and in the excitement of the creative endeavor. And it is this aspect of the research university that justifies the presence of undergraduate students and the concomitant support of the research enterprise, which their tuition provides.

In my view, the very notion of the research university rejects the false dichotomy, too often advanced, between research and teaching. Those familiar with our great

research universities know that both in theory and in fact the greatest classroom professors often are the leading thinkers in their field.

But the high quality and station enjoyed by our research universities can be a source of complacency. Our great universities are so successful, so in demand and have been for so long, that they may take as granted their value and continued existence; in other words, in a manner quite remarkably at odds with their core commitment to rigorous inquiry, they may fall into an unreflective view of their own excellence, one that is largely autobiographical and simply reifies their view of themselves.

Such complacency will be steadily more unsustainable in the face of mounting financial pressures, demographic changes and heightened scrutiny from outside the university's gates—from both the students and parents who are our consumers and the government, which more and more assigns itself an oversight role. But complacency is not only increasingly impractical, it also represents a disconnect between the ideal and the reality—a disconnect which ultimately could jeopardize the very existence of the research university.

One version of this disconnect might be an unhealthy separation in our universities of the research enterprise from the teaching enterprise. In my view, this version of the disconnect is sufficiently widespread to engage our attention—manifesting itself, for example, in the tendency even at the finest research universities to entrust undergraduate teaching to part-time faculty. Today at private research universities in the United States, at least one out of every three classes is taught by part-time faculty or graduate students. They can make an important contribution, but there is also a danger.

Too often, their greater part in the university enterprise has been accompanied by a reduced commitment to teaching for many senior faculty.

This is a troubling development, for to be attractive to students and true to itself, the research university must ensure the connection between research and learning, which is its justification. We must not create a set of incentives instilling and reinforcing a dichotomy in which faculty are not encouraged to view the teaching enterprise (including the undergraduate teaching enterprise) as a natural concomitant of the research enterprise and vice versa. We must be especially careful lest research come to be seen as the privilege and teaching undergraduates as a painful chore.

#### **9.4 Toward a common enterprise university**

The conventional wisdom among the public, encouraged by a set of popular books written largely by ideologues outside the university and with relatively little experience of it, is that professors in research universities are essentially under worked and overindulged producers of esoteric and even solipsistic tracts. The truth is quite to the contrary. Notwithstanding the fact that work of the mind is neither linear nor standardized and thus not susceptible to clock punching, there is hard evidence that professors in higher education generally work on average 50 hours a week. And in research universities the number rises to 60 hours a week.

Of course, there are examples in elite universities of faculty who, even as they work very hard, view themselves simply as independent contractors and there are too many forces, both within and outside the research university, that press against a sense of

institutional loyalty. Thus, for example, as our celebrity culture has infiltrated the culture of the academy, the economy of rewards and recognition tends to push faculty members to seek compensation and satisfaction outside their university— and, indeed, sometimes to consider the university as honored by their affiliation. To faculty who adopt this view, tenure may be little more than a retainer, the university merely one of many clients.

Contributing to this attitude is a phenomenon that is otherwise powerfully positive: the acceleration through the internet and the communications revolution of a disciplinary community characterized by a continuing conversation unconfined by boundaries of campus, space or time. The result is that scholars may come to value their academic specialization and not their academic institution as their primary allegiance. The phenomenon is likely to accelerate as now unimagined technological advances offer faculty more absorbing and more meaningful membership in virtual academic communities that literally can span the globe.

In my view, the challenge is not to discourage faculty loyalty to disciplines or to stifle their ambition to have an effect in the wider world; rather the challenge is to produce an appreciation that one of the best tools for inquiry and insight is examining intellectual formulations not just with colleagues in the same discipline, wherever they are located, but with colleagues and even students in the same discipline and colleagues in other disciplines within a scholar's own university. Put another way, there is a richness at home, sometimes discovered quite serendipitously, sometimes discovered without even looking for it, to be found in the ordinary course of campus life, that can be invaluable to the scholar.

In the best of our universities faculty will be present—not just on the campus, but of it. They will welcome and engage with colleagues of differing views and expertise. They will be even more available to mentor and advise students—and to continue the classroom conversation outside of class. And in doing so, they will dedicate their time and energy not only to their graduate students, but also to undergraduates. In all this and more, they will internalize the collective interest as part of their own interests—and, in effect, embrace the notion of what I call the common enterprise university—a university characterized by collective faculty responsibility and full citizenship in an institution that is the central focus of their vocation as scholars.

