

Eighteenth David Dodds Henry Lecture: Adding Value and Virtue to Higher Education by Dr. William C. Richardson

Collection: David D. Henry Lecture Series, 1972-2008

Repository: University of Illinois Archives

Rights: Data

Digital Collections at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Library

<https://digital.library.illinois.edu/items/51d85b40-fed9-013d-3124-02d0d7bfd6e4-b>

Downloaded on April 22, 2026

ADDING VALUE AND VIRTUE TO
HIGHER EDUCATION

by Dr. William C. Richardson
President/CEO, W.K. Kellogg Foundation

Eighteenth David Dodds Henry Lecture
University of Illinois at Chicago



ADDING VALUE AND VIRTUE TO
HIGHER EDUCATION

by Dr. William C. Richardson

President/CEO, W.K. Kellogg Foundation

David Dodds Henry

President, University of Illinois

1965-71

The David Dodds Henry Lectures in Higher Education are endowed by gifts to the University of Illinois Foundation in recognition of Dr. Henry's contributions to the administration of higher education, including his service as president of the University of Illinois from 1965 until 1971. The lectures are intended to focus upon the study of the organization, structure, or administration of higher education, as well as its practice. Selection of persons to present the lecture is the responsibility of the chancellors of the two campuses of the University. Presentation of the lectures is alternated between Chicago and Urbana-Champaign.

Eighteenth David Dodds Henry Lecture

University of Illinois at Chicago

March 26, 1997

BRINGING VALUE AND VIRTUE TO
HIGHER EDUCATION

by Dr. William C. Richardson
President, CEO, W.K. Kellogg Foundation

Richardson David Dornstetter Lecture
University of Illinois at Chicago

March 24, 2011



DAVID DODDS HENRY

President, University of Illinois

1955-71

The David Dodds Henry Lectures in Higher Education are endowed by gifts to the University of Illinois Foundation in recognition of Dr. Henry's contributions to the administration of higher education, including his career as president of the University of Illinois from 1955 until 1971. The lectures are intended to focus upon the study of the organization, structure, or administration of higher education, as well as its practice. Selection of persons to present the lecture is the responsibility of the chancellors of the two campuses of the University. Presentation of the lectures is alternated between Chicago and Urbana-Champaign.



David Doolittle Henry

President, University of Illinois

1952-57

The David Doolittle Henry Lecture in Higher Education was named in his honor for his contributions to the administration of higher education, including his own contributions to the University of Illinois from 1945 until 1971. The lecture is intended to focus upon the study of the organization, structure, and administration of higher education, as well as the broader educational process to provide the lecture with the responsibility of the direction of the two campuses of the University. Presentation of the lecture is alternated between Chicago and Urbana-Champaign.

C O N T E N T S

It is my pleasure to welcome you to the eighth annual David Dinkins Distinguished

Lecture. A distinguished lecture series that has been presented at the University of

Illinois. It is my pleasure to welcome you to the eighth annual David Dinkins Distinguished

Welcome, Chancellor David C. Broski

1

Thank you for your interest in the University of Illinois. It is my pleasure to

introduce you to the University of Illinois. It is my pleasure to introduce you to

Introduction, President James J. Stukel

2

Director of Public Affairs—The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Henry Levin, Adding Value and Virtue to Higher Education

Board of Trustees and Dr. William C. Richardson, Director of the

Dr. William C. Richardson

Clark, And a special thank you to the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

6

Hall House Association

We at UIC are pleased to have you here today through our leadership

Questions and Discussion

23

and that of Mayor Richard J. Daley. The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Chicago Circle Campus, which is now a part of UIC. It is my pleasure to

Henry did not have to see the full development of our new Research Building

Research Building, which is now a part of UIC. It is my pleasure to

see the fruits of your investment in UIC. And I am pleased to have you

here and to thank you for your contribution to the University of Illinois.

University of Illinois. It is my pleasure to have you here at the

University of Illinois, which is now a part of UIC. It is my pleasure to

higher education in general and to our University. And I am pleased to

be certainly an honor. It is my pleasure to have you here at the

University of Illinois, which is now a part of UIC. It is my pleasure to

David C. Broski

Chancellor

University of Illinois at Chicago

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Chapter 1: The Role of the Teacher	15
Chapter 2: The Role of the Student	35
Chapter 3: The Role of the Parent	55
Chapter 4: The Role of the Community	75
Chapter 5: The Role of the Government	95
Chapter 6: The Role of the Media	115
Chapter 7: The Role of the Church	135
Chapter 8: The Role of the Family	155
Chapter 9: The Role of the School	175
Chapter 10: The Role of the Society	195
Chapter 11: The Role of the Culture	215
Chapter 12: The Role of the Economy	235
Chapter 13: The Role of the Environment	255
Chapter 14: The Role of the Technology	275
Chapter 15: The Role of the Education	295
Chapter 16: The Role of the Health	315
Chapter 17: The Role of the Law	335
Chapter 18: The Role of the Religion	355
Chapter 19: The Role of the Art	375
Chapter 20: The Role of the Science	395
Chapter 21: The Role of the History	415
Chapter 22: The Role of the Geography	435
Chapter 23: The Role of the Politics	455
Chapter 24: The Role of the Philosophy	475
Chapter 25: The Role of the Psychology	495
Chapter 26: The Role of the Sociology	515
Chapter 27: The Role of the Anthropology	535
Chapter 28: The Role of the Linguistics	555
Chapter 29: The Role of the Music	575
Chapter 30: The Role of the Dance	595
Chapter 31: The Role of the Theater	615
Chapter 32: The Role of the Film	635
Chapter 33: The Role of the Television	655
Chapter 34: The Role of the Internet	675
Chapter 35: The Role of the Mobile Phone	695
Chapter 36: The Role of the Social Media	715
Chapter 37: The Role of the Video Game	735
Chapter 38: The Role of the Virtual Reality	755
Chapter 39: The Role of the Augmented Reality	775
Chapter 40: The Role of the Artificial Intelligence	795
Chapter 41: The Role of the Robotics	815
Chapter 42: The Role of the Nanotechnology	835
Chapter 43: The Role of the Biotechnology	855
Chapter 44: The Role of the Space Technology	875
Chapter 45: The Role of the Environmental Technology	895
Chapter 46: The Role of the Energy Technology	915
Chapter 47: The Role of the Information Technology	935
Chapter 48: The Role of the Transportation Technology	955
Chapter 49: The Role of the Manufacturing Technology	975
Chapter 50: The Role of the Agriculture Technology	995

