

UNiversitas: Journal of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

Volume 7
Number 1 *Forum Theme 1: Arts and Sciences, Transcending Boundaries & Forum Theme 2: A Third Way beyond the Old College Teacher-Scholar Model*

Article 6

3-2012

A Third Way beyond the Old College Teacher-Scholar Model and the University Researcher Model of Faculty Excellence

Eugene Rice
Association of American Colleges and Universities

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/universitas>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2011-2012 Eugene Rice

Recommended Citation

Rice, Eugene (2012) "A Third Way beyond the Old College Teacher-Scholar Model and the University Researcher Model of Faculty Excellence," *UNiversitas: Journal of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity*: Vol. 7 : No. 1 , Article 6.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/universitas/vol7/iss1/6>

This Forum Theme 2 is brought to you for free and open access by UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in UNiversitas: Journal of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity by an authorized editor of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.



A Third Way beyond the Old College Teacher-Scholar Model and the University Researcher Model of Faculty Excellence

Part of the journal section “Forum: A Third Way beyond the Old College Teacher-Scholar Model and the University Researcher Model of Faculty Excellence”

Eugene Rice, "A Third Way beyond the Old College Teacher-Scholar Model and the University Researcher Model of Faculty Excellence”

In this forum, I want us to talk about the models of academic excellence. What makes for good work? What is it that gets rewarded? I’m convinced that if we really take a careful look at American higher education there are only two models that dominate our thinking about academic excellence, and the changing character of faculty work. I also think that we need a third way, which I will discuss after considering the two models that currently dominate.

I want to go through those two models—but there was also a period of radical transition and I think we’re in the middle of that, and it started in the 80s and a lot of people have talked about it as transformation. But now books are beginning to appear that talk about the crisis in American higher education. They’re proliferating. Our news, the newspapers, the news shows are filled with it. There’s a Columbia professor, Mark Taylor, who’s written an essay that really built, who’s written an essay that appeared in the New York Times, entitled “The End of the American University as We Know It.” And he now has put that in book form, and it’s out, entitled *The Crisis on Campus*. Taylor and others are predicting that American higher education will be the next big bubble. Now that’s scary given what we’ve just gone through. But he really is saying we can’t continue to do business as usual. What we’re doing is no longer sustainable.

What I want to do is examine with you the nature of the transition taking place and whether—and I raise this as a question—whether we are moving toward a third way, a third way of viewing academic excellence. And I think a number of the things that you’re doing here is really leading the way. And to make this part of your identity, and to provide a kind of national presence where this transition is played out and you do it in a public way and you make it apart of your scholarship I think is a real challenge.

But the first model that we all know about. The first model of academic excellence has been with us a long time and is rooted back in Athens and Oxford, Cambridge and the early days of Harvard and Yale and Oberlin and Carlton, Grinnell—it is the vision that fundamentally shaped, without being fully realized, what happened in the emergences of those small colleges that

appeared on the frontier as the nation moved West during the nineteenth-century. It's the model of the liberal arts college. It's the vision of the faculty member as a teacher/scholar, as the complete scholar—the complete scholar with responsibility for educating, as it was put then, the whole person. And, in fact, the president would usually teach the last course and it would be a course on moral philosophy, moral education. So that whole notion of taking the student seriously was at the heart of this. It is this model that is especially appealing to me and really has a warm place in my heart, as I think you'll see.

The second model, the one that most dominates our thinking about academic excellence, and has become normative for most of us, because most of us went to graduate school and received our PhD's from Universities that are driven by this model: the research university. Where the professor is the specialist. The specialist on the cutting edge of his or her field. This is the model that was imported from Germany at the beginning of the twentieth-century and became the basis for what was called: the new American university. Despite the extraordinary diversity of American higher education, and, actually, it is the diversity that is the hallmark of American higher education—when you go to China or you go to India and you talk to faculty there, they come back to us with that. It's the diversity. It's that capacity for creativity and fostering the new that they really admire. But actually they can do the widgets faster than we can, they have certainly a larger population—so they do the instrumental work, but they look to America for the creativity, for those breakthroughs. But, most especially, in higher education, for the diversity that we've managed to institutionalize. It is this model that dominates our thinking about faculty work and what we think about scholarly excellence. When the American university is referred to—as it has been in the past, at least—as the envy of the world, this is what was being referred to.

