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The Seattle/Louisville decision was a serious setback in our quest to overcome the forms of systemic inequality that Katrina both illuminated and exacerbated.

Tulane University: From Recovery to Renewal
By Scott Cowen
By August 31, 2005, two days after Hurricane Katrina hit New Orleans, two-thirds of the Tulane University campus was under water. Yet as the combined result of several crucial decisions, a successfully implemented recovery plan, and unprecedented campus–community cooperation, the university managed to reopen on January 17, 2006.

Saving Higher Education in the Age of Money
By James Engell and Anthony Dangerfield
The subjugation of ideals of learning, curiosity, and scholarship to the primacy and glorification of monetary reward will, if allowed to continue, deal a crippling blow to higher education.

Democracy, Diversity, and Presidential Leadership
By Mildred García
Alumni, elected officials, faculty, boards of trustees, and members of the surrounding communities all look to college presidents to take particular stands. At the end of the day, however, presidents must be true to their own values and principles.
On the Practicality of a Liberal Education
By Rudolph H. Weingartner
Is a liberal education not an extravagant detour to the kind of training that will get the graduate respectable employment?

Faculty Accountability for Culturally Inclusive Pedagogy and Curricula
By Stephen John Quaye and Shaun R. Harper
If students are to benefit from the gains associated with classroom diversity, faculty must respond to the accountability movement by holding themselves accountable for offering culturally inclusive pedagogy and curricula.
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By Stanley D. Dotson
Thematically connected to a sequence of core general education courses, the LifeWorks program at Mars Hill College culminates with a capstone presentation of learning and a portfolio. Bonner scholars and other honor scholars also participate in a cocurricular civic engagement program.

A Campus, Not a Sanctuary
By Donald W. Harward
The horror of the shootings at Virginia Tech has created an opportunity for us to think about the kinds of places we want our college and university campuses to be.

Thinking Not Inside or Outside but About the Boxes
By Sanford Tweedie
Many academics can point to the books or articles they’ve authored, but what does the teacher have to show for his or her work?
Katrina and the Supreme Court: Failing the Real Tests

In January 2007, seventeen months after Hurricane Katrina, AAC&U convened its annual meeting in New Orleans. What we found there was at once inspiring and disturbing. We were inspired because the meeting provided an opportunity to learn firsthand from Americans who are setting a heroic standard for courage, commitment, and compassion. But many of us left the city profoundly shaken by the unavoidable evidence that our society had failed—and is continuing to fail—some of the most fundamental responsibilities of an equitable democracy.

The higher education leaders who serve in New Orleans have given us all reason to be proud. Scott Cowan of Tulane and Norman Francis of Xavier are playing indispensable roles in the recovery, working tirelessly and creatively not just to bring back their institutions but also to provide essential services that are desperately needed across the city. They have been joined in this unending work of reconstruction by other New Orleans campus presidents, by an extraordinary cadre of committed faculty members, students, and administrators, and by Americans lending a hand on many levels from all around the United States. These heroes of New Orleans have responded to the letter as well as the spirit of John F. Kennedy’s generational summons: “Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country.”

And yet, the New Orleans tragedy forces us to think hard about the other side of this oft-repeated exhortation. The Americans living in the aftermath of Katrina have every reason to ask, “What should our country be doing for us?” And beyond the storm and its aftermath, “What were our country’s obligations to the citizens of New Orleans before the winds came?” The worst part about Katrina is that the dangers New Orleans faced were well known and fully anticipated by those who looked carefully at the city’s vulnerability. The warnings were set forth in detailed reports. The calls to action had been issued, but they were not heeded.

Katrina should have been the long-overdue wake-up call for American democracy to face directly the underlying stratifications that are built into many American cities and communities, not just New Orleans. But the evidence mounts that this society continues to ignore rather than confront the racially framed inequalities that distort and deplete our democracy.

This summer, the Supreme Court invalidated voluntary public school desegregation plans in two major cities: Seattle, Washington, and Louisville, Kentucky.* The policy objective in both cities has been to reduce the amount of racial isolation in the public schools and to prevent the resegregation of school populations. Higher education leaders breathed a sigh of relief because the Court made it clear that its decision did not negate the 2003 decision in Grutter v. Bollinger that allowed some consideration of race in higher education admissions. Nonetheless, four of the justices, including Chief Justice John Roberts, declared that it is unconstitutional to use race-conscious strategies in order to end racial segregation in the public schools. And Justice Anthony Kennedy, who did not go quite that
far, nonetheless joined in forming a majority decision against plans that, in some instances, use race as a factor in creating greater racial balance.

The Court’s decision came in the context of repeated warnings and abundant evidence that segregation has been on the rise for almost two decades in our public schools. Americans often assume that Brown v. Board of Education was a turning point in the effort to integrate our schools. But in fact, across most of our major cities, much of the integration gained through decades of hard struggle is now being lost.

And in this context, as with Katrina, the expert warnings about the consequences of inaction are clear and stark. In a recent essay in Inside Higher Ed, UCLA’s Gary Orfield, a former member of AAC&U’s board of directors, noted that “a half century of research…confirms the central premise of Brown v. Board of Education that racially isolated minority schools offer students an inferior education, which is likely to harm their future life opportunities, such as graduation from high school and success in college.” Racial isolation is harmful to individuals, to communities, and to democracy itself. It is a driver of inequality in both opportunity and outcomes. And the Supreme Court has just ruled out of bounds the kinds of practices most likely to end such isolation in the schools.

The central truth about American society is that we have been diverse, divided, and stratified almost from the founding, with the result that many of our most intractable social problems are racially framed. In that context, New Orleans is just another chapter in a very long story.

Yet it is in the schools that young Americans do—or do not—build both the competence and the confidence to advance positive changes in their own lives and in their society. It is in the schools as well that Americans do—or do not—build a sense of responsibility for the future of our democracy.

What all of this suggests is that the Seattle/Louisville decision was a serious setback in our quest to overcome the forms of systemic inequality that Katrina both illuminated and exacerbated. Democracy depends for its sustainability on citizens’ active sense of responsibility to and community with one another. And, in this highly diverse democracy, sustainability further depends on citizens’ sense of responsibility to and community with people from backgrounds—racial, ethnic, and economic—different from their own.

The increase of segregation in the public schools is unraveling rather than strengthening the social fabric. And as this happens, the warning bells are sounding on the vulnerability of our democracy just as they were sounding earlier on the vulnerability of the New Orleans levees.

We already possess the knowledge. The question before us is whether we are ready to translate that knowledge into choices and action.

How ready are we to pass that real test?—CAROL GEARY SCHNEIDER

*The statement on the Supreme Court’s decision released by the AAC&U Board of Directors Executive Committee can be found at www.aacu.org/About/statements/SupremeCourtonIntegration.cfm.
The 2007 annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges and Universities was not held in New Orleans because of Hurricane Katrina; the city is among three others in a regular rotation. But neither was the meeting held there despite the hurricane. For an association dedicated to promoting liberal education, the setting itself presented an object lesson in the importance of the civic mission of the academy.

It might also be said that the annual meeting was held in the aftermath of *A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education*, the report of the Spellings Commission on the Future of Higher Education. Released in September 2006, the report has remarkably little to say about the aims and outcomes of a twenty-first-century education, even as it calls for standardized tests to measure and compare student learning. And as the AAC&U board of directors pointed out upon its release, the report completely ignores “the longstanding and distinctively American goal of preparing students for engaged citizenship”—an omission made all the more glaring by everything the phrase “Hurricane Katrina” has come to signify.

Given the context, then, the 2007 annual meeting seemed almost to title itself: “The Real Test: Liberal Education and Democracy’s Big Questions.”

The annual meeting issues of *Liberal Education* are never really adequate to convey the variety and the vibrancy of the meetings themselves. Journal reading is a poor substitute for the camaraderie, the sense of community and common purpose the experience engenders. But this seems especially so this year, when the setting was so intimately a part of the meeting.

Scott Cowen, president of Tulane University, encourages people to “visit [New Orleans], see it for themselves, and then go back home and talk about it.” Doubtless many conferees did just that. Perhaps this issue of *Liberal Education* will serve as a reminder and spark renewed conversations about liberal education and democracy’s “big questions.”
The Institute on General Education was held in Newport, Rhode Island, from May 18 to 23. It provided participants the opportunity to examine current trends in general education, discuss strategies for implementing curricular reforms, and refine campus-specific general education reform plans in the context of campus missions. The Greater Expectations Institute on Campus Leadership for Student Engagement, Inclusion, and Achievement was held in Burlington, Vermont, from June 20 to 24. It provided teams the opportunity to advance a specific educational change project.

**LEAP National Leadership Council Meets**
In June, members of the National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) met in Washington, DC, to discuss the campaign and to strategize about next steps in moving the LEAP framework for liberal education from vision to reality. The council’s 2007 report, *College Learning for the New Global Century*, lays out the essential learning outcomes of college education in the twenty-first century, and calls for greater intentionality—in the academy and in American society—about the aims and quality of college learning.

In addition to discussing future work in the areas of campus action, general education reform, assessment of learning outcomes, and research on student achievement and access to effective educational practices, the National Leadership Council began discussions about additional ways to involve business leaders and human resource professionals in communicating the importance of liberal education outcomes in today’s competitive global economy.

**Upcoming Meetings**
- January 23–26, 2008, Intentional Learning, Unscripted Challenges: Knowledge and Imagination for an Interdependent World, AAC&U annual meeting, Washington, DC
Hurricane Katrina took more than 1,500 lives. Most of those people died in their homes because they could not escape, or they died trying to escape the flood waters. The hurricane submerged 80 percent of the parish, a land mass seven times the size of Manhattan. The flood lasted for fifty-seven days and destroyed over 160,000 homes and apartments. Katrina caused the largest metropolitan diaspora in the history of the United States, displacing more than 80 percent of the population. Prior to the storm, the population of New Orleans was 465,000; within two weeks of the storm, it was 10,000; today, it is about 225,000. Katrina led to 22 million tons of debris—more than enough to fill the Superdome thirteen times, or quadruple the amount of debris that resulted from the tragedy at the World Trade Center on 9/11.

I was on campus on August 29, 2005. Tulane University’s hurricane preparedness plan calls for the president of the university, along with four or five other senior people, to remain on the campus in the event of a category four or five hurricane. I went to the designated place on campus thinking it would be just another storm and that we would be back in business again in a couple of days. When I heard on the news that the levees had been breached, I said to the five people with me that we probably ought to spend the night on campus and see what impact, if any, the breach of the levees would have. Within forty-eight hours, two-thirds of our uptown campus, which covers about 120 acres, was under water. We lost all communications—telephones, satellite phones, cell phones, computers—and there was no sewage system, no water, and no power. By the time we finally evacuated to Houston, Texas, on the Friday after the storm, Tulane University no longer existed.

Recovery
The three most important decisions affecting the recovery of the institution were made within twenty-four hours of our evacuation to Houston. The first of these was the decision to reopen the university, as previously scheduled, on January 17, 2006. That was a hubristic decision; at the time, we had no idea how we would do it, how much it would cost, who would do it, or how we would pay for it. But none of that mattered because we knew that if Tulane didn’t open in January 2006, it would probably never open again. We had to announce the decision right away to give people confidence.

There is no doubt in my mind that, three to five years from now, Tulane will be a stronger and better institution than it was before the storm.

Scott Cowen is president of Tulane University. This article is adapted from the keynote address to the American Conference of Academic Deans luncheon, held in conjunction with the AAC&U annual meeting.
From Recovery to Renewal
The second decision we made was to continue to pay all faculty and staff for as long as possible. That decision cost the institution $35 million per month, at a time when no money was coming in. But we knew that our faculty and staff were going through their own personal tragedies and that the last thing they needed was to be unsure about whether they were going to get paychecks. Moreover, we recognized that it is the people who make for great universities, and without those people you have nothing.

Finally, the third decision we made was to reach out to the higher education community and to ask for help with our students.

