

EVELYN NAKANO GLENN: Good evening, and welcome to the opening plenary of the 2010 ASA meetings. My name is Evelyn Nakano Glenn and I am from Berkeley, so we always start our classes at 10 after, so we are starting. The title of our session is, "Where is the "Public" in the Public University? How Disinvestment in Public Higher Education Threatens Democratic Citizenry." So this panel brings together 3 eminent scholars and critics of higher education. They examine the political and financial crises in universities and the acceleration of privatization and corporatization of the public university. They also turn critical gazes on the consequences of privatization and corporatization for inclusion and participation in educational institutions and they explore how the very notion of democracy and substantive citizenship have thereby been impoverished. After their presentations, no I guess it is five other eminent scholars and we have a whole lot of discussants that will comment. So, what I will do is I will introduce our three presenters and then after they present I will then present the brief bios of the commentators so you can keep track.

The first speaker will be Christopher Newfield, who teaches American Studies in the English Department at the University of California Santa Barbara, so we would like to welcome him as an interdisciplinarian. Chris's research focuses on the relations between culture and economics, on higher education history funding and policy, and on technology transfer and innovations. He is the author of several books related to higher education, including *Ivey and Industry, Business and the Making of American Universities 1880 to 1980* (Duke University Press), and *The Unmaking of the Public University the Forty-Year Assault on the Middle Class* (Harvard University Press 2008), which was the winner of the Foreword Gold Award.

Our second speaker is Sheila Slaughter, who is the Louise McBee Professor of Higher Education, Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia Athens. Her research areas are Political Economy of Higher Education, Science and Technology Policy, Academic Freedom and Women in Higher Education. Her most recent books are *Academic Capitalism, Politics Policies and the Entrepreneurial University* (Johns Hopkins University Press, with Larry Lesley), and *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy* (also John Hopkins 2004, with Gary Rhodes). She is the author of many articles and book chapters and has received grants from NIH to study university trustees, entrepreneurial research, and conflict of interest. From NSF to study how universities contribute to innovation and economic growth.

Gaye Tuchman, our third speaker, is Professor of Sociology at the University of Connecticut. Her latest book, "Wanna Be You, Inside the Corporate University." We will try and guess which University she is talking about - (University of Chicago Press 2009), which has received considerable attention worldwide, including a rave review in the Times Higher Education Supplement. Speaking at the Eastern Sociological Society Herb Gans called her first ethnography, "Making News," the best book of media sociology ever published. It is a classic in the field of communication. Gaye is particularly fond, as am I, of a much reprinted article co-authored with Harry

Levine, "New York Jews and Chinese Food." So, let us welcome our first speaker, Chris Newfield.

CHRIS NEWFIELD: Thanks Evelyn, it is really a pleasure to be here. I love sociology. I am married to a sociologist that is also, I am sort of the village sociologist of English and you will see how far whether I have done justice of any kind to your field or simply abused it. I am thrilled to be here. I really appreciate the invitation Evelyn. My co-panelists have written 2 or 3 of the best books in the last 20 or 30 years about higher education. The commentators are great and I am really quite happy to be here. I hope that I can in a second plug in my computer. Okay, there we go.

We are in this strange period right now where reports of decline, which are usually exaggerated are now being caught up with by actual American reality and I think that you have probably been reading the same blogs and articles that I have. You know that that Glenn Greenwald wrote a piece a few days ago called "What a Declining Empire Looks Like" that made a list of some these symptoms. You know, one-third of the street lights in Colorado Springs, Colorado being turned off, the entire public library system of Camden, New Jersey being closed, students being furloughed in the state of Hawaii 17 Fridays of school being canceled, and the state of Utah considering making their 12<sup>th</sup> grade optional. The Wall Street Journal published a piece called Roads to Ruin, which commented on the counties of some northern plains states digging up paved roads and converting them back into gravel to save money. State leaders are rapidly "Hooverizing" their economies. One of the leading ideas in California and elsewhere is to make more people poor; I mean that is the short-term strategy budget solution strategy and our current discourse is not at all keeping up with the problems that we are facing. The debate economically looks like it could have been happening in the 1980s or in the 1930s.

The university is getting caught up in this and it is getting pulled down into the vortex. It is essential that the university not be pulled down. So first I am going to be talking about the decline and then I am going to be talking at the very end about a couple of things I think we can do to pull it back out again. The only other introductory thing that I want to say is this, any study of history shows that societies decline for no reason other than that they stick with a paradigm that ceases to work and there is a book, that many of you I am sure are familiar with, Jared Diamond's book, "Collapse," that offers a smorgasbord of collapsing societies and one of the most vivid images in that book is of Easter Island and the cutting down of all the trees. He remarks at the end of that chapter, "I wonder what the last Easter Islander thought as he cut down the last tree."

What I am interested in is the period that is more like the one we are in right now. That is where there are still plenty of trees, but all of right-thinking people are saying to themselves, "Well there is really nothing else to do, but continue to cut the trees." The obvious analogy here is with budget cuts and particularly with cutting public budgets in particular, but what I am going to be trying to talk about here is this thing I will call the "American Funding Model;" it is our version of tree cutting. It's the thing that

we have been doing for the last 30 years; it's the thing that everyone in higher education leadership, almost, says that we need to continue to do. My argument here is going to be that we have to stop doing it now.

Okay, I am going to briefly say what this American Funding Model is. It is a strange combination at the highest tuition in the world and for a long time the broadest access. The latter having been important for the increasing diversification of American higher education, which I think is a part of the crisis now. It has 3 basic principles that I am going to be, or claims that I am going to be looking at right now. The first is that in the context of declining public funding, this model says we do find adequate private substitutes for public funds when we lose public funds. The second claim is that it funds the world's, this model, the world's highest levels of overall educational attainment, so if you feel inclined to criticize how the system is working financially, you have to face the fact that it is the best system in the world. Then the third claim is that while we are continuing to find more private money, and while we are achieving these high level of attainment, we are continuing to improve our outcomes by importing more businesslike management methods from the corporate world and elsewhere.

