

The University and the Urban Challenge

Why Should Universities Care About Cities?

Our Nation's cities are an important focus of life in America.¹ As major centers for commercial activity, cities house the leading banks, communications networks, and international trading companies. They are home to the basic infrastructure of trade and commerce—our roads, bridges, seaports, and airports. The central cities are megacenters for the arts, education, and scientific discovery. All of these amenities bring together people of diverse races, backgrounds, and religious persuasions.

Many American cities, however, are in steep and steady decline, for reasons both contemporary and historic. Current economic pressures on cities arise from global competition and technological innovation, which are fundamentally restructuring the U.S. economy. Having suffered through more than 20 years of job losses and fiscal stress, our cities can no longer generate robust economic opportunities and create good jobs for those with less than a college education. Businesses have fled to the suburbs or overseas, leaving behind “brownfields”—empty buildings on contaminated lots that no one wants to develop. These communities can no longer sustain themselves. Sadly, this fundamental fact of life will not change with an upswing in the business cycle.

The American city—historic gateway to social and economic mobility—has become home to many of the most disadvantaged people in America. Labor force detachment, lack of education, welfare dependency, drug abuse, teenage pregnancy, high infant mortality, and an increase in violent crime reflect a cityscape in which upward mobility and economic independence are virtually unknown. We are in danger of becoming two nations: one with highly skilled, well-paid workers and professionals and the other with a low-skilled, low- or even no-wage, permanent underclass. This spatial isolation of people by income and race in our metropolitan areas has become America's Achilles' heel and is spawning Third World conditions in our very midst.

Our Nation's institutions of higher education are crucial to the fight to save our cities. Colleges and universities must join the effort to rebuild their communities,

Figure 1

The Challenge of Changing Demographics

Future urban campuses are likely to make the diversity of today's urban campuses pale in comparison. With a shrinking pool of traditional Caucasian college-age Americans and an influx of older people returning to school, colleges and universities are faced with educating a population of students different from any they have educated before.

Demographic trends across the Nation illustrate the changes that America's colleges and universities can expect in the near future. By the year 2000, for example, California's white and Hispanic communities will be about equal, each with nearly 42 percent of the State's population. San Francisco will be 65 percent minority. Los Angeles County, with about 8 million people, will be 60 percent Hispanic-, Asian-, and African-American.

Although all institutions of higher education will feel the impact of this new population mix, urban campuses will experience it most intensely.

Source: Elliott, 1994.

not just for moral reasons but also out of enlightened self-interest. The long-term futures of both the city and the university in this country are so intertwined that one cannot—or perhaps will not—survive without the other. Universities cannot afford to become islands of affluence, self-importance, and horticultural beauty in seas of squalor, violence, and despair (Boyer, 1994).

Urban problems press heavily on higher education institutions: Neighborhood crime, poverty, and economic stagnation in these distressed communities threaten everyday campus life. Among America's colleges and universities, reports of robberies and aggravated assaults edged up slightly in 1993, while arrests for drug and weapons violations rose sharply (*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 3, 1995). Students do not want to study in such blighted neighborhoods, and faculties do not want to teach there. But, like other great anchoring institutions, colleges and universities cannot wall off their surroundings; nor can they just pick up and move.²

Rising crime is only one reason why colleges and universities should care about the economic and social well-being of their surrounding communities. Institutions of higher learning—both public and private—also must consider their commitment to societal welfare relative to the amount of public support they receive in funding and tax payments. From 1991 to 1992, Federal, State, and local governments spent \$64.4 billion on higher education (U.S. Department of Education, 1994). Taxpayers have every right to expect these schools to contribute—in their own ways—to solving society's problems, including its urban problems. Harvard University's former president Derek Bok asks how faculties at such institutions could “possibly expect to go on receiving such support from the Nation's taxpayers without making efforts to respond to society's needs?” (Bok, 1990.)

The notion here is similar to that underlying one of America's more indigenous ideas in higher education: the land-grant college. The Nation invested its available capital—land—to spread education, learning, research, and invention across the country during critical years of development. Today, the Nation faces new challenges and again needs the resources of higher education. As Ernest Boyer has written:

Higher education has more intellectual talent than any other institution in our culture. Today, colleges and universities surely must respond to the challenges that confront our children, our schools and our cities just as the land grant colleges responded to the needs of agriculture and industry a century ago (Boyer, op. cit.).