This is, in fact, something that the recent book, *Academically Adrift*, attempts to detail as it argues that we are now living off a reputation that is established and promoted by a very few, elite universities. The rest of us are simply following along, trying to at least appear to be something like the research campuses of the very few, elite universities.

I want to sketch out those two models more fully—and note, as I do with both of them, that I find them very attractive, but I'm also convinced that neither is economically sustainable given the way in which they have evolved. And then I want to talk about this transition period. One we've been going through in recent years and the major changes that are taking place in the way we teach, the way we learn, the way we conduct our inquiries and organize our work. And then I'll talk, briefly about a third way, and it has these characteristics—and to give you a full introduction. This is where I'm going: It is one that is more integrative, more collaborative, more inclusive, more engaged and networked.

MODEL 1, THE TEACHER – SCHOLAR

It really was developed in the liberal arts college. Bruce Kimball has written a remarkable book entitled *Orators and Philosophers: A History of the idea of Liberal Education*. He finds two

traditions in the history of liberal education. One, the focus on the student and their development—well I guess both of them do—but the first comes from the philosophers who hold that the pursuit of knowledge is the highest good. And this is represented by Socrates and Plato. And then there's the second focus, which sees the college, or the university, as developing character and building community through the cultivation of leadership. This is the tradition of the orator and the rhetorician Cicero he chooses as the representative of that model. But two of these visions, one scholarship as focusing on learning knowledge the subject matter and then the development of the student, and the relationship to learning, and the building of community. So here we have a vision, a vision of quality, that informs the teacher/scholar. What I've called the complete scholar in older writings of mine: responsibility for student learning, for the institution as a whole, and then the development of community leadership for a burgeoning democracy. And it's interesting democracy has always been apart in discussion of American higher education. Thomas Jefferson pushed it very hard, there was a direct connection between education and democracy.

I was just at a conference for the Department of Education and we were talking about civic engagement and nothing was said about the global world. Yet our newspapers and our t.v. shows have been filled with what's going on in the streets of Egypt and the key term is democracy and what's meant by that. We need to get back to that central mission and it was important in those colleges and John Dewey, I think, has really—John Dewey's being resurrected now—it seems to me he really articulated that vision of the connection between education and democracy. He's one of the founders of AAUP, American Association of University Professors. But it is a view that stresses continuity and wholeness, a broader sense of responsibility, and at its best it envisions a cultivation of a multidimensional sense of the professional self.

On the other hand, it is a vision that assumes that one size fits all. That each faculty member is expected to be excellent in everything. Sound familiar? Teaching, research, institutional service, responsibilities for community engagement. For the individual it is an overly demanding standard particularly in this highly differentiated, complex world in which we work.

I hope you all have had a chance to read, at one time or another, Robert Kegan's book *In Over Our Heads*. He really talks about that and it isn't just higher education, it isn't just faculty that have this sense—that some of you, I know, are struggling with—but it's a part of our times, a part of the differentiation—I think sociologically—it's that process of specialization and we keep pushing it out in every area, in every institution, and people are struggling with being in over our heads.

In our interviews with early career faculty, early on we interviewed people in good liberal arts colleges where this one size fits all approach was institutionalized. A number of them talked about experiencing, particularly at tenure time, a pattern of humiliation. If they can't catch you on this, they'll get you on that. There is a kind of general fear that this model is too pervasive, and in a sense, is inappropriate for our time. Institutionally, many of our liberal arts colleges—and I got this from a group of presidents meeting in Washington, they said, “You know we have

a business plan that is no longer viable. That we always think that competition is going to cut the cost, but in the liberal arts college competition raises cost.” So if your institution builds a fitness center the college down the road has to have a fitness center. If they get the new economist coming out and go with some of the star faculty the college down the road has to do the same. So tuition has escalated and we’ve all stood on the side—particularly if you’re not in one of those colleges—and look on and said, “Hey, can my kids go to those kinds of institutions?”

