

JUST AS THE EARTH IS NO LONGER PERCEIVED AS THE CENTER OF THE UNIVERSE, THE DEPRIVILEGIZING OF A SINGLE ABSOLUTE VANTAGE POINT OPENS UP THE WORLD.



Nick Sousanis, after Flammarion

Civic Engagement and the Copernican Moment

by David Scobey

Response by the
2011-2012 IA PAGE Fellows

Foreseeable Futures #11
Position Papers from

Imagining
ARTISTS AND SCHOLARS
IN PUBLIC LIFE *America*



Dear Reader,

In this *Foreseeable Future*, David Scobey provides a seeable present: the state of higher education a decade into the 21st century and sorely in need of change. Evoking a paradigm shift on the scale of Copernicus's discovery that the sun, not the earth, is the center of the universe, Scobey adjures, "there is widespread agreement that higher education faces a sea change in its intellectual, institutional, technological, and economic organization."

Here Scobey focuses on the ramifications of this shift for public scholarship. He commends civically-engaged pedagogies as energizing responses to stultified academic practices. However, he takes engaged scholars and artists to task for not fully understanding the impact of higher educational changes that affect us as well:

Our practice still tends to take as normative, or at least take as unexamined, the assumptions of what I called the traditional paradigm of undergraduate education: the assumptions that our students are full-time and full of time, committed for a compact number of years to an educational experience in which they traverse the gen ed/major journey as a unified trajectory; that they have the time, space, and money for intensive, unpaid community-based learning; that they are taught largely by regular, full-time faculty who can undertake the hard work of community-based teaching, sometimes with the aid of paid civic-engagement staff; that the melding of public work and academic work is anchored in an "in-here" campus world that reaches out to partner with a locally-bounded "out-there" community world.

David notes that engaged scholars like any other get used to doing things a certain way, even when the conditions that made those ways meaningful have changed (bringing to mind Marshall McLuhan's famous warning of driving through life looking through the rearview mirror). His remarks are concise, sobering, and rallying, summarizing fundamental changes in especially undergraduate education, cajoling us to pay attention to the "new normal," and challenging public scholars and artists to discover appropriate responses for now. He does so in his distinctive way of encouraging and "pushing back" in equal measure.

David's remarks come at a moment of change for IA as well, as we complete our first five-year term at Syracuse University under my direction. IA has become a more participatory organization, enacting our vision, mission, values, and goals with an expanding and expansive set of colleagues nationally. Our partners are of different ages and in different professional positions, their knowledge derived from multiple experiences and sources and the understanding that those struggling with an issue be at the fore of solving it. We are in our own Copernican revolution, decentering IA at the national office as the source of all research, convenings, and projects to increasingly collaborative teams trans-locally. A new director will guide IA's second five-year term hosted at SU, so aligned with IA as articulated through Chancellor Nancy Cantor's Scholarship in Action.

Fittingly, for a text oriented to higher education's changing present and future, a cohort of 2011-12 PAGE (Publicly Active Graduate Education) Fellows has composed a group response to Scobey's talk. We thus continue IA's practice of inviting young scholars to enter the discourse around the *Foreseeable Future* text of a senior scholar, initiated in 2009 by Adam Bush, now PAGE director. As Lewis Hyde beautifully writes in *Common as Air*, "Young poets need to be fed; mature poets spread out banquets. The commons of culture is a huge lake" (203-4). In the spirit of the Copernican revolution that David evokes, with the virtual increasingly the most inclusive communication method, we invite you to immerse yourself here as well as at www.imaginingamerica.org, where an expanded version of the response appears.



Jan Cohen-Cruz

Director, Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life

Hyde, Lewis. *Common as Air*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2010.

Cover image:

Nick Sousanis, excerpt, "Mind the Gaps," visual essay, chapter in Vinz & Schaafsma *Narrative Inquiry*, Teachers College Press, 2011. It can also be found here: <http://spinweaveandcut.blogspot.com/2011/03/in-print-mind-gaps.html>.

Civic Engagement and the Copernican Moment

Plenary Address, Imagining American National Conference
Minneapolis, September 21, 2011
©David Scobey, The New School

Author's note: As I discuss below, this talk was given at the national conference of Imagining America in Minneapolis (September, 2011). It draws on my essay, "A Copernican Moment: On the Revolutions in Higher Education," published in Donald W. Harward (editor), Transforming Undergraduate Education: Theory that Compels and Practices that Succeed (Rowman and Littlefield, 2011). I want to thank Don Harward for his gracious permission to use and recirculate portions of the original piece here. I hope that interested readers will go to the book itself, which offers a broad and important discussion of educational change.

It is a special joy to be here—at my tenth Imagining America national meeting. As I framed this talk for this occasion, it was frankly moving to think back to the threads of community building, public work, and educational innovation that IA attendees have woven together along the warp of this series of gatherings. So let me take a minute to honor that work by simply naming the chain of venues for our convenings: Chicago, Ann Arbor, Urbana, Philadelphia, New Brunswick, Columbus, Syracuse, Los Angeles, New Orleans, and Seattle (the only meeting I have had to miss). Over the same decade, Imagining America has been stewarded by two extraordinary directors, Julie Ellison and Jan Cohen-Cruz. (Jan has just announced that she will step down after five years of work; she and IA came to Syracuse University at the same time, and I want to thank her for her amazing work.) During those years, too, there were four chairs of the National Advisory Board (Kathleen Woodward, myself, George Sanchez, and now Bruce Burgett). My own biography has had its own parallel (and to me, unexpected) trajectory. Fifteen years ago, I was a professor of history and American culture, and then of architecture, at the University of Michigan. I found my way into a passion for community engagement in the humanities, arts, and design, launching the Arts of Citizenship Program at Michigan. I went to Bates College six years ago to help lead the Harvard Center for Community Partnerships, with the weird title of Professor of Community Partnerships. And now I am the dean of a new venture at The New School, The New School for Public Engagement, a division that integrates two previous schools at the University, offering degrees in a variety of interdisciplinary, practice-based domains of social action and

culture-making—environmental and global studies, international affairs non-profit management, writing and media and ESL—as well as an undergraduate program for adult, working students, some 20 percent of whose courses are taken online.

I dwell on these organizational and personal threads not simply for the sake of affectionate pause-taking (though that is a good thing). I do so because they serve as markers for an extraordinary history of change that we in this room have been living through and doing our best to shape—change in *both* our own movement for democratically-engaged higher education *and* in the larger institutional landscape of the academy to which our movement is a response. Twenty-five years ago it would have been almost inconceivable that someone might hold a chaired professorship in something called “community partnerships” or help to lead a university division called “public engagement,” organized not by disciplinary or professional niches, but rather by interdisciplinary domains of social and cultural practice. Inconceivable, too, that academic humanists, designers, artists, community culture-makers, and other activists would gather in the hundreds annually for a meeting that synthesized site visits, dialogue sessions, spoken-word performances, and traditional conference plenaries like this.