There are clear moral grounds for this vision of the common enterprise university, but there are more utilitarian ones as well. The best faculty are ambitious with respect to what they want to accomplish personally in their teaching as well as in their research, but the wisest will realize that neither ambition can be achieved easily in a university comprised only of independent contractors. For example, there are severe limits in what one can achieve in teaching class A if other faculty are not teaching powerful classes in B, C and D. And, with respect to research, an analogous point can be made: with the possible exception of a few intellectual geniuses, and even they may not be exceptions, scholarship is inherently communal, both because it builds on what others have accomplished and because even the deepest insights can be improved by testing them with colleagues across a range of disciplines.

In addition, as all of you here know, there is a second utilitarian, practical and inescapable argument for the common enterprise university, which arises from the harsh

economic realities of our time. In the United States, and the Western world generally, the gulf between public esteem for higher education and public willingness to pay for it is wide and growing wider as public finances come under increasing pressure. At the same time, higher education faces rising costs for hiring the best faculty, stocking libraries with an expanding range of more expensive books and journals, obtaining and sustaining the latest facilities in technology and the sciences. The explosion of new academic fields and curricular areas, from human genetics to cognitive sciences, yields great societal and academic benefits; but here too, as we have already heard today, costs can soar. And, in traditional fields as well as new ones, as the great physicist Max Planck observed, each new advance in knowledge costs more than the one before. It is not only true that first come the easier questions, then the harder ones; it is concomitantly true that first come the less expensive questions and then the more expensive ones.

How then will we generate the resources to fulfill our mission? The answer again is found in the move to common enterprise with its emphasis on faculty engagement in the setting of priorities and the making of decisions in all parts of the university, led by the faculty, a willingness occasionally to sacrifice for the collective good.

Surely, as a general proposition, the argument for a common enterprise faculty flows from enlightened self-interest. But, beyond that, the university I envision—the university I call the common enterprise university—will demand that faculty have deep in their souls an inclination to build community: a spirit that will display itself in different ways at different moments.

Let me offer just one example. In my view, the faculty of the common enterprise university will reverse conventional assumptions about seniority. They will understand that, with regard to institutional direction, senior faculty, even as they exercise authority, must view themselves as standing not just at a shaping point, but at a listening point. In short, the generation in power must accept that one of their most crucial roles is to hear and heed the voices of the next generation of leaders. I recognize that this strategy for institutional continuity and organic, consensual evolution may not win ready acceptance from some who have climbed to the pinnacle. But the world of hyperchange in which our universities and their faculties now function will mean that research and learning often will be shaped more decisively by scholars who are younger in years or experience. So the common enterprise university must resist a hierarchy that suppresses younger faculty and makes them wait their turn. Instead, such universities—in an iterative and progressive process—must foster an empowering intergenerational relationship across its faculty.

But, if a university demands so much of faculty will it compromise its ability to secure the talent it seeks? The answer, based on my experience not just as a university president but as a law school dean, although perhaps counterintuitive, is that a social contract of obligation can make the common enterprise university irresistibly attractive to some of the finest scholars because a good number of those who are drawn to the life of the mind derive satisfaction not merely from material rewards, but from a strong sense of vocation. Many of the best, although concededly not all, are attracted powerfully and primarily to the excitement of unfettered inquiry, the serious and at times even playful

exchange of ideas. They are likely to recognize the high value to them of building a stronger university, one committed to excellence and centered in a vibrant intellectual community.

### **9.5 The common enterprise faculty in action**

The changes we are witnessing in the nature and composition of university faculty need not be regarded as simply a reflex reaction to economic realities. If that's all they are, they will devalue the research university. But in the context of the common enterprise university I envision—animated as it is by a desire of each member of the faculty orchestra to produce (in cooperation with others) a symphony of discovery and learning—we can encourage the development of new kinds of players, with each addition enhancing our overall performance in some way.

Of course, every faculty member—from the most senior world-renowned scholar to the most junior adjunct—must embrace the importance of integrating knowledge creation with knowledge transmission and understand their place in the process. The principal responsibility for this integration lies with the tenured faculty, who have been chosen for their dual capacities in research and teaching—in effect making them the primary incarnation of the core purpose of the research university.