The context for this is a flattening and, in many cases, a decline in public outlays over the last 25 years. The dark blue bars going back to the mid 1980s are the public contribution; the lighter green are basically tuition dollars. The red line is the ever-increasing number of students who are lining up to be in this industry.

It is unlike General Motors, which saw its sales class by 40% in a month. Higher education has managed to mess up its finances even though people have been lining up in ever larger numbers to try to get in; something that we are going to have to think about a little bit more.

There is also not a business cycle issue. That was something that many boards of trustees were told for 20 years, "Well our money is down this year, but that is the economy is down; it will go back up when the economy goes up." It's more a case of systematic disinvestments; this is a blurry side of California budget sector's 1984 to 2004 in constant dollars. The two middle bars are health and human services up a third and K-12 of about a quarter in real dollars. The giant boom bar on the right is of course the prison budget in California, which doubled. The only sector in California over that 20-year period that actually declined in real dollars was higher education. Another way of putting the point is this, there is money, it is just not for us. The state personal income of the state in California goes up about 5 or 6% every year and this has done this for 3 decades or more. The last year is of course an exception.

When we did a study a few years ago trying to compared UC revenues to state personal income - what we found is charted here and that is that as a percentage of income over the capacity to pay, a capacity that is based on in part access to higher education, California had fallen by almost half in the share of these actual monies available that it was willing to spend on that sector.

Okay, at this point, I mean for years, at least in my experience on many budget committees at the University of California, nobody would really talk about this openly; there was very little open criticism of state legislators. All of this changed in the last couple of years and there is now much more aggressive and belligerent targeting of state legislators. Their leaders are saying this is not good but, and this is where the first claim that I mentioned before comes in, Universities can in the pinch that we seem to be perpetually in always find adequate private substitutes for public funds and there are these three big categories - There is fund-raising, which has gone up, you know it has tripled at many of public flagships over the last 20 years, sponsored research, which has doubled at many public flagships over the last 20 years, and of course the perennial favorite "tuition increases" year in and year out. There's a problem with this though, which is that this first claim has succeeded all too well. The result of university leaders having made these arguments for 20 years is that everyone actually now believes them and the result of this is, legislators are saying "Great, now we can cut your public money and do no harm to you." So there is a feedback loop that has been set up and the university has been trying to be good sports. I mean there is sort of understandable motivation behind some of this, but university leaders have also now given legislators a built-in excuse to cut the public side of university funding whenever there is a perceived need to do that.

Okay, so to summarize the problems for the first two problems at least with this private revenue substitution idea, it rationalizes the public funding cuts that the university does not want. It lets legislators off the hook year after year. The second thing that it does, and this is a deep philosophical issue that many of you in this room and on this panel have thought about it at least as much as I have so I will not say much about it, but it redefines public at higher education from general social development to personal mobility and gives the public no reason at all to continue to pay for the other person's kid's better job. If it is not about society advancing, if it is about an individual getting a better job, there is a reduced incentive to do general revenue payments and that's in fact what we are seeing.

There is a third problem, and that is what I am gonna spend a lot of my time on in the time that I have left.

The accounting behind this claim is incorrect. In reality private funding cannot actually substitute for lost public funds in terms of the actual amounts that it brings in. Philanthropy, which is this highly visible, high status, kind of celebrity side of the revenue market for higher education which is 80% to 98% restricted. That is it does not actually go into the general education purposes. It is close to 100% restricted at the University of California over the last 10 years. Tuition - it has gone up four times the consumer price index for about the last 30 years. This is not sustainable. It produces a need to discount each new tuition dollar, because so many people are unable to pay. We are basically in a situation that many people call a "tuition bubble" where were not going to sustain those increases anymore anyway and the revenues don't make up in turn in scale for what the public cuts actually amount to. I can give you more details on that if you are interested. Then we come to sponsored research, which is another very

high status and very important source of revenue. Also of course, it is a flagship university activity - it is an essential social function. What are the actual net revenues that the university research brings to campus? This was something that I had to dig into as a result of these reports and I was really very surprised by the results. These are not particularly legible slides, so I will have to read it to you.

F&A, these are indirect costs for facilities and administration costs that are really the rest of the iceberg that you do not see. Direct costs, which you actually do to pay the people to do the research to buy the new equipment for your particular project that is direct costs; indirect costs are everything else - the building, the staff, the bureaucratic activity, the custodial, and utilities payments, all of that. What you see in the first column here are a series of major research universities. The second column most recent submission means the number, the percentage that the university says its indirect costs amount to. For example, Harvard says about for every dollar it spends on direct costs it needs \$0.73 for indirect costs. The negotiated rate is what the agency in question, noted over here, actually gives to that university. These are all best-case scenarios. The federal government pays the highest indirect cost rates to universities. What you see in almost every case is a gap between what the university pays out, according to it, and what the federal government gives it. Something like five or six cents on the dollar. So, if you go down here to UCLA and you see something like a six-and-a-half cent gap, you recall that UCLA has close to a billion dollars in contracts and grants every year. Then if you add to that the idea, the assumption, which is false that all of it is best case scenario federal money. It is not. What you then can calculate is that UCLA loses 65 million dollars a year on one billion dollars of research, which it then has to find from somewhere else and that somewhere else generally speaking is state money or fees from students.

Okay, here is the summary of this - revenues are accompanied by costs. The university, I think, is the only industrial sector, if we think of it that way, in the world that does not have to actually regularly report its net proceeds. It is always giving its marquee numbers in terms of grosses and that the average is something like a 25-cent loss on the dollar. This is starting to change, because the financial emergency that is being created by these shortfalls can no longer be covered up in public universities, because of the public cuts. So, what we have here on the left is a traditional headline, "UCLA Research is Bringing in a Record \$966 Million in Contracts and Grants Awards." Then what we have is something that was new this year in California, which is a report by the research office of the president that revealed that UC has \$3.5 billion in contracts and grants annually and it loses \$720 million a year on that money. When you think that our catastrophic cut was about \$800 million you can see the importance of this particular figure and it produced this headline in the Chronicle, The San Francisco Chronicle, "You See Millions Lost in Research Costs from Grants."