W E L C O M E

It is my pleasure to welcome you to the eighteenth David Dodds Henry Lecture. A series that honors the twelfth president of the University of Illinois. I'd like to take a few minutes to introduce some individuals who are in our audience this afternoon. First, the Chair of our Board of Trustees, Trustee Susan Gravenhorst. Susan, thank you for coming. Dr. Sylvia Manning, our Vice President for Academic Affairs, is here. Donald Coe, our Director of Public Affairs—Don. And members of this year's David Dodds Henry Lecture Committee, including Michele Thompson, Secretary of the Board of Trustees, and Professor Clark Hulse of our English Department—Clark. And a special friend, Mr. Gordon Johnson, Executive Director of the Hull House Association.

We at UIC owe much to David Henry. It was through his leadership and that of Mayor Richard J. Daley that the University of Illinois built its Chicago Circle Campus, which now makes up a large part of UIC. Dr. Henry did not live to see the official opening of our new Molecular Biology Research Building, also known as Davidson Hall. But he did live to see UIC join the ranks of major research universities. And this campus is a tribute to him and to those who have succeeded him in the presidency of the University of Illinois. Partly because of the reputation of David Henry and of the University of Illinois, we have been able to persuade the foremost leaders of higher education to give this lecture over the years. And this year's speaker is certainly no exception. Here to introduce him is the President of the University of Illinois, former Chancellor of UIC, Dr. James Stukel.

David C. Broski
Chancellor
University of Illinois at Chicago

INTRODUCTION

Let me say welcome. It's so nice to see you all. One of the most pleasant assignments that a president has is the opportunity to introduce distinguished speakers such as we have here today. He and his topic which is, "Adding Value and Virtue to Higher Education," are especially relevant to a number of events and changes that are reshaping our society. As we know, universities tend to change less rapidly than the rest of society. As keepers of the tenants of knowledge and learning, and as pioneers of research, universities try to make a difference without being very different from what has always been. More than many parts of society, the academic community clings to tradition and caution. That can be a positive thing. However, there are times when we have to go about our business while the society around us changes in ways that cause us to ask, how relevant are we today in our society? Management expert Peter Drucker, by way of example, recently stated in *Forbes Magazine* that traditional American colleges are becoming increasingly irrelevant in a fast-paced, high-technology country. We do take pride in our high quality of our teaching, research, and outreach, but many people outside the academy see us through very, very different eyes. A society weary of ethical lapses in high places, fearful of corporate downsizing, alarmed by ethics and racial conflicts, perplexed by the drug culture, and dismayed that America has the highest incarceration rate and the lowest eligible voter participation rate of any major democracy asks us more and more, what value are you? What virtue is there in higher education and what are you doing to make society better? I think David Dodds Henry would welcome these questions if he were with us today. This Eighteenth Henry Lecture, as David said, presented in the honor of David Dodds Henry, is an appropriate place to answer and look for answers. And our speaker, William C. Richardson, is the appropriate

person to address the questions.

Bill was maturing intellectually during the turbulent 60's. He earned his bachelor's degree in history at Trinity College, his MBA at the University of Chicago, and his doctorate from University of Chicago's Graduate School of Business in 1971. So, while Bill was a student, the United States was experiencing attitude-changing turmoil. Many of the social alterations during the Age of Aquarius were positive. The increasing struggle for civil rights, the desire of college students to find a deeper meaning in life, the success in sending men to the Moon, thereby altering forever both our technology and our view of our relationship with the Universe. But the negative events were there as well while Bill was a student. And many of them are burned in our memories: the assassinations of John and Robert Kennedy, Martin Luther King, the expansion of the war in Vietnam, the prelude to the Constitutional crisis now known as Watergate. During that time David Dodds Henry was a quiet, steady hand at the University of Illinois, but even he might not have seen how much such historic events eroded public confidence in government and in authority of all kinds. A skepticism arose about the value of American traditions and institutions, and higher education was certainly not spared. So, among all of these questions that we are asking, there are many people out there who are not seeking truth, but only to make a personal, political statement. And the basic questions about value and virtue are not being attended to. Thank goodness Bill's going to talk about these things today and not me! But, Bill is the president of a major organization. He's the Chief Executive Officer of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, an organization committed to value and virtue and the endless task of improving the world that we live in. Under Bill's direction, the Foundation targets grants to help people improve their quality of life and that of future generations. Bill asks

questions, but his concerns and his criticisms of institutions are constructive, and not destructive. He cared deeply about people having a sense of worth, and, as I'm sure you'd know after having talked with him, about accepting responsibility, about being productive, and about creating nurturing families and responsive institutions, especially in health care and in education. His academic credentials are exemplary. He was President of the Johns Hopkins University, the Executive Vice President/Provost of the Pennsylvania State University, and he was the Dean of the Graduate School and the Vice Provost for Research at the University of Washington - Seattle. So, he knows that American colleges and universities are the envy of the world. But, there's more to be dealt with. So, he's going to deal with an issue that's important to all of us, and I have no doubt that we will leave here having a better sense of values and of what we can do as an institution to make our contribution to our society. It is my honor and my distinct privilege to introduce Bill Richardson as our speaker for the Eighteenth David Dodds Henry Lecture. Bill. [Applause.]