My aim today—as a historian and an IA activist—is to unpack something of the history of which these threads form part. I want to contextualize our efforts to build a movement that integrates academic work and public work. But perhaps even more, I want to link that story, our story, to a nexus of larger revolutions—economic, technological, demographic, intellectual, institutional—that are roiling higher education. Our work emerged in response to those revolutions, and in many ways, we have offered a creative response to the need for transformative change in higher education. Yet I also want to argue that the larger mix of crisis, change, and creative innovation that marks this moment involves issues, challenges, and possibilities that we have not yet fully grappled with. Or rather, that we grappled with and responded to in early forms and earlier moments. The wonderful statement of Vision, Mission, Values, and Goals that Imagining America adopted under Jan Cohen-Cruz’s leadership, and that is printed at the top of the conference program, ends with a commitment to iterative reflection: *“It is IA’s practice to annually review this document as the landscape of higher education shifts in response to our work, and as we adjust our goals to changing needs within higher education.”* (Imagining America, *Our Mission*) It seems to me that we are living through a moment in which we need to reexplore the changing needs and changing landscape of higher education, and to reexamine what our work should look like, how it should evolve, within that changing landscape.

This talk is meant to aid in such a reexamination. It will speak to both the achievements of the academic engagement movement and new challenges; I hope it will aid in the work of dialogue and experimentation that has always been a hallmark of IA. But before I focus in on the consequences for civic engagement and public work, I want to take a broader look—more sweeping than superficial, I hope—at the current moment in the academy and in the academy’s relationship with the larger society. A history, if you will, of the present situation.

The most fundamental aspect of that situation seems to me as clear as it is complicated. Our work for educational and cultural change comes at a moment when the academy as a whole is in the throes of change. Partisans in current education battles disagree about many things; we strenuously debate how to design curricula, assess learning outcomes, make college affordable, or improve community partnership practices; but there is widespread agreement that higher education faces a sea change in its intellectual, institutional, technological, and economic organization. The knowledge, skills, and values for which students should be educated; the ways in which teachers are trained, certified, hired, and arrayed into faculties; the intellectual landscape of disciplines and degrees; the geographies and networks by which educational institutions are organized and sustained; the funding of teaching, learning, and research—all this promises to be profoundly different in twenty years. Some forces of change have resulted from our own inertia in the academy (for instance, the push from policy makers and funders for accountability and degree standardization). Others represent the consequences of our very success (for instance, the social diversity, and inclusiveness, and global reach of student bodies and curricula). Still other forces reflect broad political, market, and technological developments not primarily of our making (for instance, the growing centrality of digital media to teaching and research). Yet, taken together, these factors define a moment in which—to quote Thomas Kuhn’s account of political and scientific revolutions—“existing institutions have ceased adequately to meet the problems posed by an environment that they have in part created.” (Kuhn, 92) In such a moment, the question is not *whether* the academy will be changed, but *how*. Defending or merely tweaking our current arrangements is not an option.

This mix of inevitability and uncertainty is unnerving—and not only for loyalists to the academic *status quo*. Even for critics of mainstream practice, such as most of the academics in this room, it is tempting to assume the stability of an older, established paradigm against which, like a whetstone, our ideas for change have been honed. That “official” model took as normative an undergraduate regime of full-time, post-secondary students and full-

time, tenure-stream faculty; a four-year, two-stage course of study in which general education segues into advanced majors defined by disciplinary specializations; a curriculum segmented into fungible units of labor, effort, and time called “courses,” “credit-hours,” and “semesters”; a campus world segregated into academics and extracurricular student life and hived off from the “real world.” During most of the 20th century, this *was* the paradigmatic architecture of baccalaureate education in the United States. (Rudolph, 287-482; Thelin, 205-316) For various types of reformers who have struggled with its negative effects—the narrow bandwidth of professors’ attention to students, the instrumental goals of students, the research and status incentives of disciplinary professionalism, the siloed structure of our institutions, the disengagement of academics from public life—it made sense to critique higher education, especially undergraduate education, as *stuck*. The goal of new practices was to act as an Archimedean lever, dislodging the academy from its satisfied, secure inertia. This is certainly the taken-for-granted way in which I tended to see my own work at the University of Michigan or Bates College.

Yet I want to argue that this is *not* the moment in which higher education finds itself. In almost every particular, the conditions that were taken for granted by the older paradigm no longer hold; and the educational assumptions instituted by that paradigm no longer seem self-evident. Only about one-third of undergraduates are recent high school graduates, attending a single four-year institution; twice as many faculty work on term contracts than in tenure-stream positions. (*Greater Expectations*, Chapter 1; American Federation of Teachers, 10) The for-profit sector is burgeoning, as is online learning across *all* sectors (to my mind, a more consequential change). (Allen and Seaman) At the same time, the educational practices that seem to make the most difference to student engagement—so-called “high-impact practices” such as interdisciplinary learning communities, study abroad, capstone research, and of course community-based learning (Kuh)—are precisely those that tend to *disrupt* the established ecology of atomized courses, disciplinary courses of study, and the separation of curricular from cocurricular experience. The problem is not, then, that the “official” paradigm of undergraduate education is constricting yet effective; it is that the paradigm is constricting and exhausted. Higher education is not in stasis, but in crisis; and what is needed is not an alarm clock to awaken the academy from its dogmatic slumber, but rather a star chart by which to navigate an uncertain future. We are in Kuhn’s “revolutionary” moment when a new paradigm—a new institutional and epistemological regime for organizing educational practices and educational communities—feels necessary and imminent yet inchoate and up for grabs. To invoke the title of this talk, it is a Copernican moment.

Now I realize that in the annals of American higher education, talk of crisis is cheap—and persistent. A whole host of Cassandras and Jeremiahs have variously decried the academy’s corruption, shallowness, commercialism, mandarin exclusiveness or social irrelevance, loss of moral compass or intellectual rigor or civic responsibility. Many of us have contributed to that cacophony—proudly. Yet there is something different, I want to argue, about the current moment; the discourse of discontent is more widespread and wide-ranging. “It is time to be frank,” warns the 2006 report of Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings’ Commission, *On the Future of Higher Education*:

Among the vast and varied institutions that make up U.S. higher education, we have found much to applaud but also much that requires urgent reform... We may still have more than our share of the world’s best universities. But a lot of other countries have followed our lead, and they are now educating more of their citizens... History is littered with examples of industries that, at their peril, failed to respond to—or even to notice—changes in the world around them... Without serious self-examination and reform, institutions of higher education risk falling into the same trap... (U.S. Department of Education, *Test of Leadership*, ix, x, xii)

By contrast, Mark Taylor’s *Crisis on Campus* (2010), which offers provocative proposals for deconstructing the disciplinary *collegium* in favor of problem-based curricula and electronically-networked learning communities, could not be further from the Commission’s concern with standards and standardization. Yet Taylor’s framing of the current situation is strikingly resonant with the Commission’s:

American higher education has long been the envy of the world... But in the past four decades, this situation has gradually deteriorated. The quality of higher education is declining; colleges and universities are not adequately preparing students for life in a rapidly changing and increasingly competitive world. (Taylor, 3)

These jeremiads offer almost incommensurable accounts of what is wrong with higher education, what is coming, and what needs to be done. Yet—just because of that—what is most striking is their shared sense of the moment in which U.S. higher education finds itself: a threshold-moment of decline or disorienting adaptation.