Universities should care about cities for academic, even curricular, reasons. From 1982 to 1992, the percentage of nonwhite students attending colleges and universities across the Nation grew by 5.6 percent (*The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac*, 1994). Given the increasing diversity of college campuses (see figure 1), these institutions must become more responsive to the needs and interests of a broader segment of the population.

The city also provides a wonderful setting for learning about how society works and how to improve it. By providing an opportunity for students to serve and learn, the city allows them to put their ideas and ideals into practice in a real-world context where their actions can make a real difference. Robert Coles describes how Harvard students worked summers with inner-city children in Boston public housing projects and concludes:

Our colleges and universities could be of great help to students engaged in community service if they tried more consistently and diligently to help students connect their experiences in such work with their academic courses. Students need more opportunity for moral and social reflection on the problems that they have seen at first hand, and such intellectual work would surely strengthen both their academic lives and their lives as volunteers. Students need the chance to directly connect books to experience, ideas and introspection to continuing activity—through discussion groups in which the thought and ideas that are so suggestively conveyed in fiction and in essays are brought to bear on the particular individuals who inhabit a world of hardship and pain (Coles, 1994).

Sheldon Hackney, chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities and a former president of the University of Pennsylvania, sees an even stronger role for service-learning. He has noted that “the problem of the city is the strategic problem of our time. As such, it is a problem most likely to advance the university's primary mission of advancing and transmitting knowledge” (Hackney, 1995).

Service learning is growing as a teaching mechanism in both undergraduate and professional schools. Hundreds of schools link community service to a course or independent study, enabling students to link theory to practice. In a partnership between Arizona State University and the Arizona Department of Youth Treatment and Rehabilitation, students serve as mentors to delinquent youth on parole. At Rutgers University, where service learning has been part of the curriculum for

more than 7 years, students are working with AIDS organizations in New York City and Philadelphia to develop outreach material and to educate communities about the HIV virus.

Because of their concern for physical security, sense of responsibility as publicly supported institutions, and programs for service learning, many universities are already closely linked to, and have much to gain from, their communities. They have, in their own self-interest and the interest of society at large, much to offer in return.

Universities Contain Enormous Potential for City Revitalization

American colleges and universities possess a wealth of intellectual and economic resources that they can bring to bear on the problems of our cities. As centers of research and scholarship, institutions of higher learning can focus their academic energies to address some of the urban problems that lie just beyond their gates. As major economic entities, universities can create job opportunities for local residents, provide contracts for local businesses, invest in low-income housing, and provide other forms of economic support to their surrounding communities.

Until fairly recently, colleges and universities might have represented affluence and aloofness in surroundings of poverty and despair. The traditional German university was devoted to specialized scholarship, and it was through the production of specialized inquiry and studies that the university provided service. Cardinal Newman, founder of Dublin University more than a century ago, epitomized this view when he called the university that “high protecting power of all knowledge and science” and referred to “useful” knowledge as “trash” (Kerr, 1963).

A contrary view comes from John Dewey, who emphasized that school and society are one. He believed that the real advances in knowledge occur by means of a focus on the central problems of society. Today higher education, as the core component of the Nation’s schooling system, is particularly intertwined with what Dewey called the “dilemmas” and the “perplexities” of our time (Hackney, *op. cit.*).

This view is now widely, if not universally, accepted in American academic circles. Charles E. Hathaway, chancellor of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, and his coauthors concede that the university must guard its existence as an independent institution if it is to achieve its primary functions:

The university must not stand apart from its society and its immediate environment but must be an integral part of that society. The university best serves itself and society by assuming an active leadership role, as opposed to its traditional stance of somewhat passive responsiveness (Hathaway et al., 1990).

In the broadest sense, the American university system functions to preserve, disseminate, and advance knowledge for the improvement of society. Community colleges and research universities, of course, accomplish these functions differently. Nonetheless, there is general agreement that the American university is

designed to encompass the broad range of human knowledge and is dedicated to the preservation and advancement of that knowledge to help make the world a more civil and decent place.