James J. Stukel
President
University of Illinois

The first part of the paper discusses the importance of the research and the objectives of the study. It then proceeds to a literature review, followed by a description of the methodology used. The results are presented in the next section, and the paper concludes with a discussion of the findings and their implications for future research.

ADDING VALUE AND VIRTUE TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Dr. William C. Richardson

President/CEO, W.K. Kellogg Foundation

Jim, thanks very much and what a pleasure it is to be here and Trustee Gravenhorst let me especially thank you for being with us this afternoon. It's a real honor. And an honor indeed to be giving this lecture in memory of and recognition of the marvelous service of a great president of this great university. Someone whose life I suddenly realized, after reading his background, was intertwined in some very unanticipated small-world ways with my own. For example, I noted as you would have done in looking at the resume, that he served as Dean of Liberal Arts at Battle Creek College between 1929 and 1933. There aren't any in Battle Creek I know who recall the Battle Creek College, but I'll bet it really hummed in those days, knowing the man. And then he served as Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of Michigan, and so while I'm a late-comer to the State of Michigan, he was an early-comer in terms of his work there. My very first job in any academic institution was at New York University where he served for almost twenty years. Then, of course, I did serve, as Jim indicated, as Executive Vice President and Provost at the Pennsylvania State University for six years where Dodd received his undergraduate education as well as his master's and Ph.D. degrees in English. So, that was a connection that I was unaware of. I was honored when I was invited to give the lecture knowing the service that he provided to America and higher education and to the University of Illinois. But I'm all the more delighted knowing that here was someone who had in fact traveled some of the same

by-ways as I've had an opportunity to do. It is really wonderful, too, to come back to Chicago. It is, as you might have inferred from the introduction, a place which in so many ways my family and I still think of as home. I think that's inevitable when your children are born and you're starting a family and you think of a place as sort of where you come from. In many ways we think of this as home. My wife, in fact, is from Chicagoland, as we used to and I presume you still do call it—in at least in your looser moments.

During the 1960's when I was earning my Ph.D. in Health Policy within the Business School at the University of Chicago, it is true that we were living through truly momentous times that were to influence our lives for the next quarter century and probably well beyond in ways that would've been hard to have imagined then. Although even then it was pretty dramatic and evident at the time, I noticed that, probably for Freudian reasons, the convention slipped out of your mind as something all of us who were here at the time remember only too well. Another thing that wasn't mentioned that certainly made an impression on me though, was, as a baseball fan, the spring and summer afternoons that I spent at Wrigley Field. I remember a lot about it. Of course it's a wonderful Chicago tradition and, for those of you who are South Siders I apologize for focusing on Wrigley Field, I remember it not only because of the time I spent there, but because I remember it being a rather expensive place to go, if you went often enough. But back then, Cub fans really did believe that the money was well spent. After all, the Cubs were in a re-building phase and there was no question that they were on their way to being real contenders. Such are the painful disillusionments of youth. The Cubs, of course, are still rebuilding and Wrigley Field still has fans for whom hope springs eternal. But to their credit the Cubs organization really does add tremendous value to its product, if I can call it that, by promoting a unique experience that has

not changed over the decades. It's almost mystical in many ways. But I think there's a lesson here for American higher education -- and this is where I really want to begin -- because I think we too, should capitalize on our unique strengths and attributes and that almost mystical quality that does in fact exist. And we should emphasize not only our great traditions but very concretely our record of achievement in every aspect of American society because America's colleges and universities don't in fact have to wait until next year or until the next season to see the accomplishments and to tell the story. We're already poised this day, this season, if you will, to play a leadership role in preparing our nation and world for the challenges of 21st-Century life. As in the case of most areas of society, adding value is a key to success for higher education. Demographically, it's easy to see why this is so. Today, 62% of high school graduates attend college, up from 50% just fifteen years or so ago. Further, almost half of today's undergraduate students are over age 24, more likely than not to be married, to be female, and to be from under-served backgrounds. The burden of financing a college education now falls on a broader spectrum of American society than ever before in our history.

The good news I'd like to talk about this afternoon is that American higher education does, in fact, add value. We provide value in ways unmatched by any educational institution in world history, I would assert. We provide value in ways that provide our children with opportunities for growth and knowledge that no other institutions, no matter how hard they try, can replicate. We provide value in ways that can restore our broken communities and help lift our nation into a new era of world leadership, a very constructive era of world leadership, that can go on for many decades. How we continue to add value to existing programs and services and to communicate this value may, in fact, become one of the key areas for our

attention in the years just ahead. Of course this doesn't mean that we should minimize the serious problems that face American higher education, which is a litany that I need not repeat here. But it does require a commitment to refute what has become in many instances a siege mentality that seems to have gripped many of our public-serving institutions, be they federal agencies, health care systems, the child welfare system, which Gordon and I were just talking about, or indeed, higher education itself.

Let me just cite two examples of areas where the strengths of higher education might be better represented and better understood. Last fall I had the opportunity to talk to a leadership conference of the Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce which holds its meeting in Vancouver, B.C., each year. Their theme was, "Building a 21st Century Workforce: Critical Challenges in Post Secondary and Higher Education." This theme was overwhelmingly chosen by the CEO's and industry leaders from among others, the high-tech companies that include such giants in that part of the world as Boeing and Microsoft, among others. And a survey of Seattle Chamber members indicated no other criterion came even close to education, and specifically higher education, as a priority for deciding on where to site and operate technology-based businesses. These employers realized that the knowledge workers needed to compete and prosper will have to be products of higher education institutions and cannot be products of home-grown, self-made training programs. And they expect these prospective employees to possess not just technical skills -- and the key is, of course, right here -- but also the critical thinking and independence of thought so crucial in today's fast-paced and decentralized organizations. I think the ability of colleges and universities to prepare people of all ages for this kind of workplace is one of the underappreciated virtues of higher education, one that we don't talk so much about anymore. We need to remind the public

that technical studies, teaching electrical engineering or conducting biomedical research, as critical as they are, are only part of the picture. On a much broader scale, today's colleges and universities prepare people to think and to work and, indeed, to live in a way that will hasten America's transformation to the knowledge-based society and economy that we are, indeed and must become.