So, the point of this is that research revenue creates budgetary holes; it creates losses. There should be more research, but the research that we do should be fully and correctly funded and correctly understood through transparency and full disclosure.

Okay, I want to go into, for about 1 minute, another important consequence of the holes that are created in part by research, but also by other things and that is the impact on department budgets. There is an important lesson for sociologists here, because sociologists are poor.

I hope you can read this. These are numbers from a fairly good year at the beginning of the decade, the last decade; these are agglomerated divisions, professional, school arts, and humanities, etc. The normal way to read a table like this is to jump to the right-hand columns and to look at the research awards. You see, "wow," that 55 million went to the natural and physical sciences, 43 million went to engineering, look at these pittance numbers coming in from arts and humanities and social sciences, you look all the way to the right to the fines per faculty FTE and you see engineers bringing in over \$500,000 per person. You see arts and humanities bringing in less than half that. Social scientists bringing in a little bit more than half that. These are all funds and you think, "Well then there's a certain justice to the fact that there are so many more resources in science, they earn more, therefore they get more." What you would then expect when you come back to the rest of the table is to see that the wealthy are subsidizing the poor. This is the story that all of us have grown up with. They make this money in their research grants and then it gets skimmed off and sent to people who can't earn money in the social sciences and humanities. So you would be expecting to see that when you look, say at this fourth column, which is the ratio of the money you get for workload. The earned revenues versus the actual revenues that central administration sends to each of those divisions. What we see in fact though is exactly the opposite of the conventional wisdom and what we see is that the science professional school gets almost 3 times more than it actually earns in terms of its enrollments, engineering gets twice, physical science gets a little bit less than 100%, and down there at the bottom getting only a little bit more than one-third of the money back on the workload that it does, that it performs, in terms of those large lecture courses and so on, are these social scientists. When you break this down and the examples that I have seen it is usually high enrollment sociology departments that are the real mules and workforces of the university sending money in the opposite direction from what we think; sending money to the sciences and engineering and not sending money from them to us. This is again starting to be acknowledged this year. The president of UC, Marc Yudof, wrote a letter to the Chronicle of Higher Education agreeing finally that this was the case. The point here is that there is... or the following, that research source shortfalls cause resource inequality, harms instruction in many cases, and is worse for popular majors, often in the arts, the humanities, and the social sciences. Students that want to do social research work on cultural problems and who find themselves with the smallest number of resources of any students in the university.

Okay, so what we get to, now I am going to run through the next two much more quickly, in terms of these three major claims of this overall funding model, is that the first claim that this model has been able to find adequate private substitutes for public funds is largely false. The partial exception is ever increasing tuition. The second claim that it funds the world's highest levels of overall educational attainment is

unfortunately also no longer true. Again, you are hardly going to be able to see this - The United States is now 12<sup>th</sup> in the countries studied in this Annual ACD Survey in terms of the percentage of students that attain a bachelor's degree. The other important thing to notice here is that it is one of two countries in the world that has not improved in moving from one generation to the next; my generation's rate of education in most of these other countries was significantly lower than the current students' generation. The United States hasn't budged and it is now actually starting to decline. The current generation is the first generation in American history that is less well educated than its parents.

Okay, the question is, this is terrible; the US has lost its advantage, which is important to its economic attainments and so on, "Can we, however, blame the funding model for this?" My answer is, "Yes we can." I am going to summarize this slide very quickly in the interest of time simply by saying that higher education is like a public's health, it is an overall number getting 2% or 10% of your best students to a really high level does not do the job. You need to bring the other 75% that have been stagnant for 30 years into forward movement. The way to do that is to send them to public universities. These are the places that have the capacity to accept them, but the way that this funding model works is that it sends the smallest amount of money to the schools that have the worst continuation rates and highest percentage of low SES students and students of color. The AFN has for 30 years been giving these schools the fewest resources and the conclusion that I draw on this point is that its ongoing shift to private funds increases resource inequality, which lowers overall attainment. It is great for the people at the top, but not for the society. This model therefore cannot increase attainment. It will not do this in spite of all of the efforts of the Obama administration and everybody else.

So, the first two claims are false and now we get to the third, which is that we can continue to massage the system with business efficiencies and get better educational attainment and more research outputs out of it with this, with the kinds of lessons of resource management that we get from business. Lots of things about this are good. I am not knocking improved business systems, information systems, etc., but we also need to think about this in terms of other aspects of this what some people are calling "new managerialism." It works with what Neal Fligstein years ago called a "financial conception of control." Its financials are generally secret. They are generally final; that is they have the last word. They trump other educational issues and this has helped to create the first problem that is secrecy has helped to create the misbudgeting and the misunderstanding of the budgeting and of the accounting and of the shortfalls that I was just describing before.

The second problem with this managerial structure tendency is that it naturalizes inequalities of resources and of outcomes. It is put in place to husband resources and that means selective allocation and that means stratification in practice virtually always. That has helped create the attainment crisis that I just described a second ago.

Then the other thing, which I would really like to give a whole talk on, but I won't, is the functional and the existential and the psychological imaginative dimensions of this kind of managerialism. Top-down authority is outdated. It does not support the kinds of social interactions that we associate with what are called learning organizations and which society now needs in order to deal with destabilized economies where there is an overabundance of information where interpretation of ambiguous signals, where the passing on of informal know-how, where a whole series of delicate interactions among people have to be supported rather than simply trumped by management structures or by financial controls that come from somewhere else.

So, the suggestion here is that it is worse than these other problems and it is outdated. What it is ending up doing is creating this thing that I call a "death spiral." I do not have time to go through this; all I want to say is that if you look at the economic tendencies, the cycle of lower educational levels and income levels, and then you see how that feeds back through the a whole series of other sort of social activities, and then you insert the university into that, what you see is that the three elements that I have been talking about intensify this spiral rather than resist it. They are pro-cyclical rather than counter-cyclical. They are intensifying the loss of public support, the lowering of effective teaching and research creating fewer creative students and satisfied students and leading to fewer high education-demanding jobs and so on down the line.