This discourse of discontent is diverse, in part, because the crisis that it registers is a manifold of different problems. Most obviously, higher education is in fiscal crisis. Over the past quarter century, we have seen a shrinkage of public funding at just the same time that academic institutions have expanded

their scale and the complexity of their intellectual missions and institutional functions—and at precisely the same time, again, as they have faced rising costs in health care, energy, campus infrastructure, and faculty salaries. There has been, to use the cliché, a perfect storm of fiscal pressure; and it has yielded the sharp rises in tuition that *seem* so irrational and *are* so burdensome to taxpayers, tuition-payers, and other stakeholders.

Beyond the direct costs to students and institutions, the fiscal crisis has imposed secondary effects that undermine educational quality and equity. It has amplified the need for colleges and universities to rely on part-time and contingent faculty labor. It has encouraged undergraduate “credit-shopping” and transfers, incentivizing students to make instrumental choices in crafting their course of study at the expense of community, continuity, and shared reflection. It has also re-amplified class and ethnic divides thought to have subsided during the decades of educational expansion after World War II. It has reinforced the tendency of elite colleges and universities to jockey for status according to the dynamics of luxury-goods markets, rather than market-based cost-discipline. These pricey, price-inelastic institutions assert their desirability by driving *up* costs through a “rankings arms race” for the best amenities and services, star professors, and merit-based scholarship aid.

Equally important, the fiscal crisis has both coincided with, and constrained, the demographic transformation of the student body and the democratic project of making college access and undergraduate education more inclusive. Just as many U.S. regions (and state university systems) are becoming “majority minority,” the evisceration of public investment in education and the tuition bubble limits our ability to educate a more diverse, first-generation student body. One result has been to shut poor and working-class students (students of all ethno-racial backgrounds, but disproportionately black and brown) out of college altogether. Another has been to displace the burden of paying for it onto student loans. The expansion of student borrowing over the past two decades is a core element of the academy’s growth model—and a corrosive one, threatening democratic access, student well-being, and educational community. (Kamenetz, *DIY U*) For too many students, especially first-generation and non-white students, the most important co-curricular “other,” the activities that pre-occupy them when they are not at study, is not sports or Greek life, but loans and work. Any reform agenda must engage and change that reality.

Put another way, the costs of crisis are more than just monetary. Budget cuts, tuition hikes, and debt burdens make manifest (and to some extent obscure) a crisis of *legitimacy*: a growing sense that, as the “official” undergraduate paradigm has frayed, the academy has betrayed its commitments

to, and turned away from, the larger society. This legitimization crisis has a complex etiology, rooted in both the historic achievements and recent problems of higher education.¹ After World War II, universities and university systems grew vaster and more opaque; disciplinary professionalism enforced a hiring and tenure regime that prompted scholarship to become hyper-specialized and esoteric. At the same time—and partly in reaction against this specialization—technical and political shifts in the production of knowledge destabilized the organization of disciplines, catalyzing interdisciplinary fields like neuroscience and gender studies. And after the 1960s, these institutional and intellectual developments took place in the context of deepening divides among between a progressive professoriate, student mobilization for affirmative action and educational inclusion, and an increasingly conservative public.

There is always a social compact that regulates the relationship between the academy and the larger society, a compact that legitimizes the enormous claims we make on resources and autonomy. By the 1990s, that compact had grown frayed. Culture wars, tuition hikes, declining government support, and a kind of high-minded defensiveness on the part of campus leaders and scholars magnified the divide between higher education and its publics, bringing long-simmering resentment at the arrogance and unaccountability of the academy to a boil.

This crisis of legitimacy represents, I think, one of the most crucial factors in our current situation. It has fueled the atmosphere of mistrust that pervades public debates over higher education, the current rash for calls for external assessment and accountability, and the rising skepticism about the “value-proposition” that social and familial investment in higher education offers. Within the academy, the same legitimization crisis has generated a broad literature of complaint and reform from critics and radicals of all flavors. (Bloom; Bok; Bousquet; Muscatine; Taylor) Some, like the authors of the recent study, *Academically Adrift*, argue that the academy has abandoned its tried-and-true goals in fostering a faculty culture of research and disciplinary status-seeking and a student culture of low expectations. (Arum and Roksa) Others—I would put myself in this camp—argue that the crisis of legitimacy requires more than a renewal of rigor or an enforcement of standards. What is needed is “a new curriculum for the twentieth-first century” (to use the subtitle of Charles Muscatine’s terrific critique, *Fixing College Education*), a kind of Liberal Education 2.0, more intellectually holistic, personally integrative, and integrated with the larger world of work and citizenship. Across these disparate critiques, however, the crisis of legitimacy is grounded in a widespread sense that college has failed to deliver on its promise and its promises.

And yet: the picture I have drawn—of disorientation and crisis, failing resources and failing promise—is a far too monotonously bleak account of the current situation. It only tells half the story. If the past quarter century has eroded the taken-for-granted assumptions, economic stability, and sheer self-confidence of the academy, it has also been an era of remarkable (and often unremarked) innovation. Our “civic turn” is only one of a broad array of educational innovations that have emerged (with striking simultaneity) over the past twenty-five years. I have already mentioned the scholarly development of various interdisciplinaries like ethnic studies, cultural studies, and neuroscience. Other innovations were more learning-centered: writing across the curriculum; first-year courses that melded thematic seminars and academic advising; learning communities; undergraduate research programs; capstone requirements; and study-abroad programs. Nearly all these initiatives followed developmental patterns that are familiar to us from the growth of *Imagining America*: pioneering experiments, proliferation via scholarly and institutional networks, national convenings or associations, and the coalescing of a community of practice that debated best practices and deepened program-building.