For a historic parallel, consider the central role played by America's high schools in the late 1800's. Many people today forget that the high school, as an entity, is a relatively recent phenomenon. And if I were to have said, "Let's go back to 150 years ago", there would have been virtually no high schools in recognizable form. But if we cast our mind back to the mid- to later 1800's and think about high schools, they were regimented, they were rigorous, they were authoritarian, and they were absolutely essential to the economy of the time. Their methods were appropriate for that society. By teaching young people to sit in orderly rows, to memorize the Periodic Table, and to do other such things which today we wouldn't think of as being overly creative, they really were preparing young people for the structured workplaces of the advanced industrial age that was, at that time, very much a part of our economy. Today a minimum of two years of college has become almost as indispensable as a high school diploma was just a few generations ago. The creativity and innovation that marks a sound program of undergraduate studies is equally appropriate in preparing today's students for the coming workforce and workplace.

At so many higher education institutions, faculty are no longer, if they ever were, oracles of knowledge as they are coaches who help their students formulate questions, problem solve, and synthesize data. As companies everywhere recognize, the knowledge base of any career field can and probably will evolve almost overnight and, as we know, college

graduates who really do learn to learn will continue adding value to their organizations long after the factual knowledge first acquired on campus has become obsolete.

While we're preparing students for the Information and Knowledge Age, our colleges and universities also prepare citizens to live and work in a truly multicultural society. Here again, it seems to me that American higher education is far ahead of most American communities and institutions in achievement that goes both unrecognized and, when it is recognized, often underappreciated. Unfortunately, because of criticism, and indeed I might say sometimes the reality of political correctness, the value of diversity has been misconstrued by some as a liability. I don't believe that it is. In truth, managing diversity is not an altruistic exercise. It is, as far as I'm concerned, absolutely a social mandate. By the year 2000, one-third of our population will be people of color. Even in communities that remain less diverse, the chances are that several local employers will rely heavily either on foreign operations or markets, or operations or markets in diverse communities. And much like computer literacy, the ability to thrive in a multicultural setting will soon become another form of literacy which all employers will expect their employees to have mastered. In the United States, among the best places to learn the language of diversity is the university classroom or residence hall. In my experiences, particularly at Johns Hopkins and Penn State, campus communities have been overwhelmingly successful in a number of instances in promoting understanding and friendships between people of different cultures. People who, in their home settings, in their high schools, and in their upbringing had, in many instances, never met anyone from a culture who was very different from his or her own. This is the real story of diversity in higher education and it seems to me that more people should hear about the positive aspects and the essential aspects of this part

of what we do.

Well, these are only two examples, if you will, of higher education virtues which are often overlooked, underappreciated, or, in some instances, actually maligned. Let me now turn to the other half of the equation -- adding value by enhancing or enriching the services and opportunities which higher education provides. I believe the word co-creating captures the essence of what I'm trying to describe. This includes building partnerships with constituents, businesses, and communities to create opportunities for learning, economic growth, and community development which didn't exist before and also, while respecting the needs of constituents, viewing American universities as global, land-grant institutions which can mobilize resources to co-create opportunities of a wide variety almost anywhere. A growing opportunity exists for institutions to add value by creating flexible, useful programs for adult learners in the private sector. This is another key area that is absolutely crucial in terms of our global economy, but also makes a lot of sense within our own institutions. Again, while I was at Hopkins we embarked on a major expansion of off-campus programs so that by the time I left, more than half of the university's 16,000 students were adult, part-time, graduate students. I might add that this was done with the support of the faculty, who, as they thought through the options that face the University in terms of both opportunities and external threats, recognized that this tradition at Hopkins, for which it was not particularly well-known, presented an opportunity for us to really move the community and the University into closer juxtaposition and to serve the State of Maryland in a way that Maryland had not even anticipated or expected, but was absolutely delighted to see. And it was done, in a sense, at no opportunity cost, if you will, to the rest of the University. One of the things I watched like a hawk during the time I was there was the gap between

Hopkins, in terms of sponsored research funding, and the next closest competitor. During that time, even though Hopkins ranked number one, the gap kept widening. So, there was no question that there was a loss of commitment. And indeed, if you looked at the range of activities we were involved in, there was actually a deepening and a widening of our commitment to doing excellent research sponsored by outside sources of funds. So it was not a zero sum game; indeed, it was an opportunity to add to the University and to have the University add value to what it did within that part of the United States, and specifically, within the State of Maryland.

An example is in the field of engineering. The collaboration we had between the University and the National Security Agency was one that I thought was especially fruitful. While NSA has enough scientific brainpower on its staff to teach its own in-house master's program, [As you may know, it's the Agency that probably attracts the brightest people in the government every year, brightest young minds in the government, and could easily have done its own programs] instead, it has chosen to send its staff to Hopkins for graduate education because it viewed it as more efficient and more effective to out-source that function than to do it itself. The operative words here are efficient and effective. I should add that accessible and practical should also be on the list because to accommodate working adults who are pursuing graduate degrees, Hopkins built five centers between Baltimore and Washington, D.C., four out of the five in Maryland along that corridor between those two cities. Virtually every field of learning within the University from the humanities to music to engineering to public health were addressed within these centers serving adult, part-time graduate students. I think the public's desire for higher education to expand programs for adult learners, though, is only one manifestation of our accountability, whether I'm talking about private universities or public universities and here, of course, I don't mean

accountability just in the financial sense, because that is a given. I'm instead referring to accountability in the sense of high standards and the objectives of the university and its role within the community. The accountability to clientele, whether it's local, state, or national -- or indeed an international community -- is absolutely critical. These are the stakeholders who we are affecting in terms of their sense of our change, our value, and our role. It's absolutely essential we provide to that clientele, if you will, first rate service. We're talking here not about anything that in any way reduces the caliber of what we do, either in other areas of endeavor or in the quality of what we do as we reach out to adult, part-time learners.