American higher education institutions accomplish this mission in several ways. They are centers for the training and certification of professionals—nurses, teachers, doctors, lawyers, social workers, technicians, engineers and, increasingly, businesswomen and businessmen. Many professional schools provide direct services to the community. In fiscal year (FY) 1990, for example, the University of Pennsylvania Medical Center rendered \$9.1 million of uncompensated care for the indigent (University of Pennsylvania, 1990). Another example is Wayne State University, which provides through its medical school and hospital \$30 million worth of medical care each year: \$15 million to uninsured patients and \$15 million to underinsured patients in Detroit. Although they comprise only 20 percent of the Nation's acute-care beds, academic medical centers account for 50 percent of total charity medical care given in this country (Association of Academic Health Centers, 1994).

Another way of advancing knowledge is through the campus's function as a forum for the discussion of ideas. Higher education institutions are neutral institutions that do not belong to any special-interest constituency. They deal in a universal good—knowledge—that should be the property of all members of society. The interest higher education institutions serve, therefore, is a general interest. As such, they have been, and are, central grounds for brokering and debating ideas through conferences, meetings, seminars, and publications.

As centers of technology transfer in their regions, universities are also rapidly becoming *the* institutions with the resources to provide a stream of know-how and human capital to their respective regions that can serve as the fuel for innovation, entrepreneurship, and regional synergy (Goldstein and Luger, 1992). In FY 1993, inventions developed at 117 of the Nation's leading research universities produced some \$242 million in royalties and a total of 1,307 new patents, often directly benefitting local companies (Blumenstyk, 1994). For example, faculty at the University of Pennsylvania have made approximately 90 invention disclosures per year during 1993–95, resulting in many collaborative research and license agreements with Pennsylvania businesses.

Higher education institutions and their high-technology departments have set up or become involved with local or regional entrepreneurial activities, many with international research and marketing operations (Goldstein et al., 1994). Reflecting a maturation of the technology transfer process, a 1992 survey of U.S. research and doctorate-granting universities indicated that more than one-half sponsored technical assistance centers, about 13 percent had small business assistance centers, and 11 percent currently make equity investments in new technology-based businesses (Goldstein and Luger, op. cit.).

The economic spinoffs from higher education institutions to their locales are immense. The role of the Stanford Industrial Park in the development of Silicon Valley in California and the roles of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University in the creation of the Route 128 corridor around Boston

have become part of American lore. Of perhaps equal significance is the effect of the Research Triangle Park on the development of the Raleigh-Durham area of North Carolina, now a world-renowned center of research and development. Another example is University City Science Center's development as Philadelphia's urban research park, comprising 28 member institutions, including universities, academic medical centers, and hospitals. On a smaller scale, regional and city planning faculty from the University of Oklahoma's Center for Business and Economic Development provide research, technical assistance, education, and training for local communities.

Colleges and Universities Are Important Economic Entities

Many institutions of higher education have become potent generators of jobs and taxes in their communities. They are growing in importance as centers of local and regional economic development and stability.

Colleges and universities are major employers. In Philadelphia the three largest private employers are the University of Pennsylvania, Temple University, and Thomas Jefferson University. The University of Pennsylvania alone has approximately 20,000 employees and, through its activities, supports another 24,000 spinoff jobs in Pennsylvania (University of Pennsylvania, *op. cit.*). The indirect employment effect of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is equally impressive. The university, with about 9,500 employees, is responsible for the indirect creation of an additional 12,600 jobs in North Carolina (Goldstein and Luger, *op. cit.*).

Purchasing figures are equally impressive. In FY 1990 the University of Pennsylvania spent more than \$936 million for compensation and the purchase of goods and services, as well as an additional \$42 million for construction projects, and contributed an estimated \$2.5 billion to Pennsylvania's economy (University of Pennsylvania, *op. cit.*). Throughout the State of Connecticut, including the New Haven region, Yale University's purchases exceeded \$170 million in 1991–92. To illustrate the magnitude of university purchasing power, while the Federal Government placed orders with 11,000 vendors from 1992 to 1993, George Washington University in Washington, D.C., dealt with more than 24,000 vendors during this same period (Dolan, 1994).