After making those three crucial decisions, we started to focus on the January reopening. We thought that all we had to do was to restore all the buildings and the campus itself. It turned out, however, that the physical restoration of our campus was the simplest part of the entire task. What we did not immediately realize was that the rest of New Orleans was not functioning. We had to build a self-contained village in order to reassure people that there would be someplace to which they could return.

By late September we still did not know when the public school system would reopen, and our employees, now scattered in cities all over the world, were asking how they could return if there were no schools for their children to attend. We realized that one of the finest elementary schools in New Orleans, Lusher School, was right in our neighborhood. So we found the principal, brought her to Houston, and told her that we needed her to reopen the school by January 17, 2006. To make that possible, she told us she would need several teachers to plan the curriculum; that the school would have to be chartered; and that she would need money. We provided $1.5 million, and we convinced the school board to charter the school. The school opened on January 17, 2006, with approximately one thousand students in attendance. About four hundred of those students were the sons and daughters of faculty and staff members at Tulane, Dillard, Xavier, and Loyola universities.

The next challenges we faced were housing and health care. When we learned that three thousand of our faculty, staff, and students did not know whether they had housing to return to, we decided to go into the housing market. We built modular housing on campus and bought an apartment building, but still it was not enough. So we leased a cruise ship with berths for two thousand people, bringing it from Israel and parking it on the Mississippi River. Everyone who came back had a place to live.

There was no health care available in New Orleans; all of the hospitals were closed. But we have a marvelous set of physicians in our health science center, one of whom, Karen De-Salvo, offered to set up three clinics across the city to provide care to anybody who needed it. Those free clinics, staffed by Tulane doctors and residents, continue to operate today.

During this period—September, October, November, and December 2005—the city of New Orleans was going through a terrible time. Tulane University is the largest employer in the city, so many of us began to take on major roles in the city itself. Asked to chair the community-wide effort to come up with a new plan for public education in the city, I spent as much time on public education initiatives as I spent on university issues. We also started a public service initiative that involved Tulane students, faculty, and staff in the recovery of New Orleans.

Tulane University reopened on January 17, 2006. Within three days, the population of the parish had increased by 20 percent. We had brought back the students, the faculty, the staff, and their families. And many businesses,
especially the bars and restaurants, had timed their reopenings to coincide with ours. We built the village, and it turned out to be a pretty good village.

The Tulane University campus is completely free of water now, and every single building is up and running. In fact, since we wound up having to do about a quarter of a million dollars worth of construction and repairs, the campus looks better than it did before the storm. But the story goes beyond that. First of all, we survived Hurricane Katrina. At 80 percent of the pre-Katrina level, our current enrollment has exceeded expectations. Moreover, despite the fact that we were closed for half of it, last year was an extraordinarily strong research year. Although our faculty members were scattered across the country, they were still writing research grants. We also had a very strong fundraising year, despite the fact that we did not raise any money for the five months we were in the trenches building our village. And our endowment grew significantly. Finally, we formed lasting partnerships with the other local universities, and Tulane will continue to play a new and active role in New Orleans.

One of the reasons Tulane University survived Hurricane Katrina is that we were willing to make bold decisions quickly. This is a lesson to be learned by all of us. At what pace do you make decisions? In a catastrophe, the longer you wait, the more you put your institution in jeopardy. Of course, the faster you make decisions, the more you open yourself up to criticism from those who did not participate in the decision making. But with the benefit of hindsight, we are grateful we did what we did as quickly as we did it.

A second lesson learned concerns the importance of self-reliance. When we were in Houston, we determined quickly that we could not rely on the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the insurance companies, or the White House. We knew that we had to control our own destiny. We also realized that we had to change the way we viewed the role of our institution in community engagement, both locally and nationally.

Renewal
In December 2005, we undertook the largest restructuring of an American university in over one hundred years. The objectives were to save the institution financially and to better position it for an academic recovery in the future. Both objectives had to be met, but the
financial restructuring was absolutely essential because of our projected losses. The university was projected to lose, on an ongoing basis, $75 million per year. The revenue base went down, and there was no way to close the gap. The only option was to reduce the costs.

We also knew that we needed to position the university for an enhanced reputation and increased quality in the future, which meant that we had to be very selective about what we did and how we did it. The alternative was to make cuts across the board. But that, I believe, is the worst thing you can do for an institution; across-the-board cuts do not recognize the fact that some units deserve more, and other units probably do not deserve as much as they have. One must make difficult decisions.

The 2006 entering class was much smaller than usual: rather than 1,400 students, we had 962. One reason for the decline was that, although we received a lot of applications, in the end parents were hesitant to send their children to Tulane. But the other reason was that we did not significantly compromise on the academic credentials of the incoming students. We believed that to have done so would have been to give up the 172-year legacy of the institution. Instead, we focused on increasing quality. Our strategy was fairly simple: make the undergraduate experience as stellar as possible, and surround it with a select group of high-quality research and graduate programs.

The renewal plan had four cornerstones. The first was the undergraduate focus. Tulane already had a very good undergraduate program, but it was fragmented. Students entered through one of seven different doors, depending on their interests. That, we discovered, led to duplication of effort and inconsistency of experience. So we decided to create a single undergraduate college for all students, and to make the entire experience more campus- and student-centered. Public service is now a graduation requirement for all students, for example. Students have to live on campus longer than they did prior to the storm, and they have a common first-year experience.
These features of the new program are not revolutionary, but they are very important.

The second cornerstone was academic realignment. We had to make some very tough decisions about a few of our schools, including the schools of engineering and medicine. Those decisions led to the consolidation of units and to an overall decrease in the size of the faculty. They were, by far, the most painful decisions we had to make, but they were necessary in order to maintain financial viability and quality.

The third cornerstone of our renewal plan was new partnerships. We are now doing things at the university that we never did before. We now have an institute for public education initiatives that reports directly to the president and focuses exclusively on the advancement of public school success. We now also have an institute focused on issues of race and poverty in our community, and we have a center for public service that organizes all of our civic engagement activities. So we created a number of new units both to advance our mission locally and, hopefully, to establish a national model.

Finally, the fourth cornerstone was to reduce by one-third the number of PhD programs and, by reinvesting the money saved, to strengthen the remaining programs. The decisions involved in implementing our renewal plan were very difficult but, in the end, the results are not only saving our institution but also, more importantly, giving reasons for optimism about our future.

Challenges going forward
Tulane University now faces four major challenges. The first concerns the image of the university, which is largely formed by what is said about New Orleans in the newspapers and on the television and radio around the country. Recently, for example, there was a series of articles in the New York Times about the increase in crime in New Orleans. There was indeed an increase; it is serious, and we are dealing with it. The same thing happens in every other city, of course, but it is not written about in the same way. Similarly, USA Today has reported about the mental health issues faced by our population; and, yes, there are pressing mental health issues. But there are also many positive things going on in New Orleans.

The only way we can get people to change their image of New Orleans is to encourage
them to visit the city, see it for themselves, and then go back home and talk about it. At the university, we do “counter-messaging.” In recruiting last year’s class, we focused more on the parents than on the students. We needed to overcome the “parent factor”; we get lots of applications, the students want to come, but in the end the parents say, “no.” We are working to overcome that, and we are having a lot of success.

The second major challenge is to continue to retain and recruit faculty. That is actually going much better than we had anticipated. We lost a number of faculty members, because of both voluntary and involuntary separations, and we worried that we would be unable to hire new faculty. But in fact, we are hiring a different kind of faculty member, faculty who come to New Orleans because of what we have been through. They are not running away from the challenge; they are embracing the challenge, and that has been a real source of optimism.

The financial health of the institution poses the third major challenge. We have recovered just a fraction of the more than $500 million Tulane lost; but we are hopeful that, in time, we will recover the remainder. Finally, the fourth major challenge Tulane University faces concerns the medical school. It is one of the finest medical schools in the country, and it poses its own separate challenges for the institution. But I am incredibly proud of the school of medicine, the faculty, the staff, and the students there. They have turned the corner and rebounded beautifully.

Conclusion
I conclude with two statements, one about Tulane and one about New Orleans. I have been through an unusual eighteen months in my life, and clearly I am not Pollyannish. Anybody who has been through what we have been through, and who has done what we have done, knows what it is like to have to
survive. There is no doubt in my mind that, three to five years from now, Tulane will be a stronger and better institution than it was before the storm. I never would have wished this catastrophe on our institution, but I think our recovery is going to take a pace and have a substance to it that will make us better and stronger. And nothing I have seen in the last eighteen months changes my view of that.

I also can guarantee that, three to five years from now, New Orleans will be a better city than it was before the storm. How can I be so optimistic? Think about what makes New Orleans special. It is the only city in America that can lay claim to its own language, its own food, its own architecture, and its own music. It has a bizarre heritage and culture, but that is why people come to New Orleans. That is why tourists come. That is why those of us who are here, stay here: it is fun to be in this quirky city. New Orleans does something for you that no other city in America does. And all of those attributes remain today, and they will remain in three and five years’ time.

Before the storm, we had a lot of problems in this city that we did not talk about. We did not talk about public education or racial issues or the blighted neighborhoods the way we should have. We knew the levees were not safe, but we did not talk about it. But we are talking about all of those issues now. So I have no doubt that New Orleans will be a better city in three to five years.

The only question I have about New Orleans is whether it will be as good a city as it could be if its political leadership had the courage, the vision, and a plan to make it so. We all wish that our political leaders at all levels of government had made bolder and quicker decisions about a lot of things. And I am very sympathetic because I understand the complexity of the issues this city faces. We have lost some time, but we will make it up and eventually see the fruits of our labor in our great city.

To respond to this article, e-mail liberaled@aacu.org, with the author’s name on the subject line.
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At the annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges and Universities, the 2007 Frederick W. Ness Book Award was presented to James Engell and Anthony Dangerfield for their book, Saving Higher Education in the Age of Money (University of Virginia Press, 2005).

Saving Higher Education in the Age of Money is a critique of the pernicious syndrome set in motion when the means and concomitant benefits of higher education—money and prestige, in particular—became increasingly accepted as its most important and fundamental ends. The book contends, on the basis of extensive evidence and documentation, that such a distorted perception of the functions of higher education became far more widespread in the last three decades of the twentieth century than ever before historically, and that its influence has continued to accelerate. This trend is not sustainable. The subjugation of ideals of learning, curiosity, and scholarship to the primacy and glorification of monetary reward will, if allowed to continue, deal a crippling blow to higher education, which, ironically, produces greatest economic, competitive, and social benefits only if grounded in the intellectual and ethical objectives that brought it into being and inspired its highest achievements in the first place.

We argue that the entelechy of higher education, the web of interlocking goals that join to compose the total function and purpose of higher education, is capable of answering all reasonable demands placed on the system: within that entelechy is room for colleges and universities to make education an instrumental economic good, an aid to careers, professions, and business enterprises; an instrumental social good, a nursery of improved communication skills and worthy social integration; and an instrumental civic and political good, too, one that fosters a deeper appreciation of civic life and the multitude of ways citizens can enliven and strengthen it. All of these goods are obtainable within the entelechy of higher education and are reasonable to expect—so long as we remember to cherish and protect what undergirds and precedes them all. And that is the love of learning itself, the desire to know, the desire to impart knowledge, and the desire to regard any application of knowledge through an ethical lens.

Yet, this very love of learning, which, in a healthy ordering of priorities, should nourish and renew higher education, is now endangered by indifference, neglect, and even contempt, while many institutional energies and resources are diverted to aims that cannot, on their own, sustain themselves, let alone higher education as a whole. We analyze and document this perilous shift of institutional emphasis under the rubric of the “Three Criteria.” We use this term to denote a set of policies—sometimes deliberate, sometimes unwitting—whereby any field or discipline that (1) promises (accurately or not) higher income to participants; (2) studies money, finance, or business; or (3) receives external funding in large amounts has consistently flourished and been favored relative to those fields and disciplines that don’t. This flourishing or favoring can be demonstrated by any measure: undergraduate enrollments and majors; faculty hiring, salaries, and teaching loads; reliance on adjunct faculty; health of graduate programs; student attitudes; alumni giving; establishment of new programs; or building and capital investment. Over the past thirty-five years, all indicators point to a massive shift in favor of the Three-Criteria disciplines and, correspondingly, against those that don’t fit the bill: some sciences, especially in their theoretical pursuits,
in the Age of Money
a good many social sciences, and all of the humanities. The teaching of reading and writing—arguably one of the few absolute necessities of undergraduate education and the propaedeutic for mastery of almost any intellectual discipline—has suffered painful retreatment and neglect. Within forty years, as recorded by one prominent study held annually over that period of time, the stated motives of students for attending college have completely reversed priorities. Formerly, enriching one’s life, becoming better educated, developing a personal philosophy, and creating an original work or contributing a theoretical advance to science ranked high. But now these fall at the lowest end. Today, more than three-quarters of students confirm that the chief reason they go to college is “to be very well off financially.”