How do we serve these stakeholders? How do we discern their needs and develop the right programs and services to meet them? Well, to answer these questions we've simply got to do more than just come up with new programs or curricula. We've got to regard educational reform, I think, as an organizing principle that guides nearly every decision we make, large and small. An example would be to point to UIC's goal of becoming an urban land-grant institution of the future. This is precisely the kind of adaptability that adds value to higher education. UIC already had great expertise and experience in health care and medicine, nursing, business, education, social work, community and public health, and other fields. UIC already has research skills and extensive linkages with Chicago's communities and neighborhoods, and, most importantly, the University demonstrates a clear willingness to share its resources with the broader community, through efforts such as the Great Cities Program. The Kellogg Foundation, through its recent partnership with UIC -- of which we are very proud -- has experienced this willingness first hand. Some of you may know that last fall we awarded a \$3.8 million grant to help establish the International Center for Health Leadership Development. Let me just say a

word about why I think this Center represents not only a wave of the future for higher education, but for our communities as well. It's no secret that significant social change rarely occurs in the absence of strong leadership. This especially holds true when the changes sought involve massive, complex entities such as the U.S. healthcare system. We've been reminded of this time and time again in recent years through our programming in the Kellogg Foundation where we're very mindful of how difficult it is to make lasting change. Time doesn't permit me to talk in detail about the various healthcare initiatives we've been working on. But at the core of these initiatives are two basic ideas -- one is that the United States needs more and better equipped primary-care providers, physicians, and nurses who are educated and trained in communities and who have learned to work in teams. And second, communities should have a stronger say in deciding which health services are most needed by local people, what resources should be made available, and should be in a position to communicate that both to institutions such as this one, but also to the broader political constituency, and to programs at both the state and national levels. Our programs and community partnerships in health professions education allow students to learn and practice their academic skills in community-based care centers, which we think is the right place for a significant part of the student's time in the health sciences. Local people serve on the center's governing boards and help to determine the nature and the level of the services they provide. These centers are spread across the country and there are many moving stories of the ways in which and the degree to which local people have informed academic health centers, universities, campuses of needs in ways that could not possibly have been understood without the opening for that cross-communication.

Some of this, of course, can be thought of, and indeed a few years

ago was thought of, as being rather strange. But I must say that with the advent in recent years of managed care, for example, in the health care field, radical changes in the reorganization and re-engineering of the way in which we provide services, that what seemed strange five or ten years ago doesn't seem so strange today. And I'm almost sure that as we think out over the next five or ten years, we'll be surprised at the degree to which what may seem strange today is, if not taken for granted, at least being worked on in a conscientious way. But affecting systems change still is going to require change-makers, people who really are able to exercise effective leadership. And we need progressive institutions that can teach new ways of thinking and practicing, and who can incorporate teaching and experience in leadership at whatever level. And that's exactly what I think we're going to see developed here across the University with respect to your International Center for Health Leadership Development, which, as I said before, we view as a strategic partnership between the Kellogg Foundation and the University. Once in full operation, the Center will prepare individuals from communities and institutions to create partnerships between these entities and the Center will offer multi-disciplinary courses that cut across schools such as health, education, nursing, social work, and business, we hope in a way that will provide opportunities for fellowship programs, for people to fulfill degree requirements, and eventually offering non-degree programs and opportunities on sites other than on campus. Essentially, what we're trying to do here is to encourage a Center that provides a balance of teaching, service, and research that is appropriate to the modern needs and circumstances both of the University and the community.

This is terribly important because, it seems to me, that the consumer psychology that shaped our post-second World War society has really forever changed the way in which the citizenry view all services and

institutions, but particularly public institutions. And, as a nation, we're no longer afraid in the least to confront City Hall, or the Chancellor's Office, or the Dean's Office, or whichever office seems most likely to be responsive to such confrontations. In addition, we've become very discriminating as consumers, and in recent decades we have seen business and industry become very disciplined, focused, and efficient. Frankly we expect our tax-supported agencies and institutions, including our universities, to adopt many of the same consumer-focused policies. For example in the area of foster care, the Kellogg Foundation is doing a good deal of grant-making through a program called Families for Kids. Our idea is really a simple one -- to encourage those people in non-profit agencies responsible for foster care, those people in child welfare services agencies operated by the state and the courts, to take the focus off their own operations and to put it on both the kids and the idea of reducing the time it takes to move a youngster out of an abusive home and into a permanent placement to one year. Right now in some jurisdictions, it may take three, four, or five years, representing 80% or 90% of a child's life. And yet, to get the courts, the agencies, and the non-profits to focus on a common database to benchmark and to talk to each other about how they're doing in terms of getting these kids through systems change is extraordinarily difficult to get a focus, in this case, on the consumer.

For higher education, part of the challenge may be helping the public to better understand what scholarship and research are all about. We all know that there are inefficiencies built in to what we do. But I think the larger issue perhaps is a failure to link instruction and research to the needs of the communities and those around us. When we connect these two, we see the purposes and needs of all parties converge in some ways that can be extraordinarily valuable for faculty and students alike. The

community rightly believes that the university is being accountable by helping address local concerns. Students, through service learning in areas such as health and human services, education, or business receive a more dynamic and useful education.