The purchasing power of student bodies is significant. A visit to most urban campuses will find hotels and inns, computer stores and bookstores, clothing and music shops, restaurants, and entertainment establishments serving student needs and tastes. Demand for these goods and services does not come just from students. Yale University, for example, in 1991–92 attracted to New Haven more than 550,000 visitors who spent an estimated \$38.5 million (Office of the Secretary, Yale University, 1993).

Although they are largely tax-exempt institutions, universities still make substantial contributions to local tax coffers. In 1992–93, Yale University paid \$4.6 million to the city in taxes on noneducational property and motor vehicles and in fire, sewer, landfill, and other fees (Farrish, 1994). The George Washington University generated \$13.7 million in local property, retail sales, hotel, parking, and personal property tax revenues in 1992–93 (Dolan, *op. cit.*). And because the University

of Pennsylvania is the largest employer in Philadelphia, its employees pay more to the city in total wage taxes than their counterparts at any other institution or business operating in the city (University of Pennsylvania, *op. cit.*).

Institutions of higher learning, then, bring formidable intellectual and economic resources to their communities. It is encouraging to report that many institutions are now disregarding Cardinal Newman's advice, tearing down the wall that separates campus from community, and devoting intellectual and other resources to community building.

Helping Create Communities of Opportunity

For decades many colleges and universities have been inner-directed, formulating their aims on the bedrock of their own religious commitments, traditions, faculty desires, and ambitions for growth, largely ignoring the world outside. In recent years, however, many institutions of higher education are deciding that they prefer to live together with their community rather than live apart from it. As George Keller has observed, "Colleges are switching from a self-assertion model of their existence to a biological mode of continual adaptation to their powerful changing social environment" (Keller, 1983).

Some institutions emphasize their role as developer. As part of its \$50-million investment commitment to New Haven, Yale University, for example, is using carefully targeted investments to stimulate renovation of an apartment building and a shopping area, redevelop a four-block commercial center, and renovate four storefronts—all in downtown New Haven (Farrish, *op. cit.*). In Brooklyn, Polytechnic University's Metrotech is a 16-acre university-corporate park developed over the course of 18 years. It includes a \$42-million library that contains the New York State Center for Advanced Technology and Telecommunications and four new commercial buildings with 2.9 million square feet of office space. Plans call for more commercial building and for bringing 16,000 jobs to the area (Rothstein, 1992). And in Greeley, Colorado, the University of Northern Colorado is working with the city to develop private housing solutions to problems of affordable housing for low-income families (The American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, unpublished study).

Faced with declining enrollments since 1988 and the need for a more cohesive campus, Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, formed two nonprofit community development corporations—one for residential property and the other for commercial property. Working with local healthcare providers and major employers, Marquette has launched the Campus Circle Project, which acquires real property for community revitalization. With \$50 million in funding, the project aims to upgrade its real estate, reduce crime, keep housing affordable, and retain the community's ethnic and economic diversity.

Other schools stress their role as service providers. Under the leadership of President William Greiner, the State University of New York at Buffalo has actively launched efforts to use its academic strengths to improve the city. Nurses are trained in a clinic for the homeless; law students work on a service program for

victims of domestic violence; sociologists and planners learn their fields in a Center for Applied Public Affairs Studies that seeks to stimulate urban economic redevelopment. Teachers, social workers, psychologists, and environmental engineers all work in community settings. Elsewhere, the University of Wisconsin is collaborating with three community organizations in Milwaukee to enhance delivery of high-priority health and social services. The University of Louisville has developed a partnership of local universities, businesses, government (including the public school system), and community-based organizations to lift residents of two distressed neighborhoods out of poverty and into self-sufficiency.

Work with public schools is another focal point of university engagement with local communities. In one widely publicized case, Boston University entered into a 10-year contract to operate the Chelsea, Massachusetts, school system, which has the highest dropout and student arrest rates in the State (Nicklen, 1994). In another case the University of Pennsylvania developed a coalition, the West Philadelphia Improvement Corporation (WEPIC), to work with public schools. WEPIC is a year-round program involving more than 2,000 children and community members in education and cultural activities, recreation, job training, and community improvement and service. WEPIC intends ultimately to develop schools that are open 24 hours a day, function as the core of the community, and serve as the educational and service-delivery hub for students, their families, and other local residents.