The result has been a record of change that dramatically enlarged the possibilities of undergraduate teaching and learning. My oldest son’s experience at an urban university can serve as an example. A narrative of the most significant chapters of his undergraduate career would include: a first-year seminar on urban homelessness, which presented research on the shelter system to city officials; a study-abroad semester in South Africa; an Urban Studies major in which he interned for a city councilman and was required to compose a senior seminar paper using graphic-novel software; a capstone thesis that drew on focus group research and media theory to analyze “*The Wire*.” He had fallow times, to be sure; but at its best, this was an undergraduate experience marked by the kind of active, collaborative, exploratory, and integrative opportunities that we have sought to nurture. Hardly a single one of those opportunities was available when I attended college thirty-five years ago.

The history of the current moment, in short, is one of creativity, not simply change and crisis. Indeed it is a story of creativity responding to, and sometimes making use of, the conditions of change and crisis sketched in the first part of this essay. First-year seminars were designed precisely to overcome the balkanization and disengagement that have plagued undergraduate learning. Study-abroad programs have served as a pedagogical laboratory for how best to impart intercultural and global competencies. To be sure, these innovations have too often been siloed and *ad hoc*. Yet they constitute

a creative response to both the discontents of mainstream campus life and the dislocations of a brave new academy of globalization, digital networks, and culture wars.

Two aspects of this more hopeful side of the current moment are notable. First of all, the innovations that I have sketched correspond almost exactly with the repertoire of “high-impact educational practices” that, according to George Kuh’s influential research, have proven most consequential for undergraduates.² They are not simply creative but *effective* in engaging and transforming students. Second, they have done so against the grain, on the margins, or in the interstices of mainstream rules and structures. I do not mean that faculty, staff, and administrators have opposed innovation. Quite the opposite: the new practices have been a labor of love for thousands of academics. But sustained innovation has generally succeeded by working around, and sometimes against, the protocols of departments and curriculum committees, the grid of distribution and concentration requirements, the temporal ecology of credit-hours and semesters, and (perhaps most of all) the incentives of the faculty reward system. High-impact practices tend to live simultaneously within, across, and against the traditional disciplines; within, across, and against the traditional academic calendar; within, across, and against the boundary that separates the campus from local, global, and digital publics. To a disheartening extent, the most exciting and effective initiatives of the past twenty-five years have had to swim upstream, so to speak, against the inertial habits of ordinary academic practice. The Georgetown literary scholar Randy Bass, a leading theorist of campus pedagogical innovation, captured this hilariously when he entitled a conference workshop: “Low-Impact Practices (Formerly Known as the Curriculum).”

All this, I hope and trust, resonates with the more specific story that brings us to this Imagining America meeting: our collective commitment to democratic engagement in academic life, to building a movement that can institutionalize that commitment. For the larger story I have tried to tell—of disruptive change and counter-normative creativity—is also the back-story of IA and this movement. The turn to academic civic engagement was *par excellence* a strategic and ethical response to the legitimization crisis I have been describing: an effort to redraw the academic social compact by committing the work of teaching and learning to the enrichment of community and public life, and by trusting that such a commitment would in turn enrich teaching and learning and academic life. The work of artists, humanists, designers, and culture-makers in the IA network embodied, I would argue, an essential part of that project: a re-assertion of the role of democratic story-telling to democratic citizenship, a re-affirmation of the need for people in a diverse democracy to

come together across their differences and inequalities to construct a public sphere together through collaborative culture-making. Such work at once registered the emerging breakdown of the traditional paradigm in higher education and sought to bridge the growing cultural divide between higher education and public life.

The result was a prime example of the creative, counter-normative practice I sketched above. What began in the 1980s as an earnest but often unreflective commitment to community service and service learning—more broad than deep—grew into a mature academic movement, characterized by a broad network of campus-based centers and programs and national consortia. Faculty, staff, students, and community partners have developed models of sustained, collaborative projects and courses that are at once academically rigorous and socially transformative. Indeed there is a broad commitment to public engagement *not only* in individual courses, but across the curriculum and the institution as a whole—as well as to engagement that links community work to systemic issues of policy, power, and justice. And this in turn generated, and was sustained, by inter-institutional and cross-sector coalitions, organizations, and convenings like IA, which spread the word, tested the ideas, and seeded new initiatives. This has left a record of extraordinary change—thousands of courses and community partnership projects, dozens of centers and programs, significant community benefit, an ensemble of partnership, problem-solving, and culture-making practices, and a generation of students like my son, better educated for active, thoughtful citizenship, of which we can be proud.

And yet I want to challenge the adequacy of our response to the educational crisis. In doing so, I mean something more than the notion that we should continually interrogate, critique, and improve our campus-community practices and make sure we truly benefit our community practices. This is undeniably true and important, but it is not my core concern in this talk. Rather I want to point to aspects of the current moment, this Copernican moment, with which the movement for academic engagement has not yet fully engaged. Even at its best, I would argue, our practice still tends to take as normative, or at least take as unexamined, the assumptions of what I called the traditional paradigm of undergraduate education: the assumptions that our students are full-time and full of time, committed for a compact number of years to an educational experience in which they traverse the gen ed/major journey as a unified trajectory; that they have the time, space, and money for intensive, unpaid community-based learning; that they are taught largely by regular, full-time faculty who can undertake the hard work of community-based teaching, sometimes with the aid of paid civic-engagement staff; that the melding of public work and academic work is anchored in an “in-here” campus world that

reaches out to partner with a locally-bounded “out-there” community world. These assumptions may not always be consciously embraced, but they tend to structure our movement’s aims, strategies, and code of best practices.

I do not mean to overstate this. There are significant exceptions and experiments that extend beyond the tendencies I have sketched. And conversely, in any educational future, these practices and conditions will remain important. Yet in almost every way, the changes of the Copernican moment undermine these normative assumptions about our students, our institutions, and the landscape of our public work. And so we need to ask a new set of questions, in the spirit of that IA mission document. What does democratically-engaged learning look like, and how can we foster it, for an academy in which the majority of students will attend more than one institution, carry significant debt, and have the challenge of their employment paramount in their educational choices? What does public work look like for students who need, constantly and strategically, to blend family duties, work pressures, and study in schedules that leave little time for large, chunky projects—students whose social geography conforms less and less to the in here/out there map of our partnership models? How do we support faculty in the labor of engaged teaching and research, even as the majority of them may be neither tenure-stream, nor one-course adjuncts, but full-time contract employees? What does public engagement look like not simply at the scale of local, place-based communities, but at global and digital scales?

By way of opening up these questions, and inviting you to help me answer them, let me return to the big story of the revolutions we are living through.