And now, at this point, we can come to the question of if that's true, how do the faculty fit into this scenario? After all, isn't it true that the incentive that most American universities still reward for research more than teaching, and for research and teaching more than service? If that's true, how can we expect faculty to think and act otherwise? Well, I think there are many ways to approach that. My own personal experience suggests that it can be addressed pretty effectively, and without the sort of average amount of exchange of information that takes place among faculty and between faculty and administration. But, I think the starting point has got to be university leadership, meaning faculty leadership and administrative leadership, in a way that articulates a multi-faceted mission that is balanced and forward-looking. This is what's been accomplished here at UIC in quite a remarkable way. Then within this context, faculty appointments among other things, can be viewed as licenses for faculty to pursue their own work, but in a way that assures that the work is going to be financially supportive of the university's long-term well-being. At the same time, faculty activities, which include teaching, would be expected to be delivered at a level that makes sense in terms of the economics of the university. Or, if it's research, then the university supports the research, the research workers, and the faculty member. Or, which is more likely to be the case, some mix of these two. But again, as it involves service and work in the community, it becomes an extension of scholarly activity, in which again, if the faculty member's field and inclinations are in the direction of involving students in the community or doing work in the community

through a variety of service activities, then that also should be seen as adding as much value and having as much virtue, if you will, as would be true for teaching on the campus or research which doesn't involve the community involved with the campus.

It's also important, I think, to remember that universities are very complex places with many disciplines, some of which lend themselves to these kinds of activities more than others. Having said that, I will quickly come back to the observation that with the Hubbel space telescope and the work of the Physics and Astronomy Department at Hopkins, there was an enormous amount of work that went on with Morgan State University, with mostly minority undergraduates whom we were trying to attract into the sciences and through high schools throughout Maryland and beyond and, indeed, through the lay community that was very interested in astronomy. And all of which served both Hopkins and NASA extremely well. It seems to me the same logic applies to those who are engaged in clinical practice. Clinical practice is an integral part of what we do. For those of us who have students whose learning relies on adequate learning and clinical practice, it becomes an integral part. And again, as in the case of the partnerships program that I was describing, it needs to be treated with just as much pride, value, and importance in terms of our scholarly activities as would be other more limited forms of teaching, research, and service.

We can also focus, of course, our attention on problems around us that are critical to our society, just as critical as were the problems during the Cold War that captured the imagination of the public when they thought of why it was important at both the state and national levels to support our great research universities, public and private. Drug and violence prevention, community-based health care, technical assistance in a whole range of fields are examples of the abundance of opportunities we have for both

faculty work, student internships, and work-study experiences. That person-to-person transfer of technology, if you will, of understanding and of knowledge, which we prize as we work with the business community, which you see exemplified in places like Seattle, the Silicon Valley, Boston, and, indeed, right here in Chicago, is, as far as I can see, just as important as the work we're doing in the communities around us. And both are as important as the traditional work we might do right on the campus.

Let me wrap up with one final observation -- which has to do primarily with undergraduates [and I've touched on it very, very lightly as you can see] -- on undergraduate teaching. Not that I don't think its critically important. I think that taking more seriously and focusing on the way we create those imaginative students I talked about in the beginning of my remarks is critically important. But there's another facet, too, which is hard to evaluate in terms of the added value to students or to society around us which I suspect few of us would quibble with, and that's the social and spiritual development, awareness, and growth for our undergraduate students and of our undergraduates. And I would note that here at UIC, where you have 300 students in residence [albeit a small percentage of the total student body] this becomes an increasingly important issue. In the 1990's, universities are no longer expected to serve *en loco parentis* which would have been the case when some of us were undergraduates, but we do have a responsibility, I think, to support the development of our undergraduate students across the whole spectrum of personal growth. Positive youth development extended, if you will, into the college years, either the traditional college-age years or a little beyond that. For many students, I think this exploration goes hand-in-hand with the intellectual growth that embodies so much of the university experience and in which we take appropriate pride. But I've been amazed in my career to see the degree to

which, when you offer this opportunity and open up the idea of students learning from each other and through each other -- using as the dimension not just limited student activities and student services, but taking seriously a broader discussion of the student's personal and spiritual development -- that there's a tremendous enthusiasm, if you will, by the students and it opens the door to intergroup discussion, understanding, and curiosity that's really quite phenomenal to observe. And I noticed it particularly with respect to issues of understanding other people's faiths, in Muslim, Christian, and Jewish students, for example. And I've watched year-long seminars and informal groups and both sessions really make a difference to students, who, when they came to the campus, had no idea or understanding of any group other than their own. So, all of this weaves back together when thinking of the value and the virtue of the university and the way in which we can provide opportunities to our students. And it comes back to some responsibilities I believe we have in terms of fostering the growth and development particularly of undergraduate students.

As one thinks about the University of Illinois in general, and UIC, the times are challenging indeed, and the years ahead that I've alluded to are indeed going to be exciting and frustrating all at the same time. And there will be many who worry about the turmoil and the uncertainty which is bound to accompany all of your activities, particularly if you, as I suspect you will be, are pressing the edge of the envelope. But if you think to the creation of the land-grant universities of the 19th Century, there was tremendous turmoil and uncertainty created by the establishment of these institutions and a lot of worry on the part of those who were not focused in the way that those early land-grant institutions developed. Similarly, after the Second World War when the GI Bill was passed and we had the returning students [hopefully a period that predates most of the people in

this room, but one which we heard about certainly], there was a good deal of turmoil on many of our campuses. In fact, one Midwest president even predicted that the GI Bill would turn campuses into "hobo-jungles" and therefore should be resisted. But what have we really done? We have opened up education in a way that no other society in the world has done and if ever there was a landmark or a watershed pair of events, it had to have been the establishment of the land-grant institutions and the GI Bill. But we've also segued then into the Cold War and, as I said a few minutes ago, a lot of the way we defined ourselves, a lot of the way we organized ourselves, and a lot of the ways we determined what was of value and what had virtue within the university was defined in terms of that global competition. And when the Berlin Wall came down and the Soviet Union fell apart and we no longer had that seemingly monolithic enemy, then one could argue that from a public point of view, we entered into a phase of drift where we wondered what American higher education was really all about. And was the argument compelling, were the costs worth it, and was American higher education doing the job? In that context, we have UIC, we have the U of I more generally, providing a beacon for the rest of higher education in the United States. A beacon in the sense of an example of the way in which a university can transform itself, strengthening every one of those legs, connecting with the community and answering the questions for the people of Illinois and, indeed, for the people of the United States of America of why it is that colleges and universities in this country must adapt, will adapt, and will, in fact, continue to be the driving force that defines success in the 21st Century.