Private liberal arts colleges—it seems to me—are clearly out of the reach for most of the population. And when you project into the future, it is, in fact, scary. This first model of academic excellence is one that I admire and have benefited from, in fact they had tuition exchange at the private university where I taught, and both of my kids—I was, at one time, almost making more in tuition exchange dollars than I was making in salary. They have eliminated those programs since then, or have kept track, who’s going where and there are some schools you can’t go to. But I’ve really appreciated and benefited from this model, in fact I have even written in defense of the complete scholar as a sense of wholeness. Unfortunately I’m having a tough time making that argument these days.

MODEL 2, THE UNIVERSITY RESEARCHER

The second model of academic excellence is one with which we are probably all most familiar and toward the later part of the nineteenth-century this radical new approach to scholarship became part of our life, academically, and we had people, our scholars, going to Europe to get their PhDs and returning with a different vision of what it means to be a real scholar. And they brought with them the graduate school experience, the graduate seminar, the research laboratory, and it began to be introduced at John Hopkin’s and University of Chicago and then at Berkeley. In fact it was a fairly small group and they sat, one day—Lee Shulman is fond of telling the story about their being in San Francisco. People were forming this new American university. As they really went through the debate: Do you have undergraduates in those programs or should they be research institutes? The decision was made not to do that—and two days later the earthquake hit San Francisco. He thinks it might have had some divine intervention or statement there. But that was a major decision; to have the university include both undergraduates and these graduate programs and there have been important consequences there.

But scholarly work narrowed and was defined increasingly as specialized discipline-based research. Now most of our professional disciplines were organized formally into associations between 1870 and 1920. Think about your own association. It was a time when we defined the discipline and we’re still living with that and the departments that came out of those. So the disciplines and the departments shape the organizational reality that many of us are living with now and you’re here trying to reorganize things. I notice the dean sitting here in the front row probably looking for help. How do you put the humanities and the natural sciences together?—I mean you’re doing some wonderful things and you are raising serious questions and we’ll all be looking your way, and you need to make that work public. You need to make it visible so that other institutions can benefit from what you’re doing.

This vision, however, was articulated best by—probably the one scholar I’ve taken most seriously in my life—Max Weber. He articulated it in a lecture that was demanded by his students—which is interesting—entitled “Sciences of Vocation,” was delivered in 1918 at the University of Munich. Weber, in that essay, speaks eloquently about the inner desire that drives the scholar on the cutting edge of the field. He talks about the ecstasy—and it almost has an erotic—I mean when he writes about this, the power of being on the very cutting edge of a new field and having the joy of that breakthrough—the excitement of that. And he says that’s the life of a scholar—to be able to be at that point, the real joy in work, the real sense of vocation.

In the United States it wasn’t until after the World War II—even after sputnik and the launching of sputnik by the Soviets in 1957—that this mode of excellence became the dominate strength. It also was encouraged by the Cold War and the infusion of federal funds for scientific research. Some of us remember there being defense fellowships that would take you through to the PhD. Here it became fully institutionalized. Scholarship, as we talked about it, became research. Vocation became a profession. Departments became the organizational expression of that vision. In the 1960s higher education moved into a period of rapid expansion and affluence. And a consensus emerged during that period that I described elsewhere as the assumptive work of the academic professional.

I’m going to talk later about technology and the importance of it and I don’t want any of you to make comments about the way in which I am using it because it can be an embarrassment.

The assumptive world of the academic professional—now think of that, that heyday of higher education when it was taking off—and in our consciousness, as faculty, research became the central professional endeavor and the focus of academic life. Quality; when you want to talk about quality, it is preserved through peer-review and the maintenance of professional autonomy. Don’t tell me what to do, leave me alone and I’ll push through. The pursuit of knowledge was best organized according to discipline. Reputations were established in national and international associations. Professional rewards and mobility accrue to those who persistently accentuated their specialization. So if you moved into an adjacent field, or if you did some of this stuff—like you’re trying to do—getting into the community, you’re really getting off-track. I’m reminded of that add for—I forget which one of the companies it is—where there is the green line and you have to stay on the line. Well there was a line that was established—Fidelity[the company]. Professional rewards and mobility accrue to those who accentuate their specialization. The distinctive task of the academic profession is the pursuit of cognitive truth. This is a line from Talcott Parsons, with whom I studied, and he really meant it. He didn’t have a television set—it was cognitive truth and you stayed with that.