The shift away from liberal education, away from the liberal arts and sciences, to training dominated by occupational majors is typically justified by an appeal to “utility,” to a supposedly clear-sighted appraisal of what the “real” world demands of college graduates. In the absence of opposing arguments, this is a self-fulfilling proposition. If it is generally assumed that occupational courses and majors are superior preparation for adult life and that the nation needs more of them, and if no one steps forward to challenge that assumption, there will indeed be “demand.” But not on the basis of any demonstrated superiority of such curricula—quite the opposite.

On examination, the actual benefits of occupational majors to long-term job performance or security are often hard to discover. Few entry-level jobs necessitate four years of specialized undergraduate study. The same holds true of professional graduate programs: students may believe that medical schools want biology majors and that law schools want applicants with bachelor’s degrees in economics, political science, or pre-law, but the professional schools themselves, especially the good ones, tell a very different story. They want flexible, adaptable minds, minds exposed to a broad range of knowledge and trained in rigorous critical thinking. Such preparation, more than any other, also contains the seeds of continuing, lifelong education after formal degree programs are finished. In today’s fast-evolving world, leaders across the spectrum of vocations need a broadened imaginative and critical capacity, not a prematurely narrowed point of view. In terms of the actual world, a solid liberal arts and sciences education will generally prove the most practical preparation for a demanding, high-level career, or for the several careers that an increasing number of adults each will pursue.

But not because it is designed primarily to be immediately utilitarian. And this is the paradox that, running afoul of the short-sighted variety of American common sense, leaves the liberal arts and sciences curriculum in its current threatened state. In contemporary society, the vast though long-term virtues of curiosity-based learning across and among a variety of disciplines are hard to sell, and these days selling is, for several reasons, the name of the game. Fortunately, another variety of American common sense takes the long view and invests not for this quarter or even for this year, but for an entire generation, or, as Native American wisdom puts it, for the next seven.
The Age of Money

The “Age of Money” in the book’s title—the last three decades of the twentieth century and the first years of the present one—could equally well be styled the Age of Marketing or of Branding. Rivalry for prestige or mere name recognition is displacing competition based on merit. As a famous anthropologist wrote, “everything else is lost sight of in the one great aim of victory. Rivalry does not, like competition, keep its eyes upon the original activity; whether making a basket or selling shoes, it creates an artificial situation: the game of showing that one can win out over others” (Benedict 1947, 228). This ethos now permeates academic life. Managed like star performers, students scramble with desperate intensity for the trophy of admission to the “best” (i.e., most prestigious, most renowned) institutions, which in turn scramble for the students whose admission test scores shine and who therefore might be likeliest to land high-paying jobs and coveted spots in graduate programs, and as well for the glossiest star faculty, who in turn often jockey for positions with the lightest teaching loads. (Nationally, professorial salaries do correlate with teaching loads—inversely.) Crude but mesmerizing numerical rankings—notably that of US News and World Report—stoke the fires, with the unedifying result that institutions within whose walls other sorts of numerical data are subjected to the most searching analysis devote much time, energy, and money fighting over—and not infrequently repackaging their own data to secure—an ordinal placement. (Is Dear State or Old Ivy first this year? Fifth?) These placements are, by the standards of any learned or scientific discipline, quite spurious.

It will be argued that the counters in this game of Who’s Best—able students, eminent faculty, state-of-the-art facilities, multibillion-dollar endowments, etc.—are also sought for the betterment of learning. Fortunately, in many ways they are still turned to that use. But it is now pretense to suggest that that is more than a part of the story, or that so genuine a goal really accounts for the academic bellum omnium contra omnes that we are witnessing. Competition—rather than rivalry, to keep Benedict’s distinction—is frequently a good force in higher education, but the undesirable effects of rivalry are beginning to wag the dog.

As opposed to practical applications, ideas and ideals lose out in this sort of atmosphere, as do the fragile, inconspicuous, hard-to-market activities that are the soul of learning. Reading, for instance. Though communication within and between libraries these days is largely via computer, and though card catalogues have long been superseded by digital databases, the college or university library still supports the methodical, scholarly process of consulting and actually reading and studying books and journals, whether on paper or on a screen. Yet, the hard, long work of reading can seem almost quaint in a world devoted to speed. To restore to libraries some of their lost glamour,
many institutions employ the risky tactic of hybridizing them with student social centers. That may draw some of the crowds back, but what happens to reading? And if reading is hard-pressed in the library, its natural home on campus, how much worse off is it in the dormitory, where, inevitably, much of the reading at colleges and universities must take place? Virginia Woolf’s minimum condition for productive study, a room of one’s own without distraction, is hard to obtain in many schools.

The essential concomitant of skilled reading, skilled writing, suffers likewise in the Age of Money from its low visibility. While some things are easy to advertise—like one “star” faculty recruitment, a new performing arts center, or a ten-million dollar gift to the endowment—others, like required freshman composition, defy the shrewdest marketer’s efforts to dress them up. Only an understanding of and faith in the imperative need for sophisticated verbal skills support their continuing cultivation. As that faith and understanding diminish, composition and rhetoric get put on short rations: writing sections get larger, pay for teaching them stagnates or declines, adjunct faculty and graduate students do more and more of the teaching. Done properly, the teaching of writing (like its counterpart outside the humanities, numeracy) is slow and laborious: time and energy devoted to it are not available for activities like research and publication. But the latter now are not only the highest but often the only road to professional recognition and advancement. Small wonder then that fewer and fewer tenure-track and tenured faculty (let alone “stars”) volunteer or agree to lead writing sections. The repercussions of the creeping neglect of writing are cumulative and severe. Undergraduates who still lack a solid command of expository prose by the end of their freshman year will have to learn it later—or, all too often, not at all. The resulting deficiencies lower the standards of upper-level classes, and, over time, of graduate programs, too. Left to itself, the problem grows worse and ever harder to reverse; too much of college becomes remedial.

“Rivalry is notoriously wasteful. It ranks low in the scale of human values. The wish for superiority is gargantuan; it can never be satisfied. The contest goes on forever. The more goods the community accumulates, the greater the counters with which men play, but the game is as far from being won as when the counters were small” (Benedict 1947, 228). So it has proved. In order to obtain or maintain an elite status (the top, next to the top, in the top fifty…), colleges and universities often lure the most expensively prepared and promising students with state-of-the-art facilities and “merit” scholarships (i.e., financial aid not based on need, aid even for the rich); they hire top-name faculty at high salaries and low teaching loads, and then more teachers of lesser renown at lower pay to fill the teaching gap; they court or approve special research centers, whose outside funding—in fat years—is rumored somehow to circulate to underfunded parts of the institution, but whose shortfalls, when external money dries up, are made good straight from the general budget. The wasteful ways of rivalry are reflected in the ever-rising tuition and fees of American institutions. With the cost of four years at some private universities now hovering close to $200,000, parents and students can be forgiven their increasing tendency to treat college less as an adventure in learning and character development than as a monetary investment, pure and simple. With the elite schools perceived to pay the highest “dividend” in terms of post-graduation financial security and income, the rush to obtain admission to them has begun to resemble a panic.
It does indeed cost money, and a lot of it, to run so vast, varied, and complicated an enterprise as the institutions of higher education. That’s a simple fact. Managing a college or university constantly involves raising and managing money. There is absolutely nothing pernicious in this. The question then is, does this activity become the end of the managing, or is it the means to other goals that compose the genuine essence of an educational mission? No one would wish higher education to come up short on funds sufficient to its good purposes. Nor would anyone deny that some segments of a college or university inherently cost more than others: a biochem lab costs more to operate than an English classroom by several orders of magnitude. But the implication that wealth and the prestige that accrues to wealth—“conspicuous consumption,” in Veblen’s resonant phrase—are the ultimate goals or primary yardsticks of the learned life for students, for faculty, for administrators, or for alumni, is a belief to be repudiated. Every major ethical and religious tradition in the world teaches that wealth or money is not an end in itself but rather a means to other ends. The fact that neither we nor higher education can do without it and that we seek greater prosperity and a higher level of general welfare is no excuse for making an idol of wealth accumulation—for either the institution or the individual—at the expense of the more important educational aims that, if pursued wisely, will paradoxically enhance prosperity in unforeseen and startling ways. The philanthropy that established and sustains many educational institutions is itself a founding rejection of the belief that wealth is the final goal.

What is to be done?
Several things can be done and, if already being done, can be pursued with greater spirit:

- Teach students about the history and multiple functions of higher education, and about the particular functions and unique history of the individual institution to which they are admitted and contribute.
- Without committing restraint of trade, cooperation as well as competition can serve groups of institutions in managing libraries, purchasing, security services, study abroad, even research facilities, and a host of other possibilities.

K. Patricia Cross Future Leaders Awards

The K. Patricia Cross Future Leaders Awards recognize graduate students who show exemplary promise as future leaders of higher education; who demonstrate a commitment to developing academic and civic responsibility in themselves and others; and whose work reflects a strong emphasis on teaching and learning. The awards are sponsored by K. Patricia Cross, professor emerita of higher education at the University of California–Berkeley, and administered by the Association of American Colleges and Universities. Following are the recipients of the 2007 awards:

- **Kasey Baker**, English, University of Tennessee
- **Bethany Bowling**, interdisciplinary studies–biology education, University of Cincinnati
- **Amy Cass**, sociology, University of Delaware
- **Stephanie Milling-Robbins**, dance and women’s studies, Texas Woman’s University
- **Evelyn Perry**, sociology, Indiana University
- **Margaret Post**, social policy, Brandeis University
- **Tarsem Purewal**, computer science, University of Georgia
- **Sarah Wise**, evolutionary developmental biology, University of Colorado at Boulder

Nominations for the 2008 awards are due October 5, 2007. (For more information, see www.aacu.org.) The recipients will be introduced at the 2008 annual meeting, where they will deliver a presentation on “Faculty of the Future: Voices of the Next Generation.”
The Frederic W. Ness Book Award recognizes significant contributions to the understanding and improvement of liberal education. Established in 1979 to honor Frederic W. Ness, president emeritus of the Association of American Colleges and Universities, the award is presented at the annual meeting of the association.

For selection criteria, information about the nomination process, and a listing of past winners, see www.aacu.org/about/ness.cfm.

• Internal governance and relations among faculty, administrators, governing boards, and students require constant vigilance and communication—after all, everyone is presumably on the same team and any serious rifts become serious institutional inefficiencies.

• Emphasize and tangibly reward good teaching to a significant degree—in other words, far more than is done today.

• Eschew or at the very least moderate the “star system” of professorial appointments.

• Set financial aid policies that at every level—private, state, and federal—help prevent an educational plutocracy from developing, where wealth greatly increases the opportunity for obtaining quality higher education, which in turn greatly increases the prospect of accumulating wealth.

• Support libraries as well as laboratories.

• Remember that education in professional ethics (medicine, law, business) is futile and comes too late if there is no solid, earlier foundation for it, a substantial part of which study in the humanities provides. To imply that ethics has borders, a concern perhaps in the operating room or the boardroom but not in the dining hall or the dormitory or on Main Street or Wall Street, is to misrepresent the whole idea dangerously.

Ironically, we could have our cake and eat it, too. Colleges and universities can indeed do their part in fostering wealth creation and national competitiveness, and in guiding their graduates to successful and often lucrative careers. But, paradoxically, this will not happen in the long run if they continue to enshrine those derivative benefits of education as the chief goal of the whole enterprise. How can this be? If they continue, then higher education becomes a subservient handmaid to the immediate needs of whatever other forces and institutions—government, large corporations, political parties, ideological think tanks—prevail at the moment, and a blind cog to whatever those forces and other institutions declare are the problems that must be solved and the manner of solving them.