Thank you very much for the invitation. [Applause.]

Q U E S T I O N S A N D D I S C U S S I O N S

CHANCELLOR BROSKI: I'm sure I speak for all of us, Bill, when I say I think you've done just a marvelous job of summarizing and reminding us of the value added by our collective works here at the University. As you said at the outset of your remarks, we do seem to be besieged, if not beleaguered, by our critics in higher education. And we hear a lot about the eroding confidence of the general public and higher education. I appreciated particularly your very optimistic tone as you talked about the value added and laid out some of the challenges for the future as well. I liked the part about UIC, too. We have a few minutes before a reception where you'll have a chance to speak more personally with Dr. Richardson. Would there be any comments or questions from our audience?

DR. RICHARDSON: Since we only have five or six minutes, I would urge you to think of the least polite, most direct, toughest question that you can come up with.

CHANCELLOR BROSKI: You're in Chicago, I'm not sure how to do that...

DR. RICHARDSON: I know, I know I don't need to say that, but I thought I would anyway. Yes, sir.

PERSON FROM AUDIENCE: There are increasing suggestions, especially most recently from a meeting of the Western Governors, that distance learning and education via the Internet is the wave of the future. I'd like you to comment. Do they add value to education and if so how does it apply to the University?

DR. RICHARDSON: I'm glad you raised that. I couldn't fit everything in and that's one of the subjects I would have liked to comment on. I think that both distance learning [we don't know yet just how quickly or in what form our ability to communicate electronically through telecommunications will come] and videoconferencing have very important roles to play. We know already that we're able to do a lot with very conventional means, not even digital means, but conventional means of telecommunications. We also now know that students are spread all over, and that they expect, as with everything else, that services will be provided closer to where they are rather than further away, and provided in an efficient and cost-effective manner. So we need to figure out some ways to have that happen. Does that substitute -- in the way that the Western Governors would like it to -- for getting people together? Having long seminars, having long weekends? Communicating in a labor-intensive way, in what appears to be a fairly inefficient way in terms of the way we communicate with our students? No, I don't think so. I think all of that will be part of American higher education. I view this as more than an adjunct, but not more than a fundamental, I mean, not a fundamental change in the way in which Americans and others learn, either, at the undergraduate level -- how to think critically and to write and work effectively, or to know something about each other. There's an inherent conflict, isn't there, between what I described and what you think if you imagine us all doing it on the Internet, for example. On the other hand, it seems to me, it can be a critically useful way of conserving scarce resources. We're already seeing it in library collections and in journals, and we will see more of it. We certainly are seeing it in terms of work assignments and the ability to readily communicate between students and faculty. We see it in writing, for example, as a very useful device if the class is structured properly. It can be a virtual class, it does not have to be a

class that gets together regularly. So, I see it as somewhere between -- an additional tool which we have. I mean it's a lot more than that, but, something short of substitution for what we think of as the way in which we teach and learn. Having said all of that, we're going to be confronted with competitors. I said in the very beginning of my remarks that I didn't think anybody could substitute for what it is we do. You can be sure there are going to be plenty of people who are trying. And, if we don't keep up and if we aren't focused on some of the issues we talked about this afternoon, if we aren't always trying to keep two or three steps ahead of everybody else, [which is hard for a university to do because of our structure and our traditions and so on] then we really do face some unnecessarily threatening alternatives. We know already that industry is able to, and does in fact provide extremely high quality training. The fact that they're doing a lot of that themselves is fine. If, at Hopkins, we want to provide an opportunity to do that yourself and to have them outsource it, that's realistic, too, because companies more and more are focusing on their core business and outsourcing everything else. And to the degree that we're able to provide post-graduate level education in a way that they view as useful and something to be outsourced as the NSA did, then so much the better for us. But it seems to me we really have to be on our toes because if we're laggards in this, then there are plenty of people out there—let me just cite one example. Sylvan Learning Systems is a fast growing, highly successful company that started with essentially after-school tutoring, has now grown to a global company using electronics very, very effectively in reaching all around the world, and is doing everything from distance learning to extensive testing. And with a very dynamic CEO that understands exactly what's happening in both secondary and post-secondary education and will be looking for opportunities. He would rather collaborate with UIC in

undertaking that activity. For example, he has just formed a formal alliance with the Center for Talented Youth at Hopkins which has several thousand young people involved in after-school programs. These are for exceptionally bright kids who otherwise get bored in school. And he's very pleased to have that collaboration. He could just as well have done it himself, not as well, but just as well from his point of view. Yes sir.

PERSON FROM AUDIENCE: In view of all that you've said so very well, but in particular about the integrated roles of institutions of higher learning, how do you respond to and assess the enormous, strident attack on affirmative action that's very clearly evident across the land?