I have used the metaphor of a “Copernican moment”; and I hope you will indulge the historian in me as I unpack it a bit more. When Nikolaus Copernicus began developing his radical new model of the cosmos, early in the sixteenth century, the inadequacies of the Ptolemaic system had grown increasingly clear. Indeed Ptolemy and other ancient astronomers had from the first constructed an elaborate theory to normalize the discrepancies between the geocentric model and their observations of the night sky. Renaissance astronomers and scholars further documented and amplified these anomalies, dimming the aura of authority of the old paradigm and speculating about a heliocentric theory without being able to discern or elaborate its lineaments. It was in this moment—the exhaustion of the older system in face of anomalous new phenomena, the intuition of a new system toward which the anomalies gestured—that Copernicus undertook his work. “Having become aware of these defects [in Ptolemy’s system],” he writes in the preface to the *Commentariolus* (1514), his early *précis* of the heliocentric theory, “I often considered whether there could perhaps be found a more reasonable arrangement of circles.”³

U.S. higher education is on the threshold, I believe, of such a Copernican moment. An older, “official” paradigm of undergraduate education has exhausted itself. Reformers and critics have anatomized its failures from a variety of viewpoints and warned—or crowed—of dramatic changes to come. Meanwhile, in just the same years that the older paradigm was fraying, an array of new educational practices has emerged. Disparate, at odds with traditional practice, but remarkably robust, these innovations are something like the anomalous points of light that the Renaissance astronomers observed in the night sky. They illuminate the inadequacies of the older undergraduate system, and they point the way toward “a more reasonable arrangement of circles,” as Copernicus put it. It goes without saying that our movement and more specifically IA are among the brightest stars in that firmament of anomalies.

So what might that future look like? It would be foolish to offer anything like a full answer. Yet I think we can discern something of the possibilities by extrapolating from the double-story I have been sketching. On the one hand, I would argue, we want an educational future that draws on, and draws out, the implications of the new, high-impact practices like ours. It would provide students with an arc of learning experiences—active, collaborative, boundary-crossing, and integrative—that interweave intellectual, professional, civic, and personal growth. Faculties and courses of study would be organized around interdisciplinary issues or domains of cultural practice, not a fixed topography of specialized fields. The professoriate would be trained and rewarded for teaching and advising more fully than today’s faculty. Many more would be expert in project-based, collaborative, and interdisciplinary forms of pedagogy. Academic institutions would encourage heterodox forms of knowledge-creation, culture-making, and creative work—including public, practitioner, and digital scholarship—that are generally devalued by disciplinary professionalism.

Students would be expected to develop a broader array of proficiencies than simply the writing requirements of the old paradigm: digital literacy, civic practice (including public speaking), the application of their studies to professional practice, and teamwork. Their course of study would engage them in learning communities that extended beyond the boundary of the classroom or lab: work-based networks, community partnerships, global or intercultural encounters, and online classes. Knowing how to learn from, learn with, work with, and argue with a wide array of significant others would be a key learning outcome of the liberally-educated person. And just as the classroom would no longer be privileged as the spatial “atom” of learning, so too the new model would emancipate itself from an academic calendar in which the semester course and its metronomic rhythm of weekly meetings were the atomic building-blocks of educational time. Semesters, courses, and contact hours

may be efficient ways to administer faculty labor and student credit acquisition; but they militate against the integration of learning experiences into shared, reflective pathways. The new calendar would be flexible and distributed, weaving together synchronous and asynchronous curricula, long-form and intensive learning experiences.

On the other hand, however, we need to extrapolate from the crises and dislocations of the current moment as well: to include in our account of the future a tough-minded acceptance of the realities that are transforming the educational landscape. Our new paradigm must meet the needs of a student majority that will attend more than one institution and balance studies with wage-earning and borrowing. That may mean slimming down the amenities of college education to lower its costs; it will certainly mean embedding liberal learning with opportunities for paid work and professional apprenticeships. We will need to create promotional pathways, professional support, and intellectual *collegia* for faculty who will not, by and large, work on tenure tracks. And we will need to create curricula, pedagogical styles, and forms of sociability for institutions in which online learning and networked student communities compose as important a context as campus-based and on-site experiences. Too often, reform-minded liberal educators (and I would include publicly-engaged faculty in this) have simply abstained from figuring out how to include “non-traditional” students—adult or part-time learners, working-class transfers, online students—within the ambit of our vision. In the future, we will need to commit ourselves to creating models of teaching and learning that can flourish when the taken-for-granted conditions of college education—compact campus places, expansive student time—are absent.

If this sketch is at all suggestive, it seems to me that it offers contradictory implications for our movement as democratically-engaged educators. The good news is that community engagement, project-based partnerships, and public scholarship offer important assets and beta experiments for an era of educational change. In a world where the boundaries among tenure-stream faculty, contract faculty, and staff educators will be blurred, our movement is experienced at the kind of mixed educational teams that, say, online and competency-based curricula require. Similarly the civic engagement movement has been a pioneer in the subversion of the course and semester ecology, developing models for long-term, intensive, and sequenced learning experiences. We are vanguardists when it comes to undoing the confinements of the academic calendar.

Yet if we have in some ways served as a laboratory for larger currents of educational change, it also seems true that we have only begun to grapple

with the larger, more radical implications of the Copernican moment. Let me conclude by suggesting four areas in which we should start to challenge our assumptions and redesign our practices.

First, we need to update our assumptions about our students' lives. Unless we want community-based learning to be the preserve of students who are lucky to be full-payers, large financial-aid recipients, or attendees of selective institutions, we need to link civic engagement to student wage-earning and professional preparation, as well as fighting for government policies that forgive loan debt for civic work (including for-profit work). How do we craft academic public work so that it can be woven into the complex, multi-pressured lives of the majority student?

Second, and concomitantly, we need to integrate the pathways of career, liberal learning, and civic education—to see all of them as strands in a single, braided process of student development and self-authoring. Organizationally we need to integrate career planning and mentoring with faculty-student engagement and community-based learning—and at the same time, educate students and external stakeholders not to look for instrumental, linear paths between study, degree-holding, and jobs. Our movement, in particular, needs to overcome any lingering allergy to engaging issues of the economic and professional benefits to students' academic and public work.

Third, we need to develop educational practices and public projects that engage not only local, but trans-local, global, and digital scales of community—that is, all the scales of community that are now the ordinary life of our students. This does not mean abandoning the local community collaborations that have been a real strength of our movement. Indeed, in the more expensive, unequal, socially fragmented educational landscape that they face, working-class, first-generation, and non-white students are bound to be *more* localistic in their educational choices, even as they are parts of global networks and diasporas. But we need to develop supple practices that understand the interpenetration of geographically bounded, geographically networked, and online identities, and we need to master technologies and social networks that connect these scales. Within a decade, the majority of academic credits in the U.S. will take place either wholly or hybridly online. Students who are already digital natives will learn to be online learners of one kind or another—whether instrumental or engaged learners remains to be seen—quite as naturally as they have had to learn fractions and essay writing today. We will want to teach them to be at once local, global, and digital citizens—while learning ourselves to be that.