So, what I am going to end with are a couple of remedies. I think what we have to do is first address our own leaders who have lost faith, who have lost confidence, and who think there is really only one thing to do, which is to accept the cuts and continue to go with strategies that I have been suggesting here do not actually work. In fact, they make the problem worse. We need to start with principles and develop tactics out of that. The first principle for me is that the public university is for the general development of the whole society. We do know what public means - public means everybody. The second core principal, general development requires the effectiveness of more egalitarian allocations "our equivalent of the trees that we continue to cut" is the continued concentration of resources in an extremely ineffective way, both epistemologically and in terms of investment and allocation. In terms of actually getting us to remedies where it leads us to is basically a reversal of those three elements that I have talked about. The first thing and, this is the absolute key thing, we have to rebuild public funding by rebuilding public support via a whole society research that people feel addresses their real issues and it is not simply focused on creating high-tech businesses, which is more or less the rhetoric that we are hearing today. We have to reinvent mass instruction for maximum attainment in a minority-majority world. What we are looking at has largely created by a backlash in which a 70% white electorate in California is simply refusing to pay for 70% student of color K-12 population. That population has to be addressed and the people who are continuing to vote against have to be brought into an understanding of what this will do for the society as a whole. Then finally we need a major upgrade, a major reform of university governance. We have to be a leading institution around learning, around creative interactions, around multiple directional signals, around interpreted agency, around

craftwork as the basis of moving forward into the next kinds of industries and the next kinds of social relations that we all can feel are ahead of us, but which we are having difficulty communicating.

The last thing that I want to leave you with is this - all of this can happen with this realization, that it is possible to stop cutting down the trees.

SHEILA SLAUGHTER: Can you put my PowerPoint up back there please? I will start while hopefully they are organizing their media... my media.

I changed the title of my talk. I am going to talk about American higher education and stratification, segmentation, and fragmentation. And then I want to raise questions about the theoretical implications of these processes with emphasis on how they affect traditional faculty organizations such as departments and disciplines and professional associations. I also want to raise questions about the theoretical implications for organizational studies with an emphasis on research universities.

First, I will talk about stratification. Let me see if I make this work. Okay, research universities, stratification is some people get more and some groups get more and others do not. Of course sociologists know this all too well. Research universities absorb an inordinate amount of resources for higher education. Public research universities have revenues that are double those of master's universities and they expend double the amount, but not all research universities are equal. Private research universities have revenues about two-and-a-half times greater than those of publics and they spend about two times as much. Private research universities have revenues approximately four times as great as private master's universities and they spend about three times as much. The federal dollar spent on all of post-secondary education are not much more than that, that is spent on research, which goes to a relatively few institutions. Perhaps the top 100 research performing universities probably about 40%, maybe 50% of which are public.

This raises serious questions about how we want to think about public versus private research universities, especially given that a study we just completed for the NSF shows private research universities seem to have developed a strategy that focuses on aggressively raising faculty pay and investing in research faculty and research. This raises an issue, given the revenues and expenditures, whether private research universities are so different from other sources of research universities that we have to think about them as sort of a separate system and indeed whether research universities altogether should be considered as a separate sort of entity when we think about higher education.

Generally, professors at private research universities are paid more than those of public, and professors at research universities are paid more than comprehensive, and so on and so forth, but there are also markers of stratification within research universities often much more so than other types of professional organizations, at least in part, because there are not unionized. If we take salary as an

indicator of stratification we see that average salaries by field and research universities are extremely differentiated.

Professors and fields close to preferred markets, and about this more later, earn substantially more than faculty in other fields. The top fields for public and private research universities from 1987 to 2004 were various combinations of health, which is medicine, and engineering and business. The lowest were humanities, education, and fine arts. In constant dollars in 2006, the gap between the highest and lowest fields in 1987 was \$48,000 in public research universities and in 2004 \$56,000 in public and \$58,000 in private universities. In other words, the salary gap between the highest and the lowest is more than assistant professors in the lower fields are paid. So again we see extreme strikes at stratification within.

So, moving on to segmentation. The growth of centers and institutes are a marker of segmentation, as in some ways the growth of interdisciplinary as well as mergers and force mergers. All of these are markers I see of segmentation.

The growth of science and engineering has resulted in these areas having the largest numbers of centers and institutes and the largest numbers of dedicated faculty lines.

We did this little pilot study where we are trying to figure out where centers and institutes that research universities are and the life sciences as you can see have far and away the largest number of centers and institutes. The growth in science and engineering has resulted in these areas of getting more and more that is through federal stimulus. Physical sciences follow health and then engineering.

At Minnesota, where we examined more than stem fields we found that there are generally fewer centers in non-science fields with the exception of business and social science, but more faculty affiliates and with the exception of business, there are hardly any dedicated faculty lines. So, centers and institutes are an interface between departments, which are linked to national disciplines and professional associations and the university administrations. Centers and institutions have grown exponentially in recent years. The question is whether centers and institutes have become a means of segmenting certain faculty from their departmental homes and locating them where they can be more highly rewarded and incentives, as we now say in the business.

Faculty may readily choose to participate, because they accrue resources for research as well as status and prestige while administrators may favor them because they can control and incent them more.

Centers and institutes as organizational devices may allow high-level administrators to solve the biggest problem they face as managers; how to manage experts. In other words, research faculty have knowledge and expertise that managers don't. Knowledge and expertise that can't be caufified, especially innovative knowledge

or entrepreneurial knowledge, which is marked by patents, licenses, and income generated from that and/or discovery, which is marked by prizes and citations and memberships and memberships and things like the national Academy of Science.

Centers and institutes may separate relatively small numbers of faculty from the department's disciplinary and professional homes and offer it these faculty-rich rewards aligning them broadly with managerial goals.

Interdisciplinarity greatest in the science and engineering, the usual explanation is that the nature of science is changing and it can't be encapsulated anymore by departments, by disciplines, and so biotechnology is always the example we get. However, that explanation does not take into consideration prolonged federal stimulus making the federal stimulus we see now look small of the life sciences as well as science and engineering - a point I will return to later.