Other institutions are using their economic leverage to stimulate community-building efforts. Yale, for example, offers \$2,000 a year for 10 years to any university employee who buys a house in the city. Similarly, the University of Pennsylvania has long encouraged redevelopment in its neighborhood by guaranteeing mortgages for faculty members who move into west Philadelphia.

These examples only begin to suggest the remarkable array of approaches that farsighted colleges and universities are taking in helping to revitalize their local neighborhoods and communities. Almost universally, their efforts involve partnerships with community-based organizations (which the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) sees as a wellspring of local initiative), governments, foundations, and businesses. HUD recognizes and applauds these pioneering efforts and seeks to build on them.

HUD's Role: Encouraging Involvement

With these efforts pointing the way, HUD established the Office of University Partnerships in July 1994. This program is based on the proposition that the Federal Government and institutions of higher learning can work together to revitalize distressed communities.

The seeds of the university partnership concept were planted in the founding days of HUD when in 1965 President Lyndon Johnson said:

This new Office will provide a focal point for thought and innovation and imagination about the problems of our cities. It will cooperate with other Federal agencies, including those responsible for programs providing

essential education, health, employment, and social services. And it will work to strengthen the constructive relationships between Nation, State, and city—the creative federalism—which is essential to progress.³

Until I came to HUD, the concept of partnerships—especially those involving universities—had not developed significantly at the Department. HUD had several grant programs to help universities participate in local housing and urban development activities, but these programs were low-profile and low-priority. More importantly, the Department had no vision for what the role of universities in community building should be, or for how HUD could nurture this role. As a result activities involving universities were generally sporadic, unfocused, and short-lived. We at HUD know that Washington cannot pay for everything, should not regulate everything, and must not mandate everything. The Department's role is to marshal resources from all sectors of society and bring them to bear on these high-priority problems. HUD should catalyze, facilitate, mediate—and get out of the way and let people of goodwill and strong faith in communities do their jobs. HUD should support their efforts and become a reliable partner in community building.

We have created the Office of University Partnerships to help universities realize and accomplish their urban mission. The goals of the Office are to recognize, reward, and build upon successful examples of universities' activities in local revitalization projects; create the next generation of urban scholars and encourage them to focus their work on housing and community development policy and applied research; and create partnerships with other Federal agencies—such as the U.S. Department of Education, the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Corporation for National Service—to support innovative university teaching, research, and service partnerships.

Grant Programs

The four grant programs under the aegis of the new office provide financial and intellectual resources to universities to enable them to institutionalize community-building activities. They attempt to connect practitioners and academics in mutually beneficial partnerships for urban revitalization.

Community Outreach Partnership Centers. The Community Outreach Partnership Centers (COPC) program is a 5-year demonstration designed to facilitate partnerships between universities and communities to solve urban problems. These centers will undertake multidisciplinary research, technical assistance, and outreach activities in cooperation with community groups and local governments. The program provides the “glue” for comprehensive community building, funding the kinds of staff and activities that universities could not otherwise afford. By providing seed money for the activities, HUD hopes that schools will institutionalize the functions as a vehicle for implementing the Department's urban mission.

In October 1994 HUD announced 14 inaugural COPC awards totaling \$7.5 million. The awards enable a variety of institutions to carry out activities across a broad spectrum. The University of Illinois at Chicago, for example, is working in

its adopted neighborhoods of Pilsen and the Near West Side to nurture affordable housing, economic development, and community education. Among other activities, the university-neighborhood team is rehabilitating abandoned housing units and constructing new ones. The team is also establishing an affordable housing consortium to exchange housing information and expertise between the university and community development corporations.

The University of California at Los Angeles' partnership is addressing inequitable housing and employment conditions in three predominantly Hispanic- and African-American communities in Los Angeles—Vernon Central, Pico Union, and the Alameda Corridor. University researchers have identified 24 projects in housing, economic development, neighborhood revitalization, planning, community organizing, and education to benefit these neighborhoods. In a combination of research and outreach activities, this center is developing a plan to expand the supply of affordable housing; increase private lending; address environmental health issues, including lead-based paint abatement; and develop a building materials recycling program.