This professional vision and the inter-related complex of assumptions on which it was built contributed to a major leap forward in the advancement of knowledge and social inventions and we have to recognize that. It is one of the reasons we can speak—and I hesitate to do this—but we can speak about the twentieth-century are the American century.

This came, this development, these developments, came at a very high price. For faculty, PhD programs and graduates proliferated at a time when the number of academic appointments in many fields was dwindling. When you look at the charts and it is just incredible. Phd's were being ground out and jobs were disappearing. Creating a serious situation.

As most of us know and some of us experienced, adjunct and part-time faculty began to be blatantly exploited and in a lot of institutions that's still the case. The integrity of tenure—and I want to defend tenure—but the integrity of tenure was undermined. It became, rather than being primarily the defender of academic freedom and open inquiry, became increasingly a mechanism for job protection and protecting seniority. Now, I'm among those older folks that have benefited from that, but this is hardly defensible. **A hierarchy was developed that drove a wedge between senior faculty and junior faculty.** One of the ironies that I'm really struck by, as I visit campus after campus, is the people who have been denied academic freedom—which is why we set up tenure—are often the junior faculty that are coming up for tenure because they have to be politically correct, they have to mind—they have to stay on that green track and not get off. Yet tenure was intended to protect academic freedom and the freedom of inquiry—this is the genius of American higher education. Yet in the development of this model and the way it has evolved—tenure becomes something else.

For students, this mode of academic excellence was financed, they were piggy-backed, on the backs of undergraduates: tuition, funding priorities, fees. The lecture became the dominate mode of instruction, not because it is the best way to teach—it's not—but because it's cost effective. Lower division class size increased and teaching assistance, rather than being mentored—it could be a wonderful process of mentoring new faculty as they are coming along, and we desperately need that and there have been a number of really good efforts by the graduate programs—but rather than teaching assistants being mentored we have used them to serve this increased teaching load. Again, exploitation of the apprentice faculty. I think there will be a price to pay there in the future.

The curriculum of this model was structured to meet the needs of faculty not of the students, especially emphatically not student needs for learning. General education was cannibalized. I was chair of the sociology department of that time and I remember participating in that, insisting that we get our share of those general education distribution requirements. I remember going into those meetings and hustling for it. Probably ought to apologize.

In the majority of colleges and universities, faculty priorities and rewards moved in one direction and the mission of the institution moved in another. Increasing of a diverse student body, the demands for a knowledge base in larger and larger communities—so the mission of the institution moved in that direction and faculty priorities, given this notion of excellence, moved in another.

The model that emerged encouraged faculty to become individual entrepreneurs, focusing more on my work, than our work. And **that's an enormous cultural barrier** to what you're trying to do to any kind of new model that we might try to present. But moving from my work to our work, how do you make that cultural shift psychologically and institutionally? It is a professional model that, at the extreme, has become more increasingly competitive, exclusive, and hierarchical. Robert Bellah, professor now at Berkeley, I think one of our most thoughtful, social philosophers, in commenting on the impact of specialization on our universities, and particularly on faculty, he's observed that the process of differentiation can no longer be sustained. Differentiation has gone about as far as it can go. It's time for a new re-integration and I want to talk a lot more about that.

A THIRD WAY

Okay, in the past twenty years we've been in a major transition if not transformation. Now during these years, since 1990—I think—there's been sizeable creativity and innovation, a number of you have participated in that, a period of remarkable intellectual development. People like Lee Shulman, Donald Schön really led the way there—you could just establish a list. A time that has moved us toward a different view of academic excellence—and I'm suggesting we think about this as a third way.

So part of that change, I see, you'll catch here. The changing role of faculty shift from focus on faculty, who we are and what we know to a focus on learning. Now I think we're making that shift in a fundamental way and the things I've seen around here and that Christy talked about this morning—you're in the middle of that. Whether or not you can make the next jump, which is another—now I'll move to student development and community engagement—I think that's a big question, but an important challenge. So that's a part of this third way.