While I am unwilling at this stage to subscribe to a single formula for each member of the faculty, I am certain that the research faculty at our great universities must accept that undergraduate teaching is a vital part of their vocation. This is not to say that every tenured professor must teach undergraduates every semester. Our aim must be a

moving of the dial, a reweighing of the balance, so every student will have contact not only with those who write the textbooks used in the classroom, but also with those who are forging the ideas that will inform the next generation of those books. For the moment, I offer this as a possible benchmark: that even in the first year students should be able to enroll in more than one class with an actively engaged scholar in the field—and by the senior year, a majority of a student's courses ought to be taught by such professors.

My experience at NYU leads me to be optimistic about the willingness of even august academics to commit themselves to this. Some of our leading researchers, senior and junior alike, find it extremely rewarding to teach large introductory courses, ranging from economics to English literature. There are University Professors at NYU who teach a Freshman Seminar. For twelve years, I myself have done so—first, as dean of the Law School and now as President of the University.

The tenured faculty is only part of the story, however. As important as they are and always will be, the tenured faculty increasingly will comprise only a segment—albeit the core segment—of the research university. Notwithstanding that every course, introductory or advanced, is an integral component of the educational mission of the university, the tenured faculty do not do all the teaching in the research university today, and, more important, they should not do it in the research university of tomorrow. Thus, at every university new forms of faculty, many of whom are on full-time or even multi-year contracts, have multiplied—with the effect that important parts of the curriculum at

today's universities are entrusted to faculty who are neither tenured nor on the tenure-track.

As this important phenomenon has developed, however, too little (if any) thought has been given to the definition, role and rewards of the array of those faculty who all carry significant responsibilities in the teaching enterprise. Even less attention has been paid to connecting the deployment of those faculty to the rationale of the research university. What results is a kind of unexamined, often accidental and incidental evolution of faculty functions, some of which is undeniably driven by financial pressures, which has brought to the research university a host of actors whose presence may be critical, but who are frequently underappreciated and undervalued.

I will not pause here to review the taxonomy of titles that have blossomed in our research universities to designate these faculty—or to enumerate the variety of privileges, rights, and worth attendant to each. Suffice it to say that at most research universities there are scores of such titles, and they have sprung up ad hoc. This in turn has generated increasingly stark divisions and valuations among segments of the faculty, with too many feeling they are second- or third-class citizens.

The proliferation in types of faculty may reflect fiscal realities; but if we consider and shape their proper roles, they can enrich the intellectual life of the university in truly important ways. I will contend that quite apart from financial considerations, we ought to embrace new forms of faculty in ways that bring value to the academic enterprise and in many cases, bring a unique value which tenured faculty cannot provide.

I propose to discuss four broad categories of such faculty, primarily outside the tenure system. I will give each of these categories a name; I emphasize, however, that any connection between the name that I offer and the use of a similar term in the taxonomy of titles now existing in any university is purely coincidental—and I refuse to be limited in my exposition by any assumptions arising from the use of the title somewhere in the status quo.

First I will discuss what I call the master teacher—a category which will evoke existing forms of faculty on many campuses, but which adds a new dimension to them. Next is what I call the global professor, then the adjunct (or part-time) professor and finally the cyber faculty. These four categories do not exhaust all of the categories outside of the tenured faculty—for example, emeriti faculty, visiting faculty or faculty fellows. The four categories I treat are sufficient, however, to capture the principles of faculty deployment I mean to advance here.

## **9.6 The master teacher**

I define the ideal of the master teacher as someone chosen through a rigorous academic review process to join the faculty because he or she has been adjudged to be capable of conveying the most advanced stage of a discipline and of appreciating the creative side of the venture, while possessing a particular ability in the classroom and a special dedication to the enterprise of teaching. The teaching professor causes students to think, to reason, to question and ask the right questions, to push beyond conventional assumptions, and to reach higher than they might have reached on their own; the teaching

professor will instill in students a desire to understand the subject and to see the beauty of linking that subject to others. He or she will be capable of appreciating and of participating in the research enterprise; but he or she will have chosen to tilt the personal mix of research and teaching more dramatically in the direction of teaching than would be appropriate for one seeking tenure. The teaching professor will dedicate a full professional life to the university as an active participant in the institution and a premier participant in the education of students. The teaching professor will not be given the lifetime position we associate with tenure, but the possibility of remaining with the institution for a whole professional career will be very real.

It is my claim that teaching professors will be and ought to be key players in the symphony—in other words, as I have said before, that even in a world unrestrained by considerations of time and resources, the tenured faculty ought not cover every course.