Duquesne University in Pittsburgh is focusing on the Hill District and East Liberty—two nearby, distressed minority neighborhoods that have been the focus of significant investment by the city. Duquesne's Graduate Center for Social and Public Policy is collaborating with the Pittsburgh Mediation Center and Goodwill Industries to target gang members and youth at risk of recruitment into gangs. The program provides education and job opportunities for these youth.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities. HUD's Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) program makes important grants available to HBCU participants that help them address local housing, economic development, and neighborhood revitalization needs. The HBCU grants fund such activities as low- and moderate-income housing rehabilitation, development of a community center to offer adult basic education, General Equivalency Diploma preparation and job counseling, resident management and crime-prevention training for public housing residents, and technical assistance in the development of business plans. Other public and private funds frequently supplement HBCU grant money.⁴

Joint Community Development Program. HUD's Joint Community Development (JCD) program will provide \$12 million in FY 1995 to fund Centers for Community Revitalization among three to four institutions of higher learning. These centers will undertake a multiphased, multiyear agenda to produce large-scale community-building activities similar to those eligible under the Community Development Block Grant program. By working in conjunction with neighborhoods and localities, colleges and universities receiving JCD grants will support the long-term community-building efforts in these jurisdictions.

Doctoral Dissertation Research Grants. The Doctoral Dissertation Research Grants program encourages doctoral candidates to engage in housing and urban development policy research. The program's \$15,000 grants also produce research that can influence local and national policymaking processes. Currently funded doctoral candidates will look at subjects such as access to credit for poor urban women; the effect of the physical environment, resident involvement, and

crime on creating a neighborhood in a revitalized housing project; and the impact of bank mergers on residential mortgage lending. HUD is investing \$225,000 in 15 doctoral dissertation research grants in FY 1995.

Community Development Work Study. The Community Development Work Study program attracts disadvantaged and minority undergraduate and graduate students to community and economic development professions. Minorities and disadvantaged communities are sorely underrepresented among community development professionals, and this program seeks to fill the gap. The program also offers a way for the university to give human capital back to the community. The program, with annual funding of \$3 million, assists about 120 students a year.

Access to HUD's Resources

Although HUD's university-related grant programs, which total more than \$25 million, provide a significant boost to institutions engaged in the revitalization of their communities, the real potential for university partnerships lies in the \$25 billion of HUD's housing and community development programs, which provide a solid foundation for colleges and universities that want to help their communities. For example:

- The Hampton University Development Corporation, a partnership between the university and residents of nearby Phoebus, Virginia, has received \$1 million in HUD funds for a construction trades training program for neighborhood youth and a \$500,000 grant for various efforts to foster economic development and promote affordable housing.
- At Yale University students are working with the New Haven Public Housing Authority to develop a much-needed laundry facility in the Elm Haven district. The program is part of the HOPE VI initiative, which supports a full range of activities to transform distressed public housing developments into viable communities.
- Marquette University, with the support of a \$650,000 anticrime demonstration grant from HUD, is working with the Campus Circle Partnership, the Milwaukee Police Department, and community-based organizations to reduce crime in the Avenues West neighborhood.

These and other HUD programs offer institutions of higher learning a valuable starting point to help fight crime, restore commercial viability, and empower public housing residents in their communities. The Office of University Partnerships will offer colleges and universities an easier pathway to other HUD programs and to programs throughout the Federal Government.

A Force for Good

HUD's vision of universities working as a force for positive change in their communities stems from Dewey's notion that school and society are one, and our Office of University Partnerships is working to maximize the application of such functional knowledge. As former mayor of Atlanta Andrew Young advocated:

In establishing interactions with the metropolitan environment, we must think creatively of how we might utilize the entire student body of the university as an urban-based experiment station. The challenge for the metropolitan university is to transform itself by empowering the entire campus to utilize the metropolitan area as a living laboratory (Hathaway et al., 1990).

Now more than ever, universities are essential to helping the Department achieve its mission of creating communities of opportunity. Violence, unemployment, poverty, poor housing, and pollution surround some of our most distinguished colleges and universities. Urban America is under siege, and institutions of higher learning must lend their considerable resources to fight the good fight. Whatever the initial motivation—fear of crime, responsibilities as publicly supported entities, or opportunities for service learning—our Nation’s colleges and universities must commit themselves to this critical effort.