The flipside of science and engineering and interdisciplinarity is forced merger. This happens periodically in research universities usually with crisis, particularly in public research university and the current fiscal crisis is increasingly common. Very often these force mergers are in the liberal arts. As with interdisciplinarity, generally, or even elected interdisciplinarity, which is of course possible, interdisciplinarity is likely to undermine the power of departments undercutting the basis of power, faculty power, within the organizations and again raising the problem of what happens when departments, disciplines, and professional associations' constituencies are fragmented.

So, that brings us now to fragmentation. And markers of fragmentation are increased use of part-timers and off-track or teaching faculty as the slide shows all faculty, all fields, have large numbers of part-timers. Those with fewer part-timers and the lowest rate of increase are engineering and the natural sciences and the health sciences. Those with the most part-timers and the greatest rate of increase are education followed by the humanities. Fields with many part-timers, but relatively low rates of increase are business and fine arts, but that is because they had lots of part-timers early on. The fields with the highest rate of fragmentation seem to be the liberal arts, the humanities, fine arts as well as women's professions and I could do a whole talk on what is happening to women given stratification, segmentation, and fragmentation.

I will spare you the tables on the decline of the faculty positions on offer in the fields and the low graduate stipends and fragmenting fields. I will just make one mention of another marker, which is the number of PhDs granted within fields. According to the NSF, the number of PhDs awarded for combined Liberal Arts and sciences are lowered by a factor of four then any single stem field and while social sciences combined award a respectable number of PhDs about half the number of any single stem field. There are nonetheless problems. For example, in sociology this year there were more joint and outside jobs on offer outside the discipline than within the discipline, suggesting a crisis in the field. Many of these jobs are in business schools.

The increasing degree of fragmentation raises the question of how long highly fragmented fields will remain viable at research universities. In other words, will these fields be able to continue engaging and teaching research and then service or may be they be pooled into interdisciplinary segmented units that concentrate primarily on teaching. Someone argued this is already happening.

Okay, expanded managerial capacity. That is segmentation of a different sort. Historically, faculty salaries were the largest cost at colleges and universities. While personnel is still the largest cost, full-time faculty are no longer the largest component. Instead, we have new human resources profiles at research universities. Where there are diminishing numbers of stratified, segmented, fragmented full-time faculty and increasing numbers of senior executives and chief functional officers and particularly many more non-academic professionals.

In fall of 2007, at the national postsecondary level, professional staff, nonacademic professionals without faculty status, constituted a greater share (53% of full-time professional employees) in postsecondary education than faculty members who are 47%.

Senior executives and chief functional officers make substantially more on average than faculty and they have multiplied, although there is great variation within each category. Anything medical makes more than anything else, including head football coaches. Otherwise, salaries generally follow the predictable pattern of academic deans with medicine, law, and business making more than anybody else. Even assistant deans average more than the average salary of a full professor, which is about \$110,000 at research universities. However, the greatest expansion of administrative capacity is the many personnel that serve the senior administrators and these are the functional categories over here of whom these people are. The greatest number are in business showing us that apparently it takes a very large number of persons to run a university like a business contrary to business itself, which strives to be mean and lean and flattened such as middle-management.

All of these areas have average salaries between \$55-\$60,000 except for academic affairs, which is lower and athletics which is higher. In other words, the academic salary is slightly below that of an assistant professor, but like faculty there is great variation within categories. These non-academic professionals are professionals often holding MAs and PhDs in specialized areas. They are often organized in professional associations, but are clear they are not on the research and publication track. Rather, they understand themselves as co-producing under graduate education through management of instruction or student services and more rarely through working research and managing innovation. And, of course, many of them audit faculty as Gaye will talk about in various ways.

Very often, as they say, they also want the privileges of professionals, development funds, meetings, presenting papers, and the time to do these things, but

there is tune to the bureaucratic side of the organization and often regard faculties obstacles to co-projection of higher education. Over time, nonacademic professionals are becoming more organized within the university as well, represented on committees, having voices in planning and policy and in professional associations outside. And the big thing, the most important part, is they constitute another segment within the university that attenuates the former structure of the university where a faculty constitutes a greatest number of personnel and were organized in departments and disciplines.

I don't have time to say why this happened and how it occurs, but I have written about it extensively. I do want to point out that the reason these changes occur is not only market rationality. For example, the growth in stem fields, particularly at the graduate level is not through... by undergraduate level is not driven by market demand. Indeed, these fields have been flat and the growth is due to federal research subsidies that are tied to an industrial research interests, particularly in the medical field and the hospitals is a whole other story and concern for economic growth. In other words, this is a way to stimulate the economy. It is not about market demand. Certainly, there is growth in some fields that are related to the market business and the very many professional fields that people go into and the movement away from the humanities and liberal arts is related to the search for job, because after all we are all in it for human capital now, as Chris pointed out. Even this depends on state grants of closure and monopoly to the various professions. It is not like there is pure market. Also, important is that the massification, which is the market growth of higher education since the 70s, has been tied to federalization, first through federal student financial aid and then by loans. Federalization has replaced a great deal of the state's contribution, but with different groups inside and outside of higher education benefiting.

For entrepreneurial science, there is little market discipline. Instead, we have state subsidized entrepreneurship with few penalties for failure and there are not nearly as many successes as there are failures. These changes are closely tied to stratification processes and the broader society that are not market rationale. For example, private-sector institutions in part have been able to accrue resources and prestige, because of changes in tax law ranging from giving to research credits. And the changes are deeply connected to valorization of the private sector, despite universities being either public or nonprofit. Leave us not forget that private universities also have a social and charitable mission, which is why they have nonprofit status. And I always say, "Well, why are we only talking about public universities, because private universities have many of the same obligations as do public with regard to that which they are supposed to do.

This brings us to the many theoretical issues raised by these changes in higher education. First, can we still see disciplines and professions historically positioned between the market and the state as able to maintain that balance, which conferred on them [a moto com](#) or as research universities become more stratified, segmented, and fragmented is the organizational power of department's disciplines, professions correspondingly diminished and what does that mean for the production,

organization, and management of various kinds of knowledge. Is it easier to make the kind of knowledge for everybody that you want? I think not. Does the autonomous fraction move to centers and institutes or other niches, while the majority are managed and audited.