A major change is change in what we are learning. **We're going through pedagogical revolution**, literally, and it's because of the research on learning—so the research is paying-off here and we're learning about how people learn. What's emerged are three central thrusts. Active experience-based learning—things like service learning [and] undergraduate research. The second one is the power of relational learning—I remember reading Søren Kierkegaard and his saying “all learning is relational.” This was back in the nineteenth-century, but the power of relational learning—here we're learning more about peer learning, learning communities where students learn from peers and we're just beginning to pick up on that and technology enhances that. The third, then, is technologically enhanced learning—web based social networks, distance learning—I don't know where you are on that, it often gets put down and has become something that entrepreneurs have picked up on and run with and set up for-profit universities. So some of us have really negative views, I think it's here to stay and we're going to have to do it. But we're going to have to do it smarter and there are places where their developing a blended model and using e-portfolios as a way of keeping track of the development of competencies rather than courses and moving beyond courses, but this a pedagogical revolution that we need to take seriously.

Some of you know the NSSE Project in Indiana. These higher impact practices. George Kuh has published an essay on that and you can get it online, but just look at that list. What are the high impact practices? Those first year seminars that you're talking about here, common intellectual experiences, learning communities, writing intensive courses—and what a neglect when we start to really move into our studies and our research you had to require fewer written papers, and in fact you can trace it, it's happened, and students aren't writing, and what an extraordinary way to get people to think, and my wife is a faculty member and she has a lot of international students and I just admire that late nights she spends marking up those papers. She really helps people write—and she's gotten teaching awards, but that's what she should get rewarded for, is the serious way in which she is taking writing. You look down that list, collaborative assignments, undergraduate research—that's taking-off, MIT is into it so that 86% of their undergraduates have some connection with faculty research and they are really making a strong case for that approach—service learning, community-based learning, internships, capstone courses. Now as you look down that list, all are active relational, experience based, also collaborative. We need to rethink the way in which we do our teaching. Each one of these—almost everyone of them—has become a movement during the last twenty years. So service learning really has become a movement.

We had a conference last week out in San Francisco, the Association of American Colleges and Universities, and it was entitled *Global Positioning*. You know, it's a recession. We didn't expect people to come—that it was in San Francisco probably helped. We, in fact, had the largest attendance in the history of the association. But it was the global focus—we are all not sure about what's going on there, but we know that real intellectual inquiry is often collaborative and it's comparative. That you get that comparative perspective that you get in another culture from visiting there, from being there, from bringing it in—in different ways and this is a challenge that we've got to pick up on.

Most of the new approaches to learning, however, have been add-ons. We've been doing well enough that if you're in a growing mode; why you could bring new things in without challenging the core and you bring them in at the periphery and that's what we've done organizationally. We've taken an additive approach to organizational change and that, actually, has made things worse—not better—and has really put the squeeze on faculty and particularly early career faculty.

We did these interviews with early career faculty. Three thousand across the country, and the way they most characterize their working lives, and they keep using the term—and it's the same term that emerges in a number of the interviews—entitled “the overflowing plate.” You look down that left-hand side and what you have there is that old assumptive world, it's all in place. You look down the right side and you get what faculty are now having to attend to. So it isn't just research, research is still there but teaching, professional engagement—it's not professional autonomy but public accountability, and accountability is here in a big way. Peer review, but also heavy reliance on student evaluations and the assessment of learning—you have an office of assessment. Not only focusing on the discipline but crossing knowledge domains, so you can just

go down that list and compare it with the other and it isn't that we've dropped off things on your left, but we've added the things on the right. So enormous pressures, and faculty are having to deal with that, and I would hope in talking about this third way, we would take seriously the quality of life of faculty and the balance that we can cultivate there. I think we've neglected that.

Working with the Carnegie Foundation and Ernest Boyer when I was at Princeton in the nineties, we developed "**Scholarship Reconsidered.**" Most of you are familiar with this, but it's a part of this whole discussion and I want us to move it ahead—I've been spending the last twenty years looking at schools that have tried to take this seriously and our memory is often short. Institutions that have advanced it, and then you visit them, and they've backed up and you have to go back in and kind of refresh their memories. But I want you to look around that chart, this is an attempt to provide a more holistic view of academic work and I want to say, the scholarship of discovery is really important—particularly in schools that take teaching seriously. It's important that all of us be scholars, all of us have an intellectual project, all of us be learning—you can't be a teacher without being a learner. So scholarly work—I'm not saying it has to be published in the leading refereed journal—but that intellectual vitality, that intellectual life—that spark—has to be there with faculty and in your recruitment you need to really pay attention to that.