The larger, almost intractable problems we undoubtedly face—climate shock and environmental degradation, affordable health care, race relations, globalization, the widening gap between rich and poor nationally and internationally, ethical dilemmas of harnessing technology, immigration and refugees in this country and abroad—these problems and more cannot be solved by single institutions or by a specialist’s mentality alone. Leaders who address them and democratic societies that face them will best be served by a foundational education in the arts and sciences that is broad in scope, critical in perspective, and idealistic without illusions. Moreover, to some degree, institutions of higher education must stand outside of and criticize society itself. Solving society’s problems must include that kind of critique. You can’t solve problems without asking what went wrong to produce the problem in the first place. In all of this, higher education, and liberal education within it, plays a unique and indispensable role.

We liken the situation to the National Parks system. America’s National Parks could—for a while, at least—be run purely as recreation centers, giving free rein to all forms of pleasure seeking, including the commercial and highly mechanized. However, they would soon permanently lose the pristine natural character that had made them special in the first place and, with it, what had once made them attractive as vacation and recreation destinations. They would be effectively ruined. On the other hand, managed primarily as nature preserves, but with accommodation made for visitors and vacationers, they provide recreation to millions on a continuing basis and still perform their paramount function of preserving America’s natural heritage for future generations.

This is the higher utility, and in colleges and universities it means protecting a place in society—a set of institutions—not where the market reigns supreme (as it reasonably does in many institutions of another kind), but where the imagination takes root and grows at its own pace, undisturbed by premature or irrelevant demands for a marketable harvest, and where knowledge and the critical spirit can form a mutually supportive union. This applies equally to the arts and sciences. Imagination may sound like the province of writers and musicians, but it is essential to science,
where the consolidation and cross-pollination of disciplines is typically preceded by sallies of imaginative daring, often, though not always, with no obvious or immediate promise of use. Thus, while possible applications of Pasteur’s germ theory of disease were dimly apparent at its genesis, with other grand imaginative leaps like non-Euclidean geometry or Maxwell’s electromagnetic waves, who could tell? The vision, sometimes quite fleeting, of a “useful” application has indeed prompted much research at universities, and in some fields it is hard to separate “basic” from “applied” research. But the absence of utility must emphatically not be a deterrent if science is to thrive and not merely content itself with incremental gains in approved areas. We should look for what may well turn out to be solutions to the problems and challenges we do not yet even know will exist, as well as for solutions to the needs of the hour.

Likewise, where knowledge and ways of knowing—“useful,” not yet “useful,” or simply self-justifying—can settle into various organizational units (i.e., disciplines, departments, and professions), such knowledge and the various methods used to obtain it can then be subjected to the flames of criticism and rebellion, as a grassy prairie is convulsed and thereby renewed by periodic wildfires. As the remarkable Michael Polanyi, physical chemist turned social scientist, wrote in 1962:

The professional standard of science must impose a framework of discipline and at the same time encourage rebellion against it…. This dual function… is but the logical outcome of the belief that scientific truth is an aspect of reality and that the orthodoxy of science is taught as a guide that should enable the novice eventually to make his own contacts with this reality…. The capacity to renew itself by evoking and assimilating opposition to itself appears to be logically inherent in the sources of the authority wielded by scientific orthodoxy. (Ashby 1974, 23)

So it is with all of academic life and with democratic society itself. In educating minds to make use of and appreciate received standards, yet also to criticize and amend those standards, whether in scientific knowledge, literary interpretation, social policy, or technological application, colleges and universities at their best are models and nurseries of democratic citizenship.

To respond to this article, e-mail liberaled@aacu.org, with the authors’ names on the subject line.

REFERENCES
Our founding fathers viewed their arrival in this country as an opportunity for freedom. I remember learning in elementary school the words of the Declaration of Independence: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.” We were taught to be proud to be Americans. Every morning, we recited the Pledge of Allegiance and, in chorus, we repeated “one nation, under God, with liberty and justice for all.” As a child, I believed all of this.

Our founding fathers wanted freedom, liberty, and social justice for those who came, yet they did not recognize that that freedom came at the expense of those who were here before them and those arriving who were different from them. I had my first inkling that I was different when, in the first grade, my accent was deemed to be unacceptable, and I was placed in an accent reduction class.

My generation lived through the assassinations of President Kennedy, Martin Luther King Jr., and Bobby Kennedy—individuals who spoke about equality for all, regardless of skin color. The upheaval of the time was electrifying. Growing up in the late 1960s and 1970s, I learned about inequality and slavery, about how the poor were treated, and about the role played by skin color in dividing the haves from the have-nots. The inhumane and barbaric treatment of human beings—men and women owned, beaten, and even hanged because of the color of their skin—was incomprehensible to me. I also learned about separate and unequal schools and how privileged whites received a better education.

Much later in my educational journey, I learned that Columbus did not “discover” America but, rather, that he arrived in America. I learned that the natives were conquered, killed, and displaced from lands they cherished. While in college, I was amazed to learn that, during World War II, 120,000 Americans of Japanese descent—American citizens who had nothing to do with the bombing of Pearl Harbor—were rounded up like cattle and interned in camps. From the very beginning, the United States has not lived up to the ideals of freedom, liberty, and social justice.

Where are we now?
Today, people of color occupy positions of authority; they are represented in the boardroom and the classroom, in the professions and in government. Both Colin Powell and Condoleezza Rice have served as secretary of state. And indeed, this is a historical moment: an African American, a woman, and a Latino are seeking the Democratic presidential nomination. Yet, while some progress has been made, we still have a long way to go. Our schools are failing our children; in many of our major cities, black and Latino children are dropping out at the rate of 50 percent and higher. Many men of color are not finishing high school, and those who do finish are not enrolling in college. There remains a persistent gap between the college graduation rates for black and Latino students and the rates for white students. The percentage of college faculty and administrators of color remains small.

We must never compromise our commitment to social justice and equality in order to protect our salaries and our positions.

MILDRED GARCÍA
served as president of Berkeley College from 2001 until summer 2007, when she became president of the California State University, Dominguez Hills. This article is adapted from an address to the Networking Breakfast for Faculty and Administrators of Color at the AAC&U annual meeting.
Following the attacks of September 11, 2001, the government did not set up internment camps for Americans of Middle Eastern descent. But because many equate “terrorist” with “Middle Eastern,” racial profiling has become an accepted practice. Racial profiling is also practiced in our Latino communities, where people who look in some way like illegal immigrants are rounded up by the police.

Today, we are involved in a war based on lies: Where are the weapons of mass destruction? Where is the evidence of a link between Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein? And which Americans are fighting the war in Iraq? For the most part, it is men and women of color and it is the poor.

Finally, Hurricane Katrina affected the lives of so many people of color and exposed the
deep inequities in this country. We know that the Ninth Ward of New Orleans has been ignored and that the promises made by our government have not been kept. The lack of political will, bureaucratic bungling, and poor policy decisions have left the region’s poor further behind than ever.

**How far have we really come?**

In terms of diversity, how far have our college campuses come? The Duke University lacrosse case has been much in the news lately. Different perceptions abound; the case is rife with racial tension. At a recent board of trustees retreat, I discussed the case over dinner with two board members. Later, as I was collecting my luggage at the airport, one of them approached me with a written statement of his perceptions of what had happened at Duke. In his view, the case presents an example of democracy gone awry. A politician, looking to win an election, had jumped on the sensationalistic “majority view” bandwagon. The university president had reacted similarly, firing a renowned lacrosse coach and ruining the college careers of gifted young men who chose Duke, among other reasons, for the quality of its lacrosse program.

How often, he asked, do college presidents play politics by reacting to a vocal majority and by quashing intelligent discussion before all the facts are known? Let us be open-minded, he urged; let us be as open to the views and needs of the silent minorities on our campuses as we are to those of the vocal majorities.

The Duke case, and the different perceptions of it, raises important questions about the role of the college president in fostering democracy, diversity, and social justice. For me, it highlights the fact that, as president, I must model the behavior I seek to promote on campus. I call it “modeling constructive difficult dialogues.” That board member and I will get together at the next board meeting, for example, and we will discuss the Duke case. I will tell him that I read his views and that my own views are different. I will ask him to consider the behavior of the lacrosse team members. It appears that there had been excessive drinking. Is that something we condone? Were the students even of legal age? And what about their views
of women, especially the women of color paid to perform? I will remind him that, according to the reports, these women were treated badly; they were abused verbally. Do we condone the way these women were treated? On the other hand, one woman left and then returned. If she was treated so horrifically, as she claimed, why did she return? As a society, as an educational community, we have failed to teach these young men to respect women and not to abuse alcohol. We have also failed to educate these young women about their own self-worth as individuals.

Modeling constructive difficult dialogues can be difficult, but it is necessary. We must learn to listen, observe, and be willing to admit when we are wrong. Those of us who spoke about diversity and inclusion in the early years were wrong in not wanting to include whites in our quest for equality. In South Africa, I saw the errors of our ways. The majority in South Africa, those who had been segregated and oppressed, are now in power.

What a forgiving people! They vividly remembered the pain and inhumane treatment, yet they speak in their constitution of the need for everyone to be involved in building a just and democratic society.

As leaders, we must model and encourage debates and difficult dialogues. We must engage in civil conversations. We must admit when we are wrong, learn the arguments of those with whom we disagree, and at times, we must agree to disagree and walk away with grace. As leaders, we must insist on educating about and for diversity.

The times have changed, and diversity in this country has become increasingly complex. Diversity is no longer black and white. It is not only about the traditional census groups—black, white, Asian, Hispanic, American Indian. Diversity is multifaceted and intersecting, and there are complexities within groups as well. An increasing number of individuals now classify themselves as multiracial.
As educators, we have failed to teach about unity within diversity. The demographic shift in this country is occurring without discussion of the consequences or, even worse, with people in leadership positions ignoring it. At many colleges and universities, as in many communities, we passively react to the demographic changes. How often have we heard leaders say that today's students are different, or that they wish they were recruiting more "traditional" students? How many of us who participate in those conversations have actually responded by pointing out that these are the students of today and tomorrow, that these students will populate our cities and our country, and that they are the leaders of tomorrow?

Leadership
If we believe it, we must live it. What do our own teams look like? Do we uphold the principle of equality in our own decision making? We must be leaders of all constituencies. When I arrived at my institution—where no single group is in the majority—many said that I would turn the college into a black and Latino college. When I arrived, my cabinet members were all white. Today, the cabinet consists of two white females, one white male, one gay white male, one Latina, and one African American male. There is also professional and age diversity. It took a while to get there, and I have scars. But the conversations at the cabinet level have become more enriched, and the solutions proposed are more complete.

The responsibility associated with being a college president is daunting and awesome. Alumni, elected officials, faculty, boards of trustees, and members of the surrounding communities all look to us to take particular stands. At the end of the day, however, we must look into the mirror and be true to our own values and principles. Presidential leadership involves speaking up about injustices. The bully pulpit enables presidents to educate, advocate, and influence. Of course, we have to choose our battles carefully. But we must never compromise our commitment to social justice and equality in order to protect our salaries and our positions. These jobs do not last forever, and we might as well leave our mark by trying to make our campuses and our communities better places for everyone.

If we let them, our leadership positions will consume our lives
Coupled with utilizing the bully pulpit is the need to take controversial stands. A personal example will illustrate the point. When I was dean of students at Hostos Community College in the 1980s, the students there wanted to invite leaders of the Puerto Rican independence movement—including Lolita Lebron, who had recently been pardoned by President Carter after serving twenty-five years in prison for her role in a 1954 attack on the U.S. House of Representatives—to speak on campus. You can imagine the controversy that ensued. The chancellor, many faculty members, and local elected officials opposed the invitation.