It is time to join together to help our society achieve its promise as a fair, decent, and just society. I agree with President Greiner, who said:

If every research-intensive university in this country commits itself to changing a small portion of events in its own community; if every urban and metropolitan research university in this country commits itself to addressing needs in its own city—then, in the total of all of our acts on behalf of our neighbors and our mutual future, we will be a massive and unparalleled force for the good of our people and our country (Greiner, 1995).

The American institution of higher learning may, in the final years of this century, be entering one of its most challenging and productive eras. Among its tasks will be that of helping to reshape the city to become once again the driving force in the economic, social, and cultural life of this Nation. HUD stands ready to facilitate this task and invites every American college and university to join in this worthwhile effort.

Notes

1. This essay was first published in January 1995. The Department wishes to acknowledge the contributions of Ira Harkavy, director of the Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania; and Joseph Foote, Joseph Foote Associates, for making this essay possible.
2. Examples of university flight from distressed communities include Pepperdine University, which in 1972 left south central Los Angeles for Malibu, California; and Marquette University’s former medical school, which moved to a Milwaukee, Wisconsin, suburb in the 1960s. Joseph N. Boyce, “Campus Movement: Marquette University Leads Urban Revival of Blighted Environs,” *The Wall Street Journal*, February 1, 1994, p. A1.
3. Lyndon B. Johnson, State of the Union Address, January 4, 1965.

4. The Historically Black Colleges and Universities program is administratively not part of the Office of University Partnerships; it is administered through HUD's Office of Community Planning and Development.

References

- The American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. *1994 Community Service Survey of Urban and Metropolitan Colleges and Universities*. Unpublished study.
- Association of Academic Health Centers, Washington, D.C. Information obtained by telephone, November 10, 1994.
- Blumenstyk, Goldie. November 9, 1994. "A 40% Increase in Income from Inventions," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Bok, Derek. 1990. *Universities and the Future of America*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Boyer, Ernest L. March 9, 1994. "Creating a New American College," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- The Chronicle of Higher Education*. February 3, 1995.
- The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac*. September 1, 1994.
- Coles, Robert. October 26, 1994. "Putting Head and Heart on the Line," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Dolan, Michael. October 14, 1994. "Biggest Man on Campus," *Washington City Paper*, Washington, D.C.
- Elliott, Peggy. 1994. *The Urban Campus: Educating the New Majority for the New Century*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Farrish, Katherine. August 30, 1994. "Yale Takes a New Course, Investing in New Haven," *The Hartford Courant*.
- Goldstein, Harvey, and Michael Luger. 1992. *Impact Carolina: The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and the State's Economy*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina.
- Goldstein, Harvey, Gunther Maier, and Michael Luger. 1994. "The University as an Instrument for Economic and Business Development." Paper presented at the Symposium on University and Society: International Perspectives on Public Policies and Institutional Reform, Vienna, Austria, June 8–10, 1994.
- Greiner, William R. 1995. "In the Total of All These Acts: How Can American Universities Address the Urban Agenda?" *Universities and Community Schools* 4 (1–2):14.

Hackney, Sheldon. 1995. "Reinventing the American University: Toward a University System for the Twenty-first Century," *Teachers College Record* 95 (3):313.

Hathaway, Charles E., Paige E. Mulhollan, and Karen A. White. Spring 1990. "Metropolitan Universities: Models for the Twenty-first Century," *Metropolitan Universities*.

Keller, George. 1983. *Academic Strategy*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kerr, Clark. 1963. "The Uses of the University," *The Godkin Lectures at Harvard University*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nicklen, Julie L. October 26, 1994. "When a University Takes Over the Public Schools," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Office of the Secretary, Yale University. December 1993. *Economic Impact: Yale and New Haven*. New Haven, CT: Yale University.

Rothstein, Mervyn. April 5, 1992. "Industrial Revolution," *Education Life Supplement* in *New York Times*.

University of Pennsylvania. 1990. *University of Pennsylvania Economic Impact for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1990*. Philadelphia, PA: The University of Pennsylvania.

U.S. Department of Education. October 1994. *Digest of Education Statistics*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.