And finally we will need more than ever to overcome the structural inequality and sectoral fragmentation that constitute some of the most corrosive effects of the Copernican moment. In a world where the tuition bubble will have popped, we will need inter-institutional collaboration more than ever; in a world where transferring is the norm, we need to build on the small seeds of inter-sectoral collaboration already planted in our movement, to make regional consortia and multi-institution partnerships (and therefore multi-class and multi-racial student communities of practice) a normal part of the landscape of engaged education. The stand-alone, one-semester service-learning course, in which students go “out there” to a local community for a discrete, short-term project, will be present in such a world. But like the stand-alone PC, it will only be valuable if it connects to the larger networks of change in which our older models will become embedded.

I began this talk by looking back a decade at the development of Imagining America, and then ventured further back and forth to contextualize our work in a history of our current moment in higher education. I tried to pay special attention to the weave of change, crisis, and innovation that has characterized the past quarter century. When the *next* quarter century is over, and a new generation of historians and critics look back, to what situation will *they* respond? The landscape of academic life will surely be dramatically altered; *someone’s* new paradigm will have taken hold. Will it be an economic and instrumental regime, efficiently driving masses of students to degree completion and populating them across that era’s global division of labor? Or will we have created a model of undergraduate education in which both the new conditions and the creative anomalies of our present moment will have moved from the margins to the heart of academic practice? Will we have created a “Copernican Revolution” worthy of the name? And will we in this room and this movement have created new visions and practices of democratic education adequate to the promises and disruptions of that revolution?

End Notes

- 1 I give fuller treatments of this view that a legitimization crisis characterized the history of U.S. higher education since the 1980s in Scobey 2006, 2007.
- 2 Kuh offers the following catalogue of “high-impact educational practices,” based on analysis of student response data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE): first-year seminars; common intellectual experiences; learning communities; writing-intensive courses; collaborative assignments; undergraduate research; diversity/global learning; community-based learning; internships; and capstone courses and projects.
- 3 For a good, non-technical introduction to the context and key elements of Copernicus’ work, see Repcheck, 2007. The English translation of Copernicus’ *Commentariolus* is available at <http://dbanach.com/copernicus-commentariolus.htm>.

Citations

Allen, I. Elaine and Jeff Seaman. *Online Nation: Five Years of Growth In Online Learning*. The Sloan Consortium, 2007.

American Federation of Teachers. *The State of the Higher Education Workforce 1997-2007*, 2009.

Arum, Richard and Josipa Roksa. *Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2011.

Bloom, Allan. *The Closing of the American Mind*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987.

Bok, Derek. *Our Underachieving Colleges: A Candid Look at How Much Students Learn and Why They Should Be Learning More*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Bousquet, Marc. *How the University Works: Higher Education and the Low-Wage Nation*. New York: New York University Press, 2008.

Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College. Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002.

Imagining America. *Our Mission*. <http://imaginingamerica.org/about/our-mission/>.

Kamenetz, Anya. *DIY U: Edupunks, Edupreneurs, and the Coming Transformation of Higher Education*. White River Junction, Vt.: Chelsea Green Publishing Company, 2010.

Kuh, George D. *High-Impact Educational Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access to Them, and Why They Matter*. Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2007.

Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996 (3rd edition).

Muscatine, Charles. *Fixing College Education: A New Curriculum for the Twenty-first Century*. Charlottesville, Va.: University of Virginia Press, 2009.

Repcheck, Jack. *Copernicus' Secret: How the Scientific Revolution Began*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2007.

Rudolph, Frederick. *The American College and University: A History*. Athens, Ga.: The University of Georgia Press, 1962.

Scobey, David. "Legitimation Crisis: The Spellings Commission and the Civic Engagement Movement." Unpublished manuscript, 2006.

Scobey, David. "The Arts of Citizenship in a Diverse Democracy: The Public Work of the Arts and Humanities." Unpublished manuscript, 2007.

Taylor, Mark C. *Crisis on Campus: A Bold Plan for Reforming Our Colleges and Universities*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2010.

Thelin, John R. *A History of American Higher Education*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004.

United States Department of Education. *A Test of Leadership—Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education: A Report of the Commission Appointed by Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings*, 2006.

PAGE Fellows Discuss the “Copernican Moment” in Higher Education and Civic Engagement

This edited conversation among members of Imagining America’s 2011-2012 Publicly Engaged Graduate Education (PAGE) cohort is our attempt to both critique and enact the shift David Scobey anticipates in his talk. We have used various media to create this response collaboratively: Mozilla’s opensource Etherpad platform, email exchanges, and transcribed conference calls.

Professor Scobey reflects back on the development of Imagining America (IA) to examine the contemporary moment in the academy and its future, but what can PAGE’s development in this context say about “change, crisis, and innovation in higher education”? Since 2003, PAGE, first under the direction of Sylvia Gale and then Kevin Bott, has helped IA consider the full career arc of the publically engaged scholar¹ and contribute to trans-disciplinary professionalization and mentorship for graduate students. PAGE shares Scobey’s interest in what it might mean if the institution were not the center of our reality in higher education. We come together from various disciplines and campuses across the country for mutual support, reciprocity, camaraderie, and collaborative scholarship. While Scobey calls for a re-envisioning of place and pedagogy for undergraduates, new scholarship and artistry like Nick Sousanis’s, featured on this cover, also calls out for a re-envisioning of dissertations, doctoral programs, partnerships, and scholarly artifacts.

Please visit the Imagining America web site—www.imaginingamerica.org—for more extensive excerpts from our conversations. We invite you to respond on IA’s blog!

The 2011-2012 PAGE Fellows



Adam Bush: Scobey’s talk at Imagining America’s national conference on September 22 took place five days after the first 1,000 people gathered in Zuccotti Park to ignite the “Occupy Wall Street” movement. The movement emerged out of a long history of protest, civil disobedience, and anger with the status quo to organize around financial inequality, educational access, and citizenship. While Scobey doesn’t address “Occupy” in his talk, the paradigm shift he calls for in higher education materializes out of calls for action, access,² equity, and citizenship similar to those that have long been happening on university campuses, which is why his invocation of Copernicus

is so interesting. Copernicus introduced a heliocentric solar system, but the implications and details of that have changed dramatically, again and again, since the 16th century. So, following the Copernican metaphor, is this paradigm shift a stepping-stone to something else we can theorize about together?

Alex Olson: The Copernican metaphor is indeed provocative, but I am troubled by the way it positions something that is legitimately contested—the organization and practice of higher education—as a matter of fact and science, casting defenders of the status quo as equivalent to Ptolemaists who thought the sun revolves around the Earth. The metaphor closes conversation—why, after all, should we take people who espouse the geocentric model seriously? I think there is more to our colleagues who advocate for disciplines, tenure, majors, etc., than simply clinging to an outmoded paradigm.