When the president of the college announced her decision to withdraw the invitation, the cabinet was appalled. With two Latinos, one African American female, and a Jewish male, ours was the most diverse cabinet at the City University of New York at that time. The four of us—the deans of the college, faculty, students, and administration—met with the president and told her that withdrawing the invitation would violate the principles of open dialogue and debate. We offered to take responsibility and to use the event as a teachable moment. We also decided that if the invitation were withdrawn, we would resign as a group. Were we scared? You bet! But I look back at that episode as one of my proudest moments. In the end, the president changed her mind, the event took place, and both sides were able to engage in constructive debate.

Ours is an elitist profession. Research-intensive institutions are held up as the model, and unfortunately, many look down at the next sector. Research institutions look down on master's institutions, which look down on baccalaureate-granting institutions, which look down on community colleges, which look down on for-profits and K–12 schools. Many who sit on search committees dismiss candidates who come from sectors they look down on. Today, over 50 percent of Latinos attend community colleges, as do large percentages of women, Native Americans, and African Americans (excepting Historically Black Colleges and Universities). Yet I have seen search committees discount applicants who began their studies at community colleges or who worked at community colleges. How ironic it is that opportunities are limited in this way for
applicants from the one institution that has opened its doors the widest to students of color. The distinction made between PhDs and EdDs is similarly ironic. Ruth Simmons, president of Brown University, stated it best when she observed that the institution whose existence is all about education looks down on the education degree. As search committee members, we should consider competencies, accomplishments, and evidence of success rather than simply the plumage of the degree. We must not emphasize where the credentials were received over what the individual can contribute. We must reject academic elitism.

Staying grounded
Finally, it is not easy to engage in the struggle for democracy, diversity, equality, and social justice. This collective struggle is not a race to the finish; rather, it is a journey. We must not forget to take care of ourselves. We must feed the mind, nourish the body, and connect with the spirit.

I try to exercise three times per week. I pray every morning. I take vacations and make it a point to do something fun in New York City once per month. I stay connected with professional friends, and I am extremely close to my family. My sisters and brothers keep me grounded. With my family, I am simply “Millie”—born to humble and proud parents, nothing more and nothing less. To my mother and father, and to my entire family, I dedicate my life’s work; it is because of them that I am who I am.

If we let them, our leadership positions will consume our lives. One of the saddest comments I have heard came from a presidential colleague who told me that she admired how I try to keep connected with friends. She told me that, because of her position, she never made true friends. For her, it was the position and family and nothing else. At the end of the day, if we run ourselves into the ground, we will not be here to continue in the struggle.

The United States is an imperfect country, but it is our country. And it is up to us to strive to make it better, to make it a place where all can sing out loud, for everyone to hear, what Langston Hughes states so eloquently: “I too am American.”

To respond to this article, e-mail liberaled@aacu.org, with the author’s name on the subject line.
FOR CENTURIES, liberal education did not need to be justified. It was simply the way one came to be educated. The curriculum, of course, evolved with the growth of knowledge and changing intellectual fashions over the very long stretch of time from the late Middle Ages to the early twentieth century. However, it did not evolve as much as one might think: learning Latin and Greek and reading a selection of books written in those classical languages had remarkable staying power.

Moreover, for that long period, only a small upper-crust portion of the population was actually so educated. (Even budding lawyers and physicians bypassed what has since become required preparation and moved straight to their respective professional training.) But then two drawn-out developments in the American educational scene led to an increasing need to provide a justification for a liberal education. First, the college-bound population steadily grew and then exploded with the GI Bill of Rights; going to college became a rational ambition for a very substantial fraction of the population. But that expansion was followed by progressive increases in the cost of a college education, going from the virtually free GI Bill and years of modestly rising tuition to the point, as we came closer to the end of the last century, when a college education at a public university became pricey and at many private institutions truly expensive.

Is a liberal education, then, a luxury, not to be afforded by those who have to earn a living? While it is true that nowadays a large proportion of decent jobs call for knowledge and skills that are not acquired in secondary schools, especially not in those as inadequate as ours, is a liberal education not an extravagant detour to the kind of training that will get the graduate respectable employment? It has to be conceded that a liberal education does not aim at preparing students for their first jobs. That doesn’t mean they won’t get one, the economy willing, only that it is not likely to be one of the many that call for some specific expertise. To be sure, today the competencies needed to be a lawyer or a physician, or to hold one of the diverse positions of the business world, can be acquired only after candidates have undertaken a liberal education or something resembling it. If your goal is to be that kind of professional, the short and unsatisfying answer is that those plus or minus four years are a stepping stone; that is the way the educational system is set up. It is an inadequate answer because it answers neither the question of what a liberal education does for a student nor why professional schools require it.
Some purposes of liberal education

I will assume that except for certain specific needs such as chemistry for medical students or statistics for would-be MBAs, the answer to both of these questions is essentially the same. A liberal education is preprofessional and it is pre-life. Its first ingredient is simply, but not trivially, literacy: the ability to express oneself clearly and forcefully, especially in writing, as well as the ability to comprehend, without confusion, the written and spoken language. These are among the proficiencies that must be developed in college. But there are also numerous conversancies* that make the liberally educated person at least familiar with our world: that of nature and that made by man, that of the past and that of the present, that which is close to home and that which is far away. While this goal calls for acquiring a good deal of information, it requires, above all, that students gain the ability to use techniques and methods by which we come to know the laws that govern natural phenomena, the properties of the abstract worlds of mathematics, and the complex features and products of human societies.

But it is not enough to think in intellectual terms alone. By studying art, music, and literature we become not only acquainted with the most exalted products human beings have devised, but we develop both appreciation of them—that is, the capacity to enjoy them—and taste. “Arts & Leisure” is the name of the New York Times section; pre-life education must take us beyond the world of work.

And both for life and for work, to become educated requires learning how to delve deeply into a subject matter to attain a measure of competency in some area of knowledge. That is the central point of the major or concentration required in almost all undergraduate programs. No doubt more people wind up not working in the field of their concentration than do, but learning to dig, as well as to work with some independence of teacherly oversight, contributes signally to what is perhaps the single most important goal of a liberal education: learning how to learn.

The world is far too complex for knowledge about it to be compressed into a few years of study. Nor for a single moment does it stand still. Even if it were possible to learn in a few years all that matters, a substantial fraction of that would soon be out of date. An indispensable product, therefore, of a liberal education must be both the inculcation of the desire to learn and the ability to do so throughout a lifetime. In complex ways, the environment in which we live is ever changing, as are the conditions under which we do our work. Knowing how to learn is the key to understanding and coping with both.

“Practical” people sometimes assail liberal education as superfluous. They are the world’s true optimists: they think that human beings
are prepared by nature to understand the world, to keep pace with social and technological change, to make wise decisions about their own futures and the futures of others, to lead satisfying lives. I myself am sufficiently pessimistic to think that the least it takes is work.

To respond to this article, e-mail liberaled@aacu.org, with the author’s name on the subject line.

NOTE
JULIAN IS AN AFRICAN AMERICAN college student. All of his professors, and the overwhelming majority of his classmates, are white. In fact, as he approaches the end of his senior year, Julian has not had a single instructor who was not white. He and his same-race peers often meet at the black culture center on campus to decompress and reflect on instances of marginality that repeatedly arise in their predominantly white classroom environments. Their frustration at the cultural negligence with which their professors approach teaching and learning is among the usual topics of conversation. Having somehow survived almost four years at a university that remained unresponsive to his cultural needs and interests, Julian has emerged as a mentor and self-appointed peer adviser for younger African American students who gather at the black culture center for support.

Julian actively encourages the other African American students to assume increased levels of cultural ownership of their educational journeys. Specifically, when they complain about the absence of Africentric perspectives in the curriculum, their professors’ blatant disregard for multiculturalism in class discussions, and their disappointment with the limited opportunities to learn about their cultural selves and diverse others in the classroom, Julian discusses his approach to “filling in the gaps” in his own educational experience. He supplements assigned course readings with culturally relevant books and essays written by black authors and other scholars of color. Despite having asked several of his white professors for help, Julian has had to search for this body of knowledge on his own. Also, he spent the spring semester of his junior year studying in West Africa. Julian pursued this opportunity not because a professor encouraged him to do so, but because he realized on his own that this would likely be his only formal opportunity in college to learn about the history and origins of his people. He often shares photos and details from the trip and encourages other African American students to seek out similar educational and cultural ventures.

Aside from advice on making curricula more culturally relevant for themselves, Julian also teaches his younger peers how to speak up for themselves and demand that their voices be represented in classroom dialogues. His approach entails the voluntary provision of a black perspective on course topics, the unsolicited sharing of his own life story as it relates to course content, and the introduction of facts and histories that extend beyond (and sometimes contradict) the white viewpoints offered in assigned readings and reinforced by his professors. While this approach works well for Julian, most students in the peer group are afraid to question their professors’ intellectual authority and selection of readings. Likewise, they are reluctant to insist upon the inclusion
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of cultural perspectives that faculty at the university obviously deem unimportant.

Not all of the African American students who engage in these conversations at the black culture center agree with Julian’s approach. Some take issue with his willingness to assume work for which faculty are paid. One student recently said to Julian, “Just like the administrators at this university, you are willing to let these professors off the hook. No one holds them accountable for meeting my needs and enhancing the cultural learning experiences of all students in the classroom. I shouldn’t have to do this work for them.” Outside of the black culture center, Julian engages his white roommate and friends from different racial backgrounds in related conversations. Like the African American students, Julian’s other peers also complain that the classroom offers few opportunities to learn about cultural diversity and multicultural perspectives. “Were it not for my interactions with you, I would feel culturally illiterate and insufficiently prepared to work with people who are not white,” Julian’s roommate asserted.

In this article, our goal is to personalize these concerns of diverse student populations and encourage faculty to intentionally incorporate cultural inclusion into their pedagogy and their courses. Julian’s story is a composite of perspectives shared by the 219 participants in the National Black Male College Achievement Study,* many of whom described similar approaches to assuming cultural ownership for their learning in classrooms on thirty predominantly white campuses. In light of Julian’s story and the responses of some of his peers, we emphasize that the onus needs to shift from students, who are expected to adjust to insensitive and monocultural classroom environments, to faculty, who need to change their teaching approaches to benefit an increasingly diverse array of students.

Accountability and diversity
Accountability has become a prominent movement within higher education. No longer can institutions of higher learning simply rely on anecdotal accounts of student learning. Faculty and administrators now must document student learning and achievement through the systematic assessment of outcomes. Alongside the accountability movement is the use of “diversity” as a buzzword within most, if not all, colleges and universities. One would be hard-pressed to find an institution whose mission does not include helping students appreciate diversity. Yet, students continue to grapple with learning how to value the differing experiences and perspectives their peers bring to the campus. If students are to benefit from the gains associated with classroom diversity, faculty must respond to the accountability movement by holding themselves accountable for offering culturally inclusive pedagogy and curricula.

In 2002, the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education issued fifty “incomplete” grades in its 2000 and 2002 state-by-state report cards, Measuring Up. The center deemed evidence of student learning both inconclusive and insufficient in all fifty states. State policy makers and regional accrediting agencies are responding by requiring institutions to engage in purposeful and systematic assessment efforts to confirm claims of educational effectiveness. The center’s report incited an accountability wave to create measurable learning goals. Since learning and engagement are inextricably bound, and students from all racial and ethnic backgrounds are more likely to be engaged when faculty expose them to multicultural perspectives, it is clearly appropriate to connect classroom diversity with accountability.

Acknowledging the outcomes
Cognitive development, perspective-taking, critical thinking skills, academic achievement, and problem-solving skills are among the outcomes that researchers have consistently noted in studies about the effects of inclusive pedagogy and curricula. Accordingly, engaging in meaningful, but sometimes uncomfortable, discussions about racial/ethnic, gender, religious, and socioeconomic differences, as well as privilege in all its forms, affords students opportunities to think critically about topics to which they previously had not been exposed. When faculty interweave multicultural perspectives into classroom discourse, students can challenge preconceived notions and learn about the unique knowledge that their peers of diverse backgrounds hold and bring to the classroom.