Second, when we are talking about the current crisis in higher education whether with regard to the public good or dramatic fiscal shortfall. This subject of discourse is usually the higher education system as a whole or particular types of universities are talked about that usually has organizations within a field, research universities for example. Or, if a single institution is the topic the organization as a whole is usually the subject. In other words, the subject "higher education" is construed in the popular press, policy discourse, and even sociology is as a system, a field, or a bounded organization; however, the burden of my presentation is that higher education is stratified, segmented, and fragmented along relatively predictable fault lines that have deepened so far that it is very difficult to comprehend higher education as a system, a field, or a bounded organization. Instead, I think we have to start thinking of elite research universities as an organizational field separate from the rest of higher education as research universities is extremely divided within and is private research universities probably moving to constitute their own field and then we have to think about what that means for the kind of changes that Chris was talking about and these things may not be difficult to do. Thank you.

GAYE TUCHMAN: So what does that mean, if I hit green it goes to the next one. The thing is I am so short I cannot even see. Yeah, okay.

So, I am going to be more concrete than everybody, as it seems appropriate, because I was an English major and Chris who teaches English does statistics. I cannot really do that and, I face this interesting task of getting 23 pages of paper down to eight and a half, so I have taken a little long quotes and put them on slides and in that way I do not have to read them, which I felt was a really keen idea.

Bob was good enough to read my paper beforehand and told me that it was depressing, so I also used the opportunity to make as many jokes as possible in the Power Points, and I am reading and that is another reason I did Power Points, because I am going to be talking about Wannabe University and I like to do that with a high degree of precision and not just slip in my words.

Okay, so while identifying diversity as a strategic goal. Universities are reducing the funds available for actions that might help to combat the unequal freedom of some working-class and poor minorities. These rescissions matter for minority access to higher education encourages substantive citizenship. This paper ignores universities front stage platitudes to examine some of the backstage processes that grant priority to goals other than diversity. I emphasized a categorization, commensuration, and internal bureaucratic processes that render some programs more vulnerable to rescissions than others.

Diversity among college graduates is supposedly a long-range national goal, but political opposition makes it difficult to achieve even on a local level, for the corporate administrators who currently serve as the top administrators in higher education tend to tackle problems that can be solved in the short term and this is not a short-term problem.

My data are drawn from over 6 years of participant observation at Wannabe University, a flagship institution in the Northern United States. A footnote says it shows I chose it because it was an easy commute. The last time I was asked I said it was Oregon. Compare it to its chosen peers; Wannabe U has a good record, a good metrics on diversity. It employs a higher percentage of minority faculty than those other universities and it received an award for the retention rate and six-year graduation rate of its African-American students. In its dedication to its business plan Wannabe U also typifies contemporary nonprofit colleges and universities. The associated use of metrics pervades higher education and measurement as consequences. While it may seem to indicate how well an organization is meeting its goals. The metrics about diversity represent a primer and how to lie with statistics. To an unfortunate extent, good numbers may indicate bad practices.

The ebb and flow of cases reported to Wannabe U's Office of Discrimination and Equity over 2 decades illustrates how good numbers, low reports of discrimination, may mean bad practices significant perceived discrimination.

The office is mandated by statute to investigate illegal forms of discrimination including harassment and also serves as a preliminary investigative unit for campus complaints that are reported to its states commission on human rights and opportunities.

When the offices caseload was low, many women and members of racial minorities felt that discrimination was so rampant that it was useless to complain. When the caseload seemed high, people seemed to feel that bringing a discriminatory situation to the attention of people in the Office of Discrimination and Equity just might bring good results.

In the 1980s, and early 1990s, very few people complained about discrimination to the office. For the unit seemed to specialize in showing people the way. Such practices guaranteed a very low caseload. Asked why she and her colleagues did not file a complaint about the sexual harassment said to be rampant in her department, a female professor shrugged, "Why bother? No one will do anything." The Office of Diversity had already dismissed what some professors in that department had identified as a case of discrimination in hiring ethnic. Ultimately, the director of the office displayed such an unenthusiastic approach to investigating cases of discrimination that she was encouraged to retire.

In the early years of this century, the new director initiated more aggressive investigations as directed by a new vice provost for multicultural affairs. The

university had to hire additional lawyers to investigate the soaring workload - over 60 cases a year. Its director asked colleagues at other universities about their caseloads, only to learn that wannabe's was typical for excise.

Then, in 2007, someone on the staff of Wannabe's newest president decided that the heavy caseload "made the university look bad." As if there were lots of discrimination, and so advised the director to decrease the caseload.

Now, there are two associated ways to accomplish that goal. The first is to discourage people from filing complaints with outside bodies. One may advise a group of women, "You have a good case of mixed discrimination here, race and gender discrimination set in the context of bad departmental management, but if you go to the human rights commission it will be expensive and I do not think he will win."

The second method is to discourage people from even consulting with the Office of Diversity and Equity. The first method can achieve the second. Consider the reaction of members of the group that had been advised not to file a formal complaint, because of expenses and the probability of failure. "That was certainly a waste of time." I wouldn't encourage anyone to go there to the ODE. They didn't help us. Even on a large campus, word gets around.

The notion that it is worthless to complain indicates either the presence or perception of discrimination.

An alternative explanation might be that the complainers too sensitive or as a white member of the men's track team once told me "The black guys on the team say that were prejudice, but they are just much too sensitive." Thus, the paradox, better numbers may indicate a worse situation. Bad numbers, many cases, may indicate the perception that the top administrators want to eliminate discrimination, but bad numbers are also a public relations nightmare; a stress on the metric obfuscates what is going on.

Categories supposedly provide clean definitions for messy lives. One of the universities definitions of minorities are typical and hide the wide range of experiences reported by members of ethnic groups, especially those of people of color. Like other universities, Wannabes fact books and reports to trustees, governments, and official organizations, such as the NCAA used the U.S. Census categories. Documents designed for other purposes such as compliance with anti-discrimination laws include more categorical possibilities.