DR. RICHARDSON: Well, first of all, I think it's wrong. But that doesn't have anything to do with it because what we're talking about is, as far as I can see, a clash of philosophy and an even bigger clash of understanding and of words and symbols. And that makes it extraordinarily difficult to even have a conversation between two sides on the issue. There is, as far as I can see, gross misunderstanding of the circumstances of various groups, one by the other. For example, in a poll that was done and published, which you may have seen a year or so ago in the Washington Post—over 60%—I think it was two-thirds of white Americans believed that African-Americans, on average, were as well or better off than whites on average. And, that simply isn't the case. And yet, there is that perception. If somebody would have told me ten percent of white Americans believed that, I would have believed it. I know most of the ten percent. But the fact that it was 67%, I thought was just a stunning number. So, you can imagine, as I think I've said earlier, maybe it was in an earlier conversation, we've been through this restructur-

ing that I was referring to which was brutal, and has been brutal, and will continue to be brutal as it rolls through the society and the economy, had accompanying it, deflation. And, people know that when they leave a higher-paid job and take a lower-paid job, and the unemployment rate doesn't change—they know they're worse off, and when their spouse has to add some hours and so forth. In that circumstance where the whole society is stressed in that way, if you add to that people who believe that another group, which is in fact disadvantaged, is about as well off as they are and then you say for this group that is about as well off as you are, we're going to give special privileges, we're going to give opportunity, we're going to have a quota system, or whatever it may be that they're thinking it's all about. And so, to my way of thinking, there's a misunderstanding of the facts. There is a discomfort across the whole society in terms of economic wellbeing, despite the employment numbers. And then, there is a program, that in some instances has been misapplied or over applied, but by and large in my personal experience, has been absolutely essential to accomplishing ends that I thought were not only just, but were critical to the future of our democracy. And so, I reconcile it by saying, that what's going on out there can be explained, but that to my way of thinking doesn't alter the fact that we need to have those kinds of opportunities if American higher education is going to achieve the potential as an integrative force that I alluded to during my remarks. We've simply got to fight for it. We don't necessarily have to fight for a particular program, and every case has to stand on its merits. But the principle of diversity and of understanding one another's circumstances, it seems to me, is something if we're going to have a functioning democracy thirty or forty years from now, we have to fight for. I don't know if that's responsive to your question.

PERSON FROM AUDIENCE: I have a question, a final question.

DR. RICHARDSON: Let's see, I try to be gender neutral. Barring that opportunity...Yes, sir.

PERSON FROM AUDIENCE: How do you suppose that the emerging United Nations [the United Nations as another government that we have to consider now, we have federal government, we have local government, now we have international government] how is that going to impact the curricula of the colleges of the future in languages and in, let's say, business? And, I'm sure you agree, the United Nations is a much more powerful entity today than it was in 1944-45, for starters. And I think that there is a lot of talk about the need of Americans to go back to studying languages.

DR. RICHARDSON: Well, there are two or three things woven in there, some of which you and I agree on and lots of which we don't. I think, when you refer to government, international or national, I think we're moving towards less government and less government involvement in our affairs. I don't think it's a tactical move, or a zig or a zag. I think it's a trend. And I think it's one that we're likely to see applied in the international arena just as we do at the national level and, perhaps at the state level. And, therefore, I believe, that while we do need greater emphasis on international understanding, on languages, perhaps even on area studies, although that's more controversial, I think it's going to come from a different direction and is coming from a different direction, namely, a global economy and market forces that are inexorable and very, very powerful and which are unlikely to be deterred by major political counter forces through an international government such as the United Nations. We're certainly going to need that. We're going to need the forums in order to meet and deal with international

issues, whether it's the environment, political issues, population issues or health issues. Health -- really international health -- is a critically important thing for us to be considering. So I agree with you in that sense, but I think that the driving force here is going to be a global economy. Who knows, I could be back here in ten years and we could be all sitting around bemoaning the protectionists. Maybe not even bemoaning, maybe half the audience would be breathing a sigh of relief. But I think a protectionist approach is unlikely. And I think, therefore, that we simply must adapt ourselves to understanding and working effectively in a global context. And the thing that makes it inexorable to me is not the political changes that we've seen dramatically in the last decade, it's really the information revolution and the communications revolution and the way the globe has shrunk in that respect.

Again, many thanks for having me. [Applause.]

CHANCELLOR BROSKI: Once again, many, many thanks...

THE DAVID DODDS HENRY LECTURES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

"The Administration of Higher Education in an Era of Change and Conflict," by Clark Kerr, October 1972

"Can We Maintain Quality Graduate Education in a Period of Retrenchment?" by David Riesman, April 1975

"The Administration of Education for the Health Professions: A Time for Reappraisal," by John R. Hogness, April 1976

"Adding Value and Virtue to Higher Education," by Dr. William C. Richardson, March 1977

"The Education of Administrators for Higher Education," by Harlan Cleveland, April 1977

"Socially Imposed Costs of Higher Education," by Howard R. Bowen, April 1978

"Quality and Equality in Health Professions Education and Service," by Lloyd C. Elam, April 1979

"How We Talk and How We Act: Administrative Theory and Administrative Life," by James G. March, September 1980

"The Liberal Arts Revisited," by Hanna Holborn Gray, October 1981

"The University Presidency: Comparative Reflections on Leadership," by Martin A Trow, October 1984

"Innovation and Tradition in Higher Education," by John B. Slaughter, October 1985

"Mandate for a New Century: Reshaping the Research University's Role in Social Policy," by Donna E. Shalala, October 1989

"The New American University," by Frank H. T. Rhodes, October 1990

"Beyond Conservation and Liberation: The Education of Our Aspirations," by Linda S. Wilson, February 1992

"(R)evolution in American Higher Education," by Donald N. Langenberg, December 1992

"Higher Education and the Concept of Community," by Alexander W. Astin, October 1993

"The Public University of the Twenty-First Century: Beyond the Land Grant," by Walter S. Massey, October 1994.

"Reactionary Thoughts of a Revolutionary," by J. W. Peltason, October 1995