Octavio Villalpando (2002) studied the effects of diversity on student learning among 15,600 undergraduate students from 365

postsecondary institutions. He found that after four years of college, students were most satisfied with faculty who employed methodologies that respected and were inclusive of cultural differences; constructed welcoming environments for sharing cultural perspectives; and required writing assignments that challenged students to think critically about diversity and equity issues. Villalpando’s findings do not apply only to minority students; white students reported the same outcomes.

In their study of the educational benefits of diversity within higher education, researchers Patricia Gurin, Eric Dey, Sylvia Hurtado, and Gerald Gurin establish that curricula that expose students to racial and ethnic diversity enhance intellectual engagement and active thinking skills. “The success of these curricular initiatives,” they report, “is facilitated by the presence of diverse students and pedagogy that facilitates learning in a diverse environment. In conclusion, we find that education is enhanced by extensive and meaningful informal interracial interaction” (2002, 359). In the example above, Julian searched for readings and experiences on his own that reflected diversity since his professors relied exclusively on white, mainstream perspectives. As a result, neither he nor his white peers benefited from the type of classroom learning environment Gurin and her colleagues describe.

Similarly, Richard Light (2001) found that students at Harvard University consistently reported educational gains accrued through
meaningful interactions with diverse peers and exposure to multicultural academic content. Approximately 93 percent of the students Light interviewed recalled moments in their educational experiences when a comment from a peer provoked them to think differently. This was especially true for white participants in the study, as they were affected most positively through interactions with their racially and ethnically different peers. Light concluded that it is important for educators to capitalize on such educational moments that allow students to interrogate and rethink their assumptions in order to facilitate meaningful learning.

Where’s the accountability?
Despite the abundance of evidence showing the positive effects of diversity on student learning, most college and university instructors continue to teach in culturally neutral ways. Faculty socialization is conceivably the most salient explanatory factor. More often than not, faculty members have not been trained to seek out and infuse diverse readings and pedagogical methods into their courses. Most of the professors they had as graduate students did not model an appreciation for multiculturalism, emphasize cultural inclusiveness in their socialization efforts, or engage in culturally empowering pedagogical practices. Therefore, it is no surprise that graduate students enter the professoriate and recycle the content, knowledge, and teaching behaviors of their former professors.

When students are exposed only to white, dominant perspectives, they come to believe that viewpoints from other racial and ethnic groups are trivial and lack value, intellectual worth, and scholarly credibility. Julian’s story exemplifies this point. The black culture center was the only place on campus where the experiences of African American students mattered. Since faculty devalued the knowledge of other cultural groups, classroom spaces were exclusive. If professors were critically to examine their classroom practices and assigned course materials, the extent to which they are (or are not) welcoming of multiple groups would likely become apparent.

Another reason many professors fail to capitalize on the opportunities that increased classroom diversity can offer students is because it is more convenient and safer to ignore diversity. Mildred Garcia and Daryl Smith (1996) assert that educators at most institutions continue to use monocultural, rather than multicultural, methods to engage students. Christine Bennett insists that “when predominantly white campuses serving culturally diverse populations take a business-as-usual or assimilationist approach, they allow institutional and cultural racism to persist” (2001, 674). Like Garcia and Smith, Bennett draws attention to the fact that most professors still expect students to assimilate to white cultural norms and practices, while overlooking contributions from other racial and ethnic groups.

Changing pedagogy and curricula to be reflective of diverse experiences and viewpoints inevitably will lead to conflict among students who come from differing vantage points. It is therefore safer and easier to avoid the potential friction between students and focus on the white, heteronormative content and knowledge that is already dominant.

Academic freedom is another barrier to holding faculty accountable. Since most professors maintain autonomy over what and how they teach, it remains difficult to
require these educators, especially those with tenure, to purposefully weave diverse content into their courses. One way to bring about a paradigmatic shift toward accountability among faculty colleagues within a particular program, department, college, or school is to engage them in conversations about the well-documented outcomes associated with infusing multiculturalism into curricula and pedagogy. Faculty are often motivated by evidence and results; therefore, providing empirical evidence to demonstrate the concrete student learning outcomes achieved through exposure to classroom climates of cultural inclusiveness can compel faculty members to hold themselves more accountable for rethinking their pedagogical philosophies and practices. Regardless of the various reasons faculty do not employ culturally inclusive content and teaching methods in their courses, accountability must be constantly reinforced and given greater importance within various academic units.

**Curriculum and course content**
The curriculum itself communicates important messages about the importance of diversity (or the lack thereof). On the first day of classes, when students browse the syllabi created by their professors, do they see readings that mainly reflect white, conventional perspectives? Including works by diverse authors is essential to maximizing student learning outcomes, such as critical thinking, perspective-taking, and appreciation of differences. Only acknowledging the experiences of African American students during Black History Month and compartmentalizing underrepresented student experiences into one “diversity course” or single class unit treats them as “add-on” topics to the curriculum. These practices tokenize students from different cultural backgrounds and diminish student learning. Faculty cannot depend exclusively on the course content to which they were exposed during graduate school. Instead, they must hold themselves accountable for introducing new literature to which they might be unaccustomed in order to enable students to understand differences. Doing so challenges the “business-as-usual” approach and validates the unique knowledge that members of other cultural groups possess. Likewise, department chairs and deans should engage faculty in dialogues and exercises that illuminate the urgent need to diversify curricula within their departments and schools. More specifically, by engaging in collaborative peer review, faculty can receive feedback on the readings and other materials they select for their courses. This practice can enable faculty who struggle with identifying multicultural literature to build on the expertise and knowledge of their colleagues, thus enhancing their own knowledge. Moreover, soliciting input from students of all backgrounds regarding their affective dispositions toward selected content and readings is vital to holding oneself accountable. Students are best positioned to confirm that readings and materials reflect perspectives about which they are unfamiliar and that would afford multiple, sustained opportunities to learn from and about others.

**Pedagogy and classroom practices**
In her book *Teaching to Transgress*, author and activist bell hooks describes a dilemma that frequently arises in postsecondary classrooms:

> Often, if there is a lone person of color in the classroom she or he is objectified by others and forced to assume the role of “native informant.” For example, a novel is read by a Korean American author. White students turn to the one student from a Korean background to explain what they do not understand. This places an unfair responsibility onto that student. (1994, 43)

Julian’s story depicts the “native informant” role that is all too familiar for many underrepresented students. Relying entirely on racial and ethnic minority students to provide the “multicultural viewpoint” is problematic because it disengages these students and does not afford white students the opportunity to challenge their own preconceived notions while striving to learn about differences. In addition to engendering feelings of embarrassment and tokenism among minority students, this culturally insensitive practice does not
enable white students to connect their cultural backgrounds to the readings and materials presented in the course. Inviting all students to bring their unique cultural experiences and perspectives to classroom discourse is a more productive way to help students achieve the diversity-related learning outcomes. If professors purposefully employ pedagogical techniques that empower white students to also reflect publicly on their cultural similarities and differences, perhaps racial and ethnic minority students would not feel that they are being singled out and pressured to offer the multicultural perspective.

Texas A&M professors Christine Stanley and Yvonna Lincoln stress the importance of cross-race mentoring in order to retain minority faculty and facilitate their success as educators:

To demand that a marginalized faculty group conform to conventional research agendas serves only to create the impression that non-mainstream research is without value, that diversity is respected only insofar as it conforms to majority interests, and that faculty of color are to some degree incapable of laying out research agendas of their own. (2005, 48)

Like the students who are expected to serve as “native informants,” faculty who endeavor to respect diversity in their courses and teach students about content that might be unfamiliar to them are often placed at the margins of their institutions. As Stanley and Lincoln maintain, it is important that professors from dominant groups hold themselves accountable for learning new culturally inclusive pedagogical techniques. This form of accountability ensures that responsibility moves from the student to the professor, particularly among faculty members from dominant groups whose contributions are already provided ample space in curricula.

Self-reflection

It takes honesty and self-reflection to admit that one’s courses do not currently incorporate non-mainstream perspectives. Similarly, facilitating opportunities for students to learn through different views, content, and pedagogy will fail unless faculty members examine their own assumptions, biases, and knowledge insufficiencies and assume responsibility for learning how to infuse diversity throughout the curriculum. According to Marcia Baxter Magolda, “students perceive education as ‘not made for them’ when it does not acknowledge, respect, and connect to their experience and perspectives. Hostile learning environments created by marginalization of particular students interfere with learning” (2001, 234). Baxter Magolda calls upon educators to reflect on their teaching practices and how they contribute to placing certain student groups on the fringes while privileging others. Because white, normalized standpoints routinely receive attention within the classroom, faculty who do not regularly examine the types of readings and content they use are prone to reproduce the dominance of white values and beliefs, which stifles learning among white and minority students alike.

Gloria Ladson-Billings (1995) refers to a self-reflective pedagogy as culturally relevant. Educators who subscribe to this type of pedagogy, Ladson-Billings claims, value the knowledge that students already possess and invite students to share that knowledge within schooling contexts. When students learn that their own experiences and viewpoints are valuable, perspective-taking, appreciation of differences, and self-confidence are likely outcomes.

Self-aware professors pose the following questions to themselves: What biases, prejudices, and assumptions do I bring to the classroom? What did I not learn in graduate school about culturally different persons? What evidence do I have to verify that my current pedagogical practices are inclusive, empowering, and appropriate for the multicultural era in which we live and the diverse settings in which students will someday work? How do I hold myself more accountable for advancing the multicultural agenda of contemporary American higher education? Faculty members who consistently ponder these kinds of questions are uniquely positioned to construct culturally relevant and affirming learning environments. Had Julian’s professors asked themselves these questions, they likely would have enhanced his learning and not made him entirely responsible for identifying multicultural resources on his own.
In addition, department chairs and administrators from across the campus should engage in collaborative reflection about the ways the espoused values of the institution are enacted. Campuses that espouse an appreciation for diversity on Web sites and in mission statements, while taking passive and insufficient measures to ensure that students from all backgrounds feel valued and respected within their courses, pose a tremendous contradiction. When espoused and enacted values are disconnected, student learning is stifled. Faculty can transform the multicultural infrastructure by collaborating, modeling effectiveness for each other, promoting a spirit of shared accountability, and taking an honest look at how their work affects learning and engagement among diverse groups of students.

Conclusion
As he reflects on his past four years at the university, Julian realizes he has learned a great deal about himself and his culture. However, it becomes clear to him that most of this learning was self-initiated and empowering, despite being invalidated in his courses. Taking some of the criticisms of his African American peers into account, Julian admits that he assumed an unfair share of the responsibility for his education. That is, he recognizes that he was his own most influential teacher, although professors were hired and rewarded to play more important roles in ensuring his growth and enhancing his learning. Julian wonders what his experience would have been like, and more importantly, what he would have learned had he not undertaken such self-guided cultural exploration. Even though Julian willingly accepted responsibility for learning about cultural differences outside of class, faculty cannot expect that other students will do the same.

Accountability for culturally inclusive curricula and pedagogy is necessary in order to shift the onus from students to faculty. The form of accountability described in this article is not regulatory, but is instead collaborative and self-imposed. Institutions where faculty continually neglect the cultural assets that diverse student populations bring to the classroom will continue to come up short and receive “incomplete” grades concerning educational effectiveness. For the sake of students like Julian, his African American peers who gather at the black culture center, and their classmates, faculty members must devote attention to curriculum and course content, pedagogy and classroom practices, and self-reflection. Diversity, learning, and engagement are cyclical and largely dependent upon accountability, collaboration, and multicultural consciousnesses among faculty.

To respond to this article, e-mail liberaled@aacu.org, with the authors’ names on the subject line.
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NOTE
IN THE SPRING OF 2005, the academic council at Mars Hill College unanimously passed a proposal to institute a civic engagement certificate program. This vote did not come easily; it followed more than a year of discussion and debate about the merits of certificate programs, the meaning of engaged learning, and the tension between and potential alignment among cocurricular learning and the academic disciplines.