Roughly 8 years ago, Wannabes Office of Multiculturalism issued a plan that made clear that the categories did not capture how students, faculty, or staff experienced life on campus. I had to put in all the little dots, because otherwise no one could read it.

Unfortunately, social science sophistication of this statement did not indicate broad acceptance of the plans definition of minorities or even a desire to eliminate racism and sexism on campus. The board of trustees accepted the plan, it did not approve it, when in 2006 a committee appointed by the then provost wrote a new mission statement for Wannabe U and forgot to mention diversity. Also, some people did not think that there was sufficient racism or sexism on campus even to necessitate a diversity plan. The university's own research indicates that relatively few white students believe that faculty, staff, or the university engaged in racial discrimination.

One final note here, to some extent, Wannabe U has used the census categories to support students of color, because it was forced to do so. Prompted by student sit-ins, 1968 - a good year, instances of racism, such as white students spitting on Asian-American students in 1987 as they all rode a bus to a semi-formal dance and faculty, staff, and student pressure, Wannabe funds and houses five cultural centers also. Although it might have been inspired by best practices also known as the isomorphism of contemporary American higher education, the Wannabe U Administration decided to establish an Office of Institutional Effectiveness, an Office of University Relations, an Institute for Student Success, and A Teaching and Learning Institute - all on its own, but it was pushed to found these minority centers.

Like many other colleges and universities, Wannabe U has also used the census categories to play minorities against each other, especially in terms of admission. Wannabe's reports on admission lump all minorities together and so hide the vast inequalities on the campus and in the state.

I am going to show you something differentiated though. Lumping enables the office of enrollment management and planning to meet its state's dual mandates. To educate the best and to educate first-generation college students and low-income students. In this context, first-generation and low income are euphemisms for minority, but the Office of Admissions judiciously selects between and within minorities in a way that appears to make Wannabe U seem more selective and helps it to clamor up the rungs of US News and World Report Ratings.

At issue here, are a series of correlations and including the association between income and race ethnicity. We all know those correlations. The census' racial categories tend to be associated with income and wealth. Within categories, there are vast disparities by root country, socioeconomic status, and generation because Wannabe U follows common practice and does not distinguish within groups it reproduces inequality while it espouses diversity. Wannabe U lumps all students of color in the diversity roles of its strategic plan. Not only has the plan failed to specify subgroups within census categories, but it does not even break out the overarching census categories, thus Wannabe U discusses - sorry, Wannabe U disguises the over representation of whites and Asian-Americans and the under-representation of African-Americans and Latinos. Indeed, the over-representation of Asian-Americans has been growing. They are even more over-represented as first-year students in the honors program, where African American and Latino students are virtually absent. I do not

want any one to think that I mean that there should be a cuff in the Asian-American students, but I do think that they might use something other than GREs to decide who goes in the honors program. I do not want to suggest either that most Asian-American students are wealthy while most African-American undergraduates are poor and that the parents of the Asian-Americans are college-educated and those of the African Americans are not, that would not be true.

There are lots of meaningful variations within and between categories. To paraphrase a Wannabe student “intersectionality rules by hiding variations.” Lumping makes it appear as though Wannabe U is fulfilling its diversity plan. Nonetheless, there are items that lumping cannot hide such as Wannabe’s failure to increase the proportion of underrepresented minorities on its faculty. Underrepresented minorities is a euphemism of course for black, Latino, and Native American. The university does not provide funds to identify and court minority faculty in nontraditional ways, especially since those methods might be expensive.

In 2009, a new vice president who is not an academic, shifted blame to the faculty, who as Evie pointed out in an essay, “Don’t always do the right thing.” The vice president complained that professors always find something wrong with minority candidates. Other administrators added, “Administrators are like politicians, they respond to pressure, but professors did not pressure them, their deans and so the deans did not pressure the provost and so we cannot have more minority faculty.”

Such recriminations do not alter the university’s failure.

Finally, the bureaucratic structure of the university and the drive for economy, efficiency, and effectiveness are keys to how the rescissions affected Wannabe U’s five cultural centers and so it is minority population.

Bureaucratic programs necessarily involve responsibility and accountability and wisest budgets. Administrators who found successful programs may receive promotions and raises at Wannabe U’s or at the next place; however, taking over an existing program that does not have meaningful political and financial backing is a no-win situation.

An ambitious administrator does not want to be responsible for programs that are not receiving adequate funds, which their bosses do not seem to favor and which do not have easily fulfilled short-range goals - that is a pretty dumb administrator.

I already suggested that Wannabe U administrators excel at adapting others best practices. Many that I have mentioned are associated with the general expansion of middle managers in academe.

Administrators tend to lull the programs that they have initiated or copied as opposed to the programs that were forced on them recall. “Some students, faculty,

and staff, who occupy the pockets of diversity scattered around campus,” that is a quote, “pushed administrators to establish complex diversity programs.”

Even before the great recession support for diversity programs waned. When the head of the board of trustees energetically backed diversity programs the top administrators did so, but when the man's term was over and the new head did not signal the diversity was a top priority, support for the programs declined. This lack of enthusiasm has organizational ramifications. Unless someone, with considerable power and influence is enthusiastic about a program that most managers want to ignore, the program will wither.

At Wannabe U, the lack of enthusiasm for diversity programs identify them as prime candidates for rescissions, especially because newly created programs designed to help everyone, not just minorities, complain to have superseded them and other managers did claim credit even for Wannabe U's award for relatively high African American retention and graduation rate.

Faced with severe cutbacks and state support and guided by the Wannabe U's business plan, Wannabe's board and his top administrators introduced rescissions and other measures. Every department in the university would give back 3½% of its budget and some of those monies would be redistributed to the programs that represented the best investment, such as fuel cell development and nanotechnology.

The five cultural centers and four minority academic programs were not candidates for investment.

Academic departments try to make the required cuts without firing the unionized personnel. The women's studies program eliminated courses that graduate students were scheduled to teach. Since the president had also dissolved the bureaucratic structure of the academic minority programs, without providing any structure, the rescissions exacerbated tensions among these programs.