In part, this view is derived from a principle of comparative advantage applied to the enterprise of undergraduate education in our research universities. Simply put, although the importance of exposing undergraduates to those who are engaged in advanced research cannot be overstated, it would be a misallocation of aggregate faculty time to carry that principle to an extreme that every course were taught by such persons. Moreover, as undergraduate education at our universities moves—quite felicitously in my view—in the direction of increasing the time devoted to student contact outside of class, whether to continue the classroom conversation or to provide career and personal counseling, the kind of time and devotion I associate with the teaching professor—the master teacher—will become more and more important. And, finally, incorporating into

the enterprise a set of actors singularly devoted to the development of pedagogies to integrate research and teaching is bound to be beneficial.

### **9.7 The global professor**

In addition to the Teaching Professor, I also propose another relatively new but increasingly important category of faculty, the global professor. By this I mean a distinguished academic from outside the United States who, if not willing to move here permanently, is willing on a long-term continuing basis to commit a portion of the year—two or three months—to the research university. Global professors engage in collaborative research with others on the faculty, teach courses on a compressed schedule, and make themselves available to the university's students throughout the year—whether they are students studying abroad or drawing on the resources of cyberspace.

Global faculty add perspective and dimension—both inside disciplines, which may manifest themselves differently in different cultural contexts, and in a more general sense, because they bring their conceptions of reality and the richness of their own values into the wider university conversation. As the pace of globalization accelerates and the value of integrating perspectives other than our own is accepted in disciplines or professions that have not already embraced it, the university will enlist an increasing number of global professors.

### **9.8 The adjunct faculty**

At the same time, the common enterprise university will value and valorize adjunct faculty who truly can make distinctive contributions. In my lexicon, an adjunct professor is someone selected because he or she, while forswearing a full-time academic life, comes into the classroom as an exemplar of the application of knowledge creation in the world outside the gates. His or her commitment to the university may be less intense or less consuming, since the commitment in both directions is less than full-time.

But consider the advantage of such adjuncts at a university like NYU. Blessed by our location we are able to draw on the unparalleled pool of talent in the world's capital city. To bring that breadth of experience and expertise to our students is not an expedient measure; it adds another layer of richness and depth to a liberal education.

I would argue that the impact of adjuncts on campus cannot be captured in a simple statistic: the category itself tends to obscure a broad range of activities from teaching introductory language courses to offering novel and interesting insights from the best of practitioners who are willing not only to convey, but to reflect on their own work. A pie chart of faculty categories cannot tell us what individual faculty members are contributing to students and to the university itself. Adjuncts can offer students exposure to knowledge, experience and insight from creative and professional careers that have changed society and even the very disciplines we teach and study. A Spike Lee can be an extraordinary gift to film students. And what law student would not want to learn from someone like Marty Lipton, who has changed the face of corporate law?

Not every adjunct will be as famous—and no one should teach in the classroom who should not be there. But it would be shortsighted and dogmatic to deny the special

qualities that adjunct faculty can bring—whether they are celebrated movie directors, public officials, journalists, social workers who know how theory works in practice, newly-minted Ph.D.s or more experienced ones who are exposing students to introductory concepts and theories in their fields.

Clearly, adjunct faculty play a different role in the common enterprise university. They are not constantly present; the opportunities for serendipitous engagement with other faculty and with students outside the classroom will be rarer; their participation in the wider academic dialogue will be intermittent. But in contexts where such costs are outweighed by the benefits of the rich experiences or the depth of knowledge they can bring to the university, adjunct professors can offer much that we should prize.

## **9.9 Cyberfaculty**

The final form of faculty that I will discuss is inspired by the enormous possibilities affecting both research and teaching that are opened up by the continuing advances in technology. Gradually, if sometimes grudgingly, we are letting technology transform the way we think, teach and learn in the research university. And the truth of the matter is that all faculty will have to be expert in new technologies. As new generations of students take technology more and more for granted, they will demand faculty who deal with technology as readily and deftly as they do. Students who were apparently born with a mouse in their hands will themselves become faculty. In brief, I think that all faculty will, within a generation or two, be acting like cyber faculty, even if much of their teaching is done face-to-face and on-site. This involves more than just

technical capacities. Just as there will be great research in pedagogy that will be brought to bear in teaching, there will be a whole wisdom that will integrate technologies into research and teaching that will not be known to the domestic computer user, and will require more than the traditional IT department provides.