Our work on the civic engagement program actually began nine years ago, when we devoted a full year to asking a wide range of constituencies what they would like to see our students gain from their community engagement. This yearlong qualitative study was prompted by the Bonner Foundation, which asked all Bonner Scholar-affiliated colleges to begin designing a student development model. Our president at the time, Max Lennon, encouraged us to form a “Blue Ribbon Commission” in order to gain the input of some of the brightest and best leaders in the country. Indeed, he introduced us to many of these leaders—people like the president of one of the nation’s largest banks and the vice president of Duke Energy. It was important to many of us working on the project, though, to hear the voices of all kinds of people who would be affected by our program—students, faculty, staff, and community partners. I started talking with farmers and millhands and maintenance workers. I called these my “Pabst Blue Ribbon Commission.” These working-class PBR Commissioners represented a different perspective from the wine-and-cheese crowd who held powerful positions in the community.

As we analyzed the qualitative data from all these community voices, some common responses and patterns began to emerge. The responses to the question of what should be gained from engaged learning generally fell into three categories: content knowledge (which we began calling the “know-what”), skills (which we called the “know-how”), and values or attitudes (which we called the “know-why”). Over the next several years, we used these data to design and implement our cocurricular leadership program.

The LifeWorks program is developmental, moving students up five steps of a staircase and ending with a capstone presentation of learning and a portfolio. The program is thematically connected to Mars Hill’s sequence of core general education courses (see description of these courses below). While all students take these “Commons” courses, the Bonner scholars and other honor scholars also participate in the cocurricular civic engagement program, connected to four years of involvement in community service. The knowledge, skills, and values are meant to build on one another as students progress through the program. In the “know-what” category, we begin with the knowledge base of appreciative inquiry, building on the premise that knowledge is gained from asking good questions. Then we move to knowledge of self, of the community, of conflictual and controversial issues, and of career options. The “know-how” category begins with the skill set associated with time management, building on the premise that students need to “show up,” in every sense of that phrase, before they will be able to master other skills. Next, we work on the skill of active listening, followed by facilitation, civil discourse, and resource development. The “know-why” category begins with the value of imagination, building on the premise that if we can first cultivate dispositions of wonder, discovery, and imagination, students will gain much more from everything that follows. We then address values of courage, respect, integrity, and enthusiasm.

STANLEY D. DOTSON is dean of the LifeWorks Learning Partnership at Mars Hill College.

The Bonner Foundation engages students in an intensive, developmental, four-year, service-based scholarship and civic engagement program. Seventy-five colleges and universities are currently working to build and sustain an integrated cocurricular and curricular model for campus civic engagement. With support from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE), many of these campuses have or are creating a parallel academic initiative in the form of a civic engagement certificate, minor, or concentration.

For additional information and resources, including frameworks, campus profiles, practitioner how-to essays, and more, see www.bonner.org or the AAC&U publication Civic Engagement at the Center: Building Democracy through Integrated Cocurricular and Curricular Experiences, (forthcoming 2008), which presents the model along with strategies for developing an in-depth academic initiative.

STANLEY D. DOTSON
In the capstone year, students learn the skill of evaluation, and they strengthen the value of appreciation as they look back on four years of engaged learning and recognize all the significant people who made a positive impact on them. They synthesize the knowledge they gained, prepare a portfolio, and give a presentation of learning at their senior banquet.

The teaching and learning of these sets of knowledge, skills, and values takes place in weekly group meetings attended by the Bonner scholars and honor scholars pursuing the civic engagement certificate. During each semester, we spend five weeks on the skill set, five weeks on the knowledge base, and five weeks on the value commitment. We are in the process of designing journal reflection books for each semester, with artwork, quotes, and essays reinforcing the desired objectives for each component. The weekly meetings consist of group discussion, journaling, a film clip, music, and interactive exercises, with all the activities reinforcing the theme for the week.

For example, in one of the weeks on time management, we show a humorous clip from the Charlie Chaplin movie *Modern Times*, which critiques the industrial revolution’s value system and the assembly line’s emphasis on speed. The students reflect on the importance of resisting the cultural pressure to treat their educational experience as a factory production. They do a fun exercise that involves rolling marbles down a series of pipes cut in half, while listening to the Rolling Stones song

We want our students and graduates to experience alignment between their jobs, their faith convictions, their intellectual pursuits, their political persuasions, their investments, and their volunteer activities.
“Time Is on My Side.” Each marble represents a goal they have articulated, and they have to work as a team to get the marbles down the pipes without the marbles jumping track. They reflect on what this exercise can teach them about creating momentum toward achieving their goals, and they journal about what it means for them to “make good time” as they engage the community and the classroom. At the end of each five-week period, the students write an essay on the theme we have covered, reflecting on the connections between that theme and what they are learning in the classroom and in their community work.

The Commons sequence
As we identified our cocurricular themes and began designing the teaching and learning materials, we worked closely with faculty members who were redesigning our core general education curriculum, in order to ensure a sense of coherence between the cocurricular and curricular engagement of our students. The sequence of interdisciplinary core courses that the faculty developed, called the Commons, does align quite well with the themes of our civic engagement program. The design specifications for the Commons courses require that each include an experiential or community engagement component.

The Commons sequence begins with the first-year seminar, called Challenges. This course introduces students to the idea of the practical liberal arts, demonstrating how the liberal arts help address everyday challenges of life in community. Students are also introduced to service learning through this course, with each class doing a short-term service project related to the theme for the class. For example, the class addressing the challenges of food and hunger works with local farmers and a local food bank. Another class addresses the challenge of social responsibility and works with a local homeless ministry.

We have held a series of workshops with community partners and faculty members in the Commons courses to strengthen the connections between the students’ community engagement and their academic work in the classroom. For the Challenges course workshop, we invited a dozen of our core community partners and sent them some of the texts the students read in the course, such as Martin Luther King Jr’s “Letter from Birmingham Jail.” The community partners shared with the faculty how they saw the texts connecting with their daily work, and how they would help students make these connections. These workshops have strengthened our relationships with our community partners by honoring them as co-educators and not simply as volunteer managers.

The second course in the Commons sequence is Character, an interdisciplinary study of human nature and why we do the things we do. This fits nicely with the stage-two knowledge base of the cocurricular program—knowledge of self. In the Character course, the students are given a list of the texts they are to read, and at the end of this list is a paragraph entitled “Your Life as Text.” The students are instructed to choose one aspect of their lives in community. They can choose their service-learning work, or their participation in a performance group or athletic team, or a part-time job. Whatever they choose, they are expected to learn how to “read” that aspect of their lives and to make connections between the ideas and theories and questions raised in the other readings and classroom discussions and what is happening in their life text.

We facilitated a second engaged learning workshop with the Character faculty and a group of our community partners. They read Plato’s “Ring of Gyges” and a story about Le Chambon, a village in France that sheltered Jews during World War II. One of our faculty members rewrote Plato’s story to talk about people who feel “invisible” in our communities. A holocaust survivor from the community led the discussion of the Le Chambon story. It was quite enriching, and the commu-
Community partners shared with us how much they appreciated engaging with us in this way, (rather than simply focusing on the logistics of service learning).

The third Commons course is Civic Life, which fits with the cocurricular knowledge of community theme. This course is taught through a series of cross-cultural and historical case studies that demonstrate different ways human societies have attempted to build community, including the ancient Mayan society, the Hebrew covenant community, the Greek city-states, a Chinese village, the Cherokee Nation, pre-revolution America, and Appalachia during the Civil War. For the experiential component, the students are instructed to choose a “personal case study” to examine alongside the seven historical case studies in the course. This personal case study represents an ingredient of community life, and must focus on something the students are personally involved with. Students choose from a list of ten possible issues for their personal case studies: food and shelter, business, religion, the arts, sports, politics, education, the environment, health care, and security.

The personal case study then becomes a lens through which the students examine each of the cross-cultural and historical communities. And the students look for ways the historical communities inform their understanding of the contemporary issue. They also bring in questions that emerge from their own experiences with that issue in the community. For example, students who choose the environment will look at how each of the seven societies managed their natural resources, and will connect this learning with their involvement in environmental protection. One faculty member said that he had the most engaged group of student athletes he had ever had, because they were able to choose sports as their personal case study and examine the role of sports in civic life.

The fourth Commons course is Critique, which explores the dynamic tension between faith and reason, particularly around some of the hot-button issues of our society. This fits with the knowledge base at this stage of the cocurricular program, which focuses on controversial issues dividing communities today.

The last Commons course is Creativity, which explores the creative process at work across fields and disciplines. This fits well with the cocurricular knowledge base of career options, as we want students to see how they can creatively contribute to the common good in any career path, not only in the so-called “service fields” or the nonprofit sector. The experiential components of these last two courses are not yet as fully developed as the earlier courses in the Commons sequence. We hope to build these components over the next two years.

**Defining ultimate outcomes**

As we have implemented our civic engagement program, we have found that the knowledge, skills, and values outcomes we have identified are instrumental; that is, they can be employed to serve any number of ultimate ends. It was interesting to hear how much resonance there was among the various constituencies we interviewed about what students should gain from a civic engagement program. There was even a lot of similarity between what was said by those on the “Blue Ribbon Commission” and what was said by those on the “Pabst Blue Ribbon Commission.” Indeed, one would be hard-pressed to find anyone who would argue with the language of our instrumental outcomes. Who would not be for values of courage and respect, skills of listening and facilitation, knowledge of self and community?

To illustrate the point, during our year of data gathering we interviewed two “Wendells,” two civic leaders who have very little in common other than their first name. Wendell Murphy is one of the country’s largest agribusiness owners, an industrial hog farmer characterized as “Boss Hog” in a Pulitzer-winning
These ultimate outcomes describe the range of contributions to the common good incurred through different avenues of engagement in the community.

Story by the Raleigh News and Observer for the way he has consistently manipulated the system to his benefit. Wendell Berry, on the other hand, is a sustainable agriculture practitioner and one of the sharpest critics of agribusiness in America. Both men used a similar language to describe what students should gain—knowledge of self and the community, skills of listening and talking, values of respect and courage. And yet these two would use those skills and employ that knowledge for very different purposes—cross-purposes.

Defining instrumental outcomes for civic engagement is not sufficient. We recognized from our “tale of two Wendells” that we need to begin clarifying and sharpening our ultimate desired outcomes. It is not enough for students to be equipped for civic engagement. Some of the most effective civic leaders are using their expertise, skills, and value systems for ends that are detrimental to community. In the 1950s, some of the most effective civic leaders used their knowledge and skill to maintain segregation. Today, neighborhood leaders are highly effective in keeping poor people out of their neighborhoods.

In our initial attempts to define ultimate outcomes, we stated that any engaged learning activity should meet the identified needs of a vulnerable population. That is, we wanted our program to serve the interests of those without privilege or power, not to increase the privilege of those in power. That seemed simple enough until the students started asking the logical questions: What do you mean by vulnerable population? How do you define vulnerability? Through long conversations with students, staff, faculty, and community partners, we have identified seven areas of vulnerability and seven ultimate outcomes or desired impacts on community life that would empower and serve the interests of the underprivileged, instead of consolidating the power and serving the interests of the overprivileged. These ultimate outcomes describe the range of contributions to the common good incurred through different avenues of engagement in the community.

Moreover, these outcomes help us answer the perennial student question: does this count for service learning? (Fill in the blank for what activity this refers to.) When faced with this question, we now direct the students to the list of ultimate outcomes (see sidebar), and ask them to tell us how the activity contributes to one or more of these goals.

This list was particularly helpful in our conversations with students whose vocation is in the arts. A student who sings in the college choir, for example, wanted to “count” the choir tour as community engagement. We asked her to reflect on the criteria, and see whether the activity fit. She came back and talked about where they went on tour; they started out singing at large, well-resourced churches, and she could understand how this doesn’t meet the criteria. But, she explained, they did travel to a small community in West Virginia, where one of our graduates is the church organist, and this community rarely has the opportunity to be exposed to the kind of music our choir performs. In addition to singing, the members of the choir spent time in the community, did home stays, and talked with the young people about the value of the fine arts. The student understood why some of the tour would count, and some would not count.