Nick Sousanis: I found the Copernican analogy fitting and quite specifically chosen (as opposed to other major paradigm shifts—i.e., special relativity). Copernicus’s removal of the earth from the center of the universe is analogous to the idea that the Academy is no longer the center that learning orbits around, but rather one element in an inter-connected community/universe. That understanding of no longer being THE center is no small thing, a shattering of a world/universe view that would fuel further scientific and cultural revolutions. Similarly, Scobey posits that this is the sort of change the modern university (which comes into being around the time Copernicus’s theory is published) needs, but it is perhaps as unimaginable to us now as those living in the time before Copernicus.

Alex, I totally agree—there is more to our disciplinary colleagues than geocentric delusions. But I don’t see Scobey using Copernicus to close the conversation and throw out all that’s come before. Rather, I saw him pushing the idea that we need a radically new perspective on things as they are, something the Copernican model made possible. To Adam’s point, it’s not that Copernicus was right, it’s that “this is the best theory available” until we discover a better one. Tangentially, that often seems to be the problem: instead of seeing the models we come up with as tools to aid in our understanding, we seem to mistake them for the thing in itself.

Alex O: I wholly agree that there is much to be said for the Copernican metaphor as it relates to de-centering knowledge production and power relationships. It is a main strand running through much of our work and that of others in IA. At the same time, I think we can make the point in a non-

reductive way that acknowledges the complexities of the current academic landscape. Tenure, for example, has historically worked to protect an important space of critique in American life. The notion that the whole system was predicated on being “the center of the universe” flattens these complexities to provide us with an easier-than-necessary foil. I would ask instead, how can we utilize the existing strengths of higher education, including vibrant strands of thought being generated in and around the disciplines, to help make the transition from generation to generation, paradigm to paradigm?

Adele Holoch: Let’s expand upon Scobey’s question, “what might that future look like?” with more concrete thoughts and examples drawing on our own work as scholars, educators, and community activists. What are some specific contributions we can make toward enacting the kinds of change he talks about? What can our experiences tell us, and others, about why and how change might be challenging?

Alex Agloro: This moment is a social phenomenon, too. So much of the really important learning that we do takes place in social situations, particularly with those who equip us to cross boundaries, feel differences, and manage interactions with people who do not come from the same backgrounds as our own.

Cecilia Orphan: The discussion about community is challenging as well. Alex A., you have talked about how in higher education we’re so obsessed with being global and yet there are communities surrounding our institutions that are totally falling apart. Students are developing more awareness of what’s going on abroad than in their own neighborhoods. I’m not saying you shouldn’t create global learners, but I think the communities surrounding universities are equally important local contexts for learning and exchange. We need to dispel this notion that the university is an island unto itself and the community just exists around it and when we want we can go out and engage it.

Kinh T. Vu: Around the time that Copernicus was circulating his heliocentric theory (1514), the church was also facing confrontation from one of its own, Martin Luther, who posted his 95 Theses on the Wittenberg church door (1517). Not long after, in 1545, the Catholic Church rebutted with its own reforms during the Council of Trent. How do graduate students, like today’s Imagining America fellows and other allies, advocate for revolutionary change in local, national, and global ways that prompt institutions to examine their own academic and socio-political priorities on campus and off?

Nick: I like this shift to education and revolutions—the heart of Scobey’s talk. But as a metaphor for the unsettling of a changing landscape, we should note that lacking a physical demonstration, Copernicus’s hypothesis didn’t present a real challenge to the church. Only later, with the aid of the telescope, can Galileo present a basic theory of relativity. And it’s then that the church turns against him, forcing Galileo to recant his views and putting him under house arrest.

To bring the analogy back to higher education, the environment that IA is wading into and Scobey is speaking of is hostile.³ Institutions don’t want to hear that their view of the cosmos is off. They have a lot invested in maintaining the status quo. Nearly a hundred years passed between Copernicus and Galileo, and then hundreds more before the church’s apology to Galileo. So the actual Copernican Moment is only a moment in hindsight; the actual revolution took a long time. Such, it seems, is the moment we are in today—it will be a long haul. I think Scobey’s talk affirmed IA’s work and challenges us to seize this moment and push on towards revolutionary educational shifts.

Kristin Buchner: I find the larger story of Copernicus/Kepler/Galileo interesting—Galileo was condemned as a heretic for expanding on Copernicus’s models, while years later Kepler was praised as a scholar. We can liken this progression of astronomers to that of community-engaged scholars—from early pioneers to us as PAGE fellows, representing the next generation of this work. What is our responsibility to the engagement field in terms of continuing to reinvent higher education? Scobey spoke directly to me when he said, “early scholars have struggled for the sake of this work, and have paved the way for a stronger future.” While this work is far from complete, the Copernican leaders have set the stage for the next generation of Keplerian scholars to thrive.

LaTanya Autry: I focused my attention on Scobey’s points about changes in engagement and education. Overall, I liked his statements about empowering students and being more aware of students’ identities, lifestyles, and goals. In light of the recent Occupy movement these issues, which I haven’t heard much about on my campus, are paramount. It’s very exciting to consider this challenging time as an opportunity for profound positive changes in our educational system. With so many attacks on public funding for education and increasing costs, the current situation often seems disheartening. However, public scholars can be instrumental in publicly expressing the relevance of education and fostering necessary community networks. Scobey’s mention of how we need to think locally, translocally, globally, and digitally gets at this idea.

Elena Gonzales: LaTanya importantly addresses the root of much of the trouble with higher education today. High costs and untenably tremendous student debt limit students' access. The Occupy movement—an actual response to the comprehensiveness with which our society has come to privilege the 1 percent—inspires me. I haven't been living in a tent in Chicago, but I have been asking myself where my work can amplify and bolster that of the Occupiers. My dissertation addresses museums' use of their exhibitions for social justice, and one of my case studies is the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum.⁴ Several weeks ago, JAHHM hosted Occupy Hull-House, a daylong symposium that involved academic speakers, Occupiers from Chicago and New York, and many others from inside and outside the academy. Vijay Prashad and Nathan Brown, both speakers at the symposium, argued that the movement must transform from a tactic into a strategy that should include the fight against ballooning student debt. To me, this is where Scobey's talk has gone since last September. That's not to deny universities' deep financial difficulties. Rather, as we discussed as a group, the crisis in funding throughout higher education must be used and not wasted: it can't be misdirected at professors and administrators. It has to reach policymakers.