Everyone needs this intellectual project. We need to be learners. The **scholarship of teaching and learning** has taken-off and really has been what has gone on at the Carnegie Foundation under the leadership of Lee Shulman. I think his single most important contribution was getting us beyond the content process split. That really has undermined the teaching enterprise, it's been the albatross around the necks of schools of education. It's assumed that teaching deals with education, deals with process, deals with technique with how you do it and that the disciplines deal with content. We're getting beyond that now—now technology, I think, is paving the way for that—you can't separate content and process. In the Carnegie scholars program that they have set up there they would bring in people in fields and then have them talk about the exciting intellectual subject matter and how you relate that to teaching and they aren't separated. I hope we're on the other side of that and that the future of the American university will assume that content and process go together and even some of the disciplinary associations are beginning to buy that. But that whole focus on teaching also needs to become public. You need to have an opportunity here to get together and talk about your teaching, your failures as well as your successes, about the process and what you're learning and how students learn and how quickly that ground is shifting.

We could go on all day about the scholarship of teaching and learning, but where I've had my heart is in **the scholarship of engagement**. There are a few universities in North America that have made community engagement and the scholarship of engagement as the prototype for excellence for their institutions. You look at Syracuse University and they talk about it as scholarship in action. Portland State has a walkway, right there in the middle of the city, going from the city to the university and on it, it reads "let knowledge serve the city." Wagoner College has established that small, sleepy, Staten Island, college has become a vital place because of the

emphasis on engagement and the internships in Manhattan—and it just really transformed it. The University of Northern Kentucky—you could go on down—Michigan State—a list of those who have picked up on this form of scholarship. It opens a very different understanding of scholarly work. Of the three kinds of what we require of faculty and the traditional model, teaching, research, and students, and what we're getting—and what I want to contend for—is a basic epistemological shift. This is a shift in how we go about knowing. So it's a different relationship with students. You focus on student learning and their development, on their making meaning. So it isn't just what we say, it's how we respond. And are listening to their questions, that what they want. But a different relationship with students. A different kind of research. Community based research. Research that is reciprocal, and particularly in the social fields, social inquiry, community partners are important. Sociology we have largely used the community partners to gather data and then we go to conferences and share it with one another and the community is a side show. This calls for a different approach to research. Honoring local as well as cosmopolitan knowledge. A different relationship with the community. In fact in the past few years the words that were used in scholarship reconsidered have been changed. It isn't the application of knowledge; it's the scholarship of engagement. Application of knowledge bought the epistemology of the old model: we develop it in the university and then we apply it to them. We've backed off of that now and are beginning to talk about the scholarship of engagement. Honoring the wisdom of practice. This is a part of this shift. Then as referred to earlier, the stewardship of place, the ask you project.

I hope you're reading Donald Schön, *Reflective Practitioner*, which shows the relationship between knowledge generation and experience. In fact, I find it's said best—sociologist often do this, when you want to say something important you go to the poets—on the power between relationship and intellectual developments and active practice, I think William Bulter Yeats says it best, in his exposition of the esoteric nature of reality, arrived at with his wife, George, called *A Vision*: “In other words, the human soul is always moving outward into the objective, or inward into itself and this movement is double because the human soul has consciousness only because it is suspended between contraries, the greater the contrast the more intense the consciousness.” Okay. I just think that's a powerful statement, and service learning, when it's done right, really builds on that. Community-based research does the same. So I think there's a future in this whole approach.

The form of scholarship that has been **most neglected** is the **scholarship of integration and synthesis**, and I urge you to pick up and run with that. It is beginning to get increased attention. Where the pieces come together, where the parts make a whole, where the disciplines are transcended but built on—not neglected—but built on so that we don't go back to a simpler time, and the walls that separate us come down—this is the most neglected form of scholarly work.