The set of criteria has helped us expand opportunities for students in the business department as well. For too long, the service-learning movement has fostered a deep division between the for-profit and nonprofit sectors, with the assumption that for-profit enterprises are self-serving while nonprofits serve the greater good. We now can talk with business students and community partners about the value of entrepreneurial activity and microenterprise. We should be using the same indicators to evaluate the contributions of business organizations that we use for governmental and nonprofit organizations. A community like McDowell County, West Virginia, where we take alternative break trips every year, has been in dire need of...
meaningful work for people to do since the collapse of the coal industry. Creating more service-sector nonprofits is not the long-term answer to their challenges. One of our students from McDowell County made this point when she received a Surdna Fellowship from the Appalachian College Association to go back to her community for the summer and start an entrepreneurial “Buzz on Biz” business club for teenagers there. Her dream is to create a clothing business in her community that would bring sustainable jobs for her friends and family there.

We have started using the list of ultimate outcomes in arenas other than our student civic engagement program. We have included the list in a survey of alumni to find out how they see their lives and their work contributing to the common good. We have also started using the list in our staff evaluation process in the LifeWorks office. It is a good practice for us to do the same kind of reflection on our work that we are asking students to do.

This list of ultimate outcomes recognizes a wide variety of activities that contribute to the building of healthy, sustainable communities. It also recognizes a wide variety of callings or vocations. It does not solve all problems that emerge in a civic engagement program, though. We have yet to design an effective assessment tool for measuring the impact in any of these seven areas. There is still a lot of subjectivity in how people define the language in each of the seven areas, and students still document engaged activities that vary widely in the depth and breadth of the impact on the community. Other problems in civic life occur when a person’s activities contribute to one of these outcomes and work against another. Wendell Murphy could make great contributions to the education system in North Carolina, but his business was destructive to the environment and kept wages low for the workers. Civic tension results not so much from the clash of good and evil; it more often results from the clash of two goods, or from a narrow focus on one good while ignoring other goods.

Alignment for life

There is a large sign outside a business in downtown Asheville that reads, “Alignment for Life.” (It is a car repair business, and the sign refers to front end alignment.) I use the sign as a reminder of what we hope to accomplish in our civic engagement program: a holistic vision of vocation. Frederick Buechner (1973) defines “vocation” as that place where our deep gladness meets the world’s deep hunger. Through the academic work in the Commons courses, the activities in the community, and the weekly reflection meetings of the LifeWorks program, we hope our students discover that vocation, that experience of alignment between what they care passionately about and what the world desperately needs. We want our students and our graduates to experience lifelong alignment—we want their lives and engagements to contribute in some way to all of the ultimate outcomes.

We want our students and graduates to experience alignment between their jobs, their faith convictions, their intellectual pursuits, their political persuasions, their investments, and their volunteer activities. Whether students sense a calling to be a minister or a corporate executive or a hog farmer or a poet, we want them to be the kind of people whose actions in all areas of life diminish poverty and preserve the environment and create beauty in the world. We want them to be the kind of people whose career choices and spiritual lives and voting patterns diminish discrimination and underachievement and make the world a safer place to live.

To respond to this article, e-mail liberaled@aacu.org, with the author’s name on the subject line.
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THE HORROR OF THE SHOOTINGS at Virginia Tech has created an opportunity for us to think about the kinds of places we want our college and university campuses to be. The common view of higher education as a commodity leads many to think of faculty and staff as highly trained “service providers” and to expect campuses to be “sanctuaries.”

I think this common view of higher education is deeply mistaken. If a crisis occurs, a truly aberrant event, it encourages the rush to ask why a campus didn’t have more precautions in place, or why any violation of the sanctuary wasn’t immediately communicated. If we want our college and university campuses to be sanctuaries, then those are reasonable and expected questions. But I don’t believe that is what we should want our campuses to be.

Yes, colleges and universities must be places apart; but they also must be places connected to the community. They must be safe havens for the exploration of ideas; but they also must be places where ideas are connected to the realities of the world and to practices and actions in the world. Campuses should be reassuring and familiar, and they certainly should be expected to maintain at least reasonable standards of safety. But campuses are not bastions or armed camps. They are not, and they should not become, gated communities.

Whereas decisions about who can be let into a sanctuary are made before development, change, or transformation occurs, campuses are the very places where these processes are meant to occur. A sanctuary serves to gather homogeneity within a security barrier; a college campus emphasizes difference as a necessary condition for trust and makes community and commitment beyond self-interest possible. When a horrific, aberrant event violates this community and this trust on one campus, all of our campuses are affected.

To prohibit students diagnosed with depression from attending our colleges and universities—as some have suggested in the wake of the Virginia Tech tragedy—would be not only illegal but also just wrong. To create a profile of

DONALD W. HARWARD, president emeritus of Bates College and senior fellow at AAC&U, is director of the Bringing Theory to Practice project.
those who should be removed from campus based upon symptoms of depression would be to exclude nearly half of our students. (National studies show that over 40 percent of current undergraduates self-report having experienced an episode of depression sufficient to interrupt their studies or campus life.)

We must resist calls to make our campuses into even “tighter” sanctuaries. To do otherwise would be to concede that college and university campuses should be sanctuaries at all, and it would be to concede that, in light of recent events, they should become less penetrable, more homogenous, and more concerned about “protecting from” than “being open to.” In my judgment, we should instead use this opportunity to reexamine common views of what colleges and universities should do and be. What are the core purposes of an institution of higher education, and are those core purposes being served? Do the outcomes of our students’ experiences reflect the achievement of those purposes?

Attending to students’ emotional well-being, their own realization and definition of their potential, and their civic development is as much a part of the mission of our colleges and universities asseeing to it that students gain knowledge. We need to challenge the view that colleges and universities are essentially service providers, that they are places where a credential can be gained for social and financial advancement, and that they are or should be sanctuaries.

Education and the places that support it must be liberating rather than confining, yes. But that is not enough.

The expectations of students and parents, the intentional objectives of institutions, and the patterns of activity on campuses all must reflect a shared commitment to the integration of learning. Thus, faculty and staff must attend to students’ mental health and civic development. Through the Bringing Theory to Practice project, sponsored by the Association of American Colleges and Universities and the Charles Engelhard Foundation, more than two hundred campuses have launched programs and explored what happens when colleges and universities do attend to these core aspects of higher education’s mission (see www.bringingtheorytopractice.org).

The campus must be an arena where learning and discovery are valued; but it also must be the crucible where students experience transformation and explore possibilities for self-realization and for mental and physical well-being. And the campus also must be a place where students encounter their own privilege, discover their responsibility to build community, and deepen their own civic development. College and university campuses must work at being such arenas, such crucibles—and not at being or becoming sanctuaries.

To respond to this article, e-mail liberaled@aacu.org, with the author’s name on the subject line.
BOXES, STACKED TWO HIGH, lined the hallway outside my office door, “Please Recycle” scrawled across a sheet laid atop them. Each of the more than half-dozen boxes was filled with files and papers: a large swath of my academic life. “There’s something important in there,” I said to my colleague as we stared at the heap.

“You’re not going to look for it?” she asked when I didn’t make a move.

“Nah, I don’t know what it is. I’m sure if I looked through everything, I would find it—a misplaced assignment, an idea for an article, a paper tucked in the back of a folder,” I explained, the dust from the seldom-moved files making my nose itch. “But if I don’t look, I won’t know what I’m missing.”

Like most of us in academe, I don’t throw out as much as I should. In sorting through my files, I realized I had kept almost everything: class notes, old assignments, potential readings, committee work, documents, documents, documents. I was reminded of the time a trustee asked me if I was at work on the great American novel. I assured him that I was being much more productive creating “the great American memo.” I considered merging the two into an academic novella entitled The Old Man and the Memo in which the grizzled professor spends all his energies trying to land the one big memo that will make him the envy of his colleagues. I just could not settle on who should play the role of the frenzied sharks attacking at the first scent of ink. Instead, I ended up creating A Farewell to Memos, the hallway remainder bin now filled with its indistinguishable pages.

Having been a professor for twenty years, I long ago filled the filing cabinets built into my desk and the huge lateral unit across from it. With the added extravagance of a large closet, I rotated my stock into cardboard cartons that I stacked high behind its doors. I probably still have another twenty years to teach, so the mound could easily double. I did not fear the empty days of retirement; I feared the full boxes. I could spend my golden years pulling out my graying hair as I sorted through my yellowing papers.

That was before the move.

Like a mother who discovers the week before school that none of her child’s clothes fit and so dashes to the mall in a quick makeover attempt, our department decided in late August to move four colleagues out of our overcrowded building into a new facility across campus. I volunteered to go. Because I was moving to a smaller office and because I didn’t have a sabbatical to spend going through each folder, I began the paper purge with the fervor of a book burning.
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I called it my “bitch and pitch” session. I would complain to anyone within earshot about how stupid I was to agree to the move, then toss another log onto the bonfire.

As I dragged box after box into the hall—sometimes only glancing as tabs waved at me from within, drowning folders trying to get a lifeguard’s attention—I began to wonder when I had turned into an academic packrat. Why did I keep coursework from my master’s, completed some twenty years ago? Why did I still have last year’s portfolios from students who obviously had no intention of picking them up? As I added my lesson plans from a course I taught in 1992 to the pile, the answer struck me: because we teachers produce no product.

In Studs Terkel’s *Working: People Talk about What They Do All Day and How They Feel about What They Do* (2004, xxxii), laborer Mike LeFevre says: ‘Somebody built the pyramids….Pyramids, Empire State Building—these things just don’t happen….I would like to see on one side of the Empire State Building a foot-wide strip from top to bottom with the name of every bricklayer, the name of every electrician, with all the names. So when a guy walked by, he could take his son and say, “See, that’s me over there on the forty-fifth floor. I put the steel beam in.” Picasso can point to a painting….A writer can point to a book. Everybody should have something to point to. Sure, many academics can point to the books they’ve authored or to the display case with its quilt of tables of contents from journals they’re published in. But the teacher side of us has nothing. We can’t point to the steel beam or the painting. If we are arrogant enough, we might say that we produce minds. But these minds stubbornly hide inside people.'
Many of our “products” are with us for only fifteen weeks, then they disappear, never to be seen again unless it’s a quick hello while walking across campus.

It is as if we are part of an educational assembly line that stretches from kindergarten through to a degree. We know that we worked on that line and maybe even recall the students going by. But we can’t with confidence say what part of the end result we are responsible for. We can believe we have altered our students. We can reassure ourselves that they have learned because of our assessments of them. Some even offer testimonials. However, we can’t point to them with the certainty of a parent who can say of her child, “I created that.” Imagine again that walk across campus where instead of saying hello, you point at the student and tell your colleague, “That’s mine. I helped manufacture that mind.”

Mike LeFevre knew almost forty years ago what the rest of the world, as it bulldozes into the information age, is now beginning to realize: the evanescence of information frustrates our desire for permanence. Teachers—who have been around longer than Mr. LeFevre and the pyramids—have known this all along.

So we hold onto our folders filled with papers. We fear we will forget, even if everything is conveniently stored on a computer. These papers offer proof, evidence, validity. “I taught that course,” the labels declare. “These were my students,” the class list claims.

As I sat on the floor deciding what to toss and what to keep, one of my colleagues came in to talk about a team-taught course proposal we are submitting together. She sat on the carpet with me, kids in a sandbox. I set aside my folders to discuss what we felt students should learn in the course. Pondering the significance of the artifacts of my work no longer seemed urgent.

Soon, someone else appeared in the door. It was my former student Jen. Despite the fact that my class was the only one she received anything lower than an A in, she still stops by to talk. It never was about the grade for her. She has her own assembly line filled with A’s. I challenged her; she came up just a little short. She knows the grade I gave her (an A-minus) was deserved, something she’s less sure about in her string of unchallenging courses. Yet she stops to see me, find out how I’m doing, asks what my kids are now up to, tells me how her own boys are growing fast. And she updates me on her progress toward the degree she sometimes finds too easy.

“So, what’s in the pile?” Jen asked, gesturing toward my manila mountain.

“Nothing important,” I said, reassured of why I went into teaching in the first place: people to talk to and exchange ideas with—rather than something to point at.

To respond to this article, e-mail liberaled@aacu.org, with the author’s name on the subject line.
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