Adam: I think you're right, Elena. This cuts deeply into the need for policy changes. Scobey's talk reminded me of one Catherine Cole gave at UCSB earlier this year, looking to Clark Kerr's Master Plan for assistance in navigating the UC's present conditions.⁵ While Kerr was the architect of the past 50 years of California's public higher education system,⁶ he also, through his work with the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, was instrumental in policy changes on the federal level and the formation of FIPSE—the Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education. Many of the innovations Scobey invokes as part of the paradigm shift—distance learning, adult education support, and credit documentation—emerged as new structures in higher education through FIPSE support. This year, the White House Office of Public Engagement, the Center for Democracy and Citizenship, and the Department of Education are inaugurating the American Commonwealth Partnership on the 150th anniversary year of the Morrill Act, which created land grant institutions to examine, create, and support new models for democracy colleges.⁷ I'm truly excited for what this moment can create for publically engaged graduate students, like PAGE, and all those invested in democratic engagement practices through higher education.

Professor Scobey notes at the close of his talk that “someone’s new paradigm” will surely take hold in the coming years. He then asks: “Will we have created a ‘Copernican Revolution’ worthy of the name? And will we...have created new visions and practices of democratic education adequate to the promises and disruptions of that revolution?” It is with that closing thought in mind that we invite you to join in on this conversation and visit www.imaginingamerica.org to read more from the PAGE Fellows.

End Notes

- 1 Please see the Imagining America web site to download our Tenure Team Initiative, new data from our Publicly Engaged Scholar Research Project, and 2011’s Catalyst Paper for Full Participation.
- 2 I think of PAGE Fellow Blair Smith and CNY PAGE director A. Wendy Nastasi who co-authored “Syracuse’s Rise” in response to an article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, writing, “We embrace engaged scholarship, the building of knowledge that is inseparable from practice. The inclusion of historically underrepresented students does not detract from our ability to recruit or to remain competitive. It contributes to a robust and dynamic learning environment where multiple perspectives and voices expand our notions of what is knowable. Public scholarship is important to us because it mobilizes community and campus resources, brilliance, and creativity.”
- 3 As evidenced by last fall’s *Chronicle of Higher Education* article, which prompted our colleagues to respond with “Syracuse’s Rise.”
- 4 http://www.uic.edu/jaddams/hull/hull_house.html
- 5 Catherine M. Cole, “Trading Futures: Prospects for California’s University.” Thanks to Kim Yasuda for alerting me to the talk. Within the talk Cole posts a link to Clark Kerr’s 1963 Godkin Lecture at Harvard: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_4J94a_NxLU/.
- 6 A Master Plan, Cole points out, that was only written with the next 15 years in mind.
- 7 The ACP is spearheaded by former IA board member Harry Boyte with a steering committee including 2011-2012 PAGE Fellow Cecilia Orphan, IA founding director Julie Ellison, board member John Saltmarsh, director of research Tim Eatman, and former board chair David Scobey.

Biographical Sketches



Photo: Phyllis Jensen

David Scobey became executive dean of what is now The New School for Public Engagement in 2010. He is a national leader in developing innovative methods to engage institutions of higher education with communities outside the academy. He was previously director of the Harvard Center for Community Partnerships at

Bates College in Maine, as well as the founding director of the University of Michigan's Arts of Citizenship Program, an initiative to integrate civic and community engagement with the arts, humanities, and design. He serves on the advisory councils of Project Pericles and Bringing Theory to Practice, and he was the chair of Imagining America's National Advisory Board. David's scholarship explores politics, culture, and space in 19th-century America and New York City in particular. He taught for 16 years at the University of Michigan, primarily as Professor of Architecture in the Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning. He holds a PhD in American studies from Yale, where he also received his BA degree, and a diploma in social anthropology from Oxford, where he studied as a Rhodes Scholar.

The response essay was co-authored by Imagining America's 2011-2012 PAGE Fellows:

Alexandrina Agloro, LaTanya Autry, Kristin Buchner, Ching-In Chen, Elena Gonzales, Adele Holoch, Alexander Olson, Cecilia Orphan, Irene Monica Sanchez, Nick Sousanis, Blair Ebony Smith, Kinh T. Vu, A. Wendy Nastasi (Central New York PAGE Director), and Adam Bush (National PAGE Director).

A diverse and inspiring group from 12 member institutions of Imagining America's consortium, the PAGE Fellows have been charged with designing and participating in a yearlong forum on innovation in publicly-engaged graduate education and mentorship. Interested in pursuing public and community practice through the humanities, arts, and design, the Fellows are leaders in their own disciplines, ranging from education to American studies, communications to art history to public affairs, and work in collaboration with Imagining America to further a national conversation on public scholarship.

Also available from **Imagining America:**

Democratic Vistas for the Humanities, by Richard Franke, founder of the Chicago Humanities Festival (**Foreseeable Futures #1**)

Harlem: Parable of Promise or Peril, by Mary Schmidt Campbell, Dean, Tisch School of the Arts, New York University (**Foreseeable Futures #2**)

Transforming America: The University as Public Good, by Nancy Cantor, President and Chancellor, Syracuse University (**Foreseeable Futures #3**)

The Tangled Web of Diversity and Democracy, by George Sanchez, Professor of History, American Studies and Ethnicity at the University of Southern California (**Foreseeable Futures #4**)

Homeland Insecurities: Teaching and the Intercultural Imagination, by John Kuo Wei Tchen, Director of the A/P/A (Asian/Pacific/American) Studies Program and Institute, New York University; Co-Founder, Museum of Chinese in the Americas (**Foreseeable Futures #5**)

Changing the Story About Higher Education's Public Purposes and Work: Land-Grants, Liberty, and the Little Country Theater, by Scott Peters, Assistant Professor in the Department of Education at Cornell University (**Foreseeable Futures #6**)

Navigating the Past: Brown University and the Voyage of the Slave Ship Sally, 1764-65, by James T. Campbell, Associate Professor of American Civilization, Africana Studies, and History at Brown University (**Foreseeable Futures #7**)

La Memoria de Nuestra Tierra: Sites of Public Memory, by Judith F. Baca, Artistic Director and Co-Founder of the Social and Public Art resource Center (**Foreseeable Futures #8**)

Traditional New Orleans Jazz as a Metaphor for American Life, by Dr. Michael White, Professor of Spanish and African American Music at Xavier University (**Foreseeable Futures #9**)

Save As...Knowledge and Transmission in the Age of Digital Technologies, by Diana Taylor, University Professor and Professor Performance Studies and Spanish at NYU (**Foreseeable Futures #10**)



Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life is a consortium of colleges and universities committed to public scholarship and practice in the arts, humanities, and design. Imagining America articulates how campus-community partnerships contribute to local and national civic life while furthering recognition of public scholarship's value in higher education itself.

As with all of our publications, these reports can be ordered for distribution at conferences and meetings. Please contact the Imagining America office by e-mailing—imaginingamerica@syr.edu.