I'm going to skip over so that we've got some time for those of you who have been through the readings, some of the issues and other challenges that we're all struggling with, one that I find particularly engaging is this **tension between collegial culture and the managerial culture**. This is development that I think is really challenging. Both models that I've been talking about

are on the left—it's the collegial culture and both models are driven by a market and on the collegial culture you have the prestige economy—and I can't say too much about that—and then the market economy on the other side. Here are two cultures that are vying for the future of the university and we need to take that seriously and move toward a collaborative culture where we learn to work together. They need to understand us on the collegial side; we need to understand them on the managerial side. We need to work together; we need to develop networks of learning that include both of the best features of these two cultures.

Now just a final word about the third way. Some are even talking about a Copernican moment. Now I'm not sure the sun's going to change position, but I do think changes are taking place. Here are the characteristics that I want us to think about. I want a notion of scholarly excellence that is integrative but differentiated beyond the discipline of the department. We need to reorganize the way in which we do our work. We need to build on the advancements of specialization, not return to a simpler past. This really is important because so much—in fact this is a sociological definition of fundamentalism—that you reduce; you go back to a simpler past. And that's the temptation of all of us, there was a time when things worked, but we can't build the future by doing that. We've got to find new ways of integration, building on what we gain from specialization. As you think about your disciplines, think about your teaching areas, I hope you'll think about that. It needs to be **more collaborative, beyond hierarchy and competitiveness**. Yet allowing for individuation and creative freedom, professional autonomy needs to be talked about—but it's not just independence and doing our own thing. It's protecting the university as a place where questions are raised and that we do it in a manner that has integrity.

I don't know whether some of you saw *Inside Job* on the financial collapse but if you get a chance see it. The academy just gets decimated. I mean our best faculty get on there and they are making two and three hundred thousand dollar fees, you know, for turning out these studies of Iceland—for one—talks about what a great system it is and its surviving and its moving forward—just before the collapse. And then—I won't tell you the dean of what school it was—but he just changed his C.V. and talked about the insecurity of Iceland rather than its stability. Didn't change the report, at all, and made \$200,000 and they asked him about it—I mean, it's a hatchet job—they went after him and he ended up just saying “get out of my office.” But the academy doesn't come across looking very good in that film, but we need to see it. And then we need to nurture that collaborative culture between the collegial culture and the managerial. Then we need to be inclusive, moving beyond diversity. This needs to be an interdependent, global consciousness that influences this. Recognize diversity as an educational value and catalyst—and I think that is increasingly demonstrated—but do it in a way that it is part of an inclusive whole. I think we have pushed on the diversity side, we haven't pushed beyond to inclusion and inclusion of everybody. And then to an engaged campus beyond walls and silos. The relationship between theory and practice needs to be rethought, the cosmopolitan and the local, the shift from walls and silos to webs and networks. And then the final, toward a network culture with new technologies that will change what we know and how we learn.

Some of you know Clifford Geertz the anthropologist, I think of the social sciences he was one of our best. He wrote an article, a number of years ago, entitled “Blurred Genres” and he says something is happening to the way we think about the way we think. Now the world wide web, the internet, everything is interconnected. Process and content are fundamentally intertwined. I mean, your students can also go to the internet and do their own research. As faculty we are at a tipping point in what we know and do and who we do it with.

In closing, I am reminded of an essay by C. Wright Mills, “Intellectual Craftsmanship,” and in there he wrote, “Scholarship is a choice of how to live as well as a choice of a career.” Scholarship is a choice of how we live as well as a choice of career. Integrity, wholeness, connectedness—there’s a spiritual dimension here. Jane Tompkins was reflecting on her life as a faculty member. She wrote a book about it and the last line says, “What do I want from work?” And here’s her list: “a sense of contribution, a common enterprise, belonging, a good feeling in the workplace, a community of hope, and integrated life”—and I wish that for you. You can be leading the way as we struggle through this emerging third way.

For further discussion about the third way at UNI, click on the following:

- [Jennifer Walz Garrett's third way at UNI](#) [
- [Mohammad Iqbal's third way at UNI](#)
- [Amy J. Petersen's third way at UNI](#)
- [Philip Mauceri's third way at UNI](#)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](#).