But thus far, the response of universities has been bifurcated. Some have created new technology ventures to produce digitized versions of instructional materials, with the aim of delivering high quality content to what were assumed to be vast untapped markets of prospective students. Other institutions of higher education have pursued an electronic infrastructure, which enables the traditional faculty and students to work more efficiently within the traditional modalities. I believe both responses, while useful, only represent early waves of much more dramatic innovations essential to realizing the full potential of technology for teaching and learning in the new research university.

So, at least for a significant transition period, I believe it is necessary to create a group of faculty whom I call cyber faculty, a set of new actors within the university charged with linking the coming waves of technological innovation with the challenges and aspirations of higher education. Cyber faculty will have quadruple-powered capacity: first, a level of technological sophistication well beyond what we associate with all but a few of today's faculty and possibly even beyond what we will associate with many of tomorrow's faculty; second, an unusually creative appetite for deconstructing traditional teaching and research and reconceptualizing them; third, an advanced competence in a substantive and traditional academic discipline; fourth, and most important, an unusual talent to inspire collaboration among contributors with diverse expertise in innovation.

The cyber faculty will be viewed fully as faculty colleagues with a specific mandate within the academic enterprise to integrate research and teaching into the new world of scholarly cyberspace. This is very different from what we typically find today in our IT service organizations, our libraries or our centers for teaching excellence, where talented and dedicated people are not nuanced in their engagement with the material—only intermittently collaborative with the knowledge creators, and then often purely as facilitators.

The creation of a cyber faculty will require an investment of resources, but one that is essential to enhance and speed the integration of technology into what universities do. True, some faculty, already masters of technology, have brought it into their work; however, far from demonstrating that cyber faculty are unnecessary (at least for an interim period), what has already been achieved by some faculty provides tantalizing proof of the potential technology offers for all. We are already witnessing signs of this at NYU, where individuals are demonstrating the importance of this new category. Some are at work in collaborations of our scholars and practitioners to create new technological infrastructure and new multimedia contents for transformative approaches to learning. A team of faculty at the School of Medicine has created Surgical Interactive Multimedia Modules, which combine rich media-enhanced lectures, annotated imaging studies, pathology data and digitized video footage of both animated and real surgical procedures. With these modules, a student in the surgery clerkship can pursue multiple lines of inquiry, interacting online, with the story of a patient—from presentation to treatment and follow-up. Students thus gain self-paced exposure to information and problem-solving

experiences not available in the classroom or even in the hospital setting. Faculty can focus more on guiding the students' engagement in learning because they need less class time to transmit information. Inspired by this experiment, the Medical School is now launching a collaborative effort to apply the same approach to other areas of the curriculum.

Conceivably, some cyber faculty may never enter a traditional classroom, and hence will not be evaluated on their capacity for traditional teaching. Instead, their performance will be normed on their ability to create in their colleagues and in the life of the university an actuation of the technological revolution, the effects of which have only begun to be felt in the research and learning process.

## **9.10 Conclusion**

So not just in response to new financial pressures, but in response to the new imperatives of hyperchange in the world of knowledge, we must encourage, draw on, respect and reward an appropriate blend of the array of faculty actors I have described here. This will be a foundation of the new research university, creating a culture of institutional citizenship that honors equality of voice and the role of all members of the community.

I have argued that many of the best of the faculty of today will embrace this vision and not reject it as just abstract theory. And I have asserted that universities will invite and evoke that response by adding another element to our traditional criteria for faculty—not just excellence in scholarship and quality of teaching—but a dedication to

the university community. I have acknowledged that some potential faculty will be allergic to this ideal; but for many, the very demand will appeal to their higher and more aspirational conception of themselves, will raise the standard of their ambitions and affect every aspect of what they do. For them the mutual obligations of the social compact will be a positive and even irresistibly powerful magnet.

For NYU and other great research universities the common enterprise ideal is the best and, in the end, the only way that, facing the realities of today, we can fulfill our mission for the faculty, students and society of the twenty-first century. Each institution will find its own path. But I am convinced that the guiding principles are the same: self-reflection, but not self-absorption, at the institutional and individual level; respect for the rigor of scholarship, but equal respect for the vocation and variety of teaching; the cultivation of the autonomy of the individual mind and creative spirit coupled with the integration of every mind and talent into a community of learning. In my view this is the research university of the future, rooted in enduring principles but ready to encompass and enhance the best possibilities of this transformed and transformative era.