The rescissions created a dire problem for the cultural centers since the rescinded monies represented over fully half of their programming. Although many units labored under the disadvantage that no one understood their activities. The diversity programs had a series of added problems. They were a political football. Why should there be special spaces for members of racial ethnic groups? Since there were not revenue streams, they seemed both redundant and expensive and also the ordinary processes of classification and commensuration showed that white people from even beginning to understand the experiences of minorities on American college campuses. So, the final element, individual prejudice; the literature is vast. Ethnographers have expressed dismay at the racism found in college dorms. I was surprised at the extent of student complaints about the knowing and unknowing racist remarks of Wannabe U faculty. Some of the Wannabe administrators have displayed an extraordinary lack of cultural competence.

The unthinking white adults helped to discourage minority students from using some of the programs designed for all undergraduates and instead encourages them to use the cultural centers as a refuge and that search for comfort encourages unthinking white undergraduates to complain of the students of color, segregate themselves.

Like other aspects of culture, prejudice accumulates from structure. Structural inequality is notoriously resistant to platitudes. Altering structural inequality and the unequal freedoms associated with it, cost time, effort, and money, neither earn the statements and their strategic plan nor good intentions are enough.

EVELYN NAKANO GLENN: Thank you panelists for wonderful presentations and I also like that phrase “unequal freedom.” I like that phrase “unequal freedom.” Yeah, thank you. I was referring to my book. I do not think on purpose.

Okay, so we do not have a lot of time left and we have a whole passel of commentators, so, yeah, why don't I do that and also if you can restrict you know yourself. I may have to use a hook or something this time.

Okay, so I will just do this in the order that I have them, or actually maybe I should say Clarence Lo Associate Professor of Sociology and Director of Graduate Studies at The University of Missouri, Columbia. He is also the core organizer of the session. Then Anthony Orum, who teaches at the University of Illinois at Chicago. Then there is Robert Perucci, who is Professor of Sociology at Purdue. Then Alessandro Bonanno, who is a distinguished professor of sociology and chair at Sam Houston State University. Finally, there is Victoria Johnson who is associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Missouri Columbia. So a combination of shortness and perhaps quickly talking the way I am talking right now, we could probably get through this. Okay.

CLARENCE LO: Okay thank you Evie, it is a real pleasure to be with such distinguished speakers.

I would just like to go to back to some of the points each of the speakers made and Chris mentioned you know culture and what was at stake and all of these controversies about the university and I think that is like an absolutely crucial question. There are, I think your book provides an answer to this. It is about the middle class. It is about two visions of the middle class. One, is you mentioned development. Is democratic development for inclusive coalition of the middle class, working class, and minorities? I think that here you find the possibilities of the hope of the expansion of citizenship. It is a public agenda as you point out. It is a very powerful vision of what the middle class and what it can be become and I think it has inspired the world. Unfortunately, what has come to pass is another vision of the middle class, which is you have a bunch of individual entrepreneurs making money. Experts rule “emphasis on

rule” and you have a hierarchy of global competitiveness, by which the United States scrambles to be on top.

I think that all of this becomes racialized and is a vision of the middle class where a certain segment of it triumphs and does not care about the other folks in the middle class. I think it is uncomfortable to think this but this is the culture that is led to the tech boom and to the waves of capital accumulation.

I think what Chris puts together in this book is that it is this culture that was so promoted by the right wing in the attacks on the university, the attacks on affirmative action, of Horowitz, all of those folks.

I often wondered “Why are doing this?” “Why are they beating us to death?” It really is to establish this other vision of the middle-class, which leads to the type of economy that they want and what it represents to me is a fusion of the economic side of the right and the cultural side of the right. It is a tremendously powerful synthesis and to the extent that they can pull it off we’re really sunk, but anyway that is what is at stake and it is not only the economy, but it is also values. I think the stakes, you know, are very, very high.

Turning very quickly to Sheila Slaughter’s excellent talk and her books on academic capitalists, you really have to read them; I mean that you know this is only 20-minute presentations - you’ve gotta read em’, because she does in these books answer the question, you know, “How does it happen?” And that is the question Sheila raised and did not have time to answer. The books really tell us, you need, these are not just trends, you need agency. You need activism on the part of the elites and Slaughter and Rhodes talk about the institutions, the networks and more important the intermediaries between the public and private sector that are blurring the lines between public and private. This is not just something that is kind of randomly falling apart, there specific organizations that are kind of pushing the privatization and commercialization agenda and just one of them, that I recently became familiar with, is The League for Innovation. It sounds like a great title, but you really have to look at what they are doing, which leads me to Tuchman’s point, which is all of us in academia have to kind of think that we are doing good. Our conceptions of what we’re doing, our conceptions of reform are super crucial of this and here Tuchman’s turn to social constructionism. I think it is a really powerful tool to probe into the legitimacy side of the current battles in the university and some of the details that in Wannabe U are just, they are really fun, and I kind of added one of my own. It is, I think symbolic interaction’s important and how the word and the concept of faculty. That is a social construction, that is just not us, that’s just you know our salaries our economics. It is a social construct. Administrators, that’s also a social construction and to bring it close to home, how often have we heard, you know faculty talking about administrators, who do they think they are? How often do we have administrators talking about faculty, who do they think they are? Precisely, see these are great questions it raises, you know, very vividly the questions of identity and labeling, that are really crucial if you are going to have, if you are going to have a process that leads to commercialization and so forth. It is not only theories of the state

and so forth and institutions. You really have to take it down to the interactional level, especially at the university, because everybody's got to justify themselves and the justifications have to be looked up and looked at and decoded. Slaughter and Rhoades mention **fuoco** (sp). There really is a very crucial sense which the ideas are about not only the good life, but the good university have to be deconstructed and seen in terms of power relations and contemporary policy and the books actually do this. I mean it is impossible to do it in a 20 minute talk, so you gotta read the books and that will kind of bring you up to date. Thank you.

ANTHONY ORUM: Okay, I will be brief and allow my fellow panelists and members of the audience to make their own points. I have not read your books, but I have enjoyed your presentations a lot and I just want to echo a few things graphically and then raise a little bit of some other questions.

First, in terms of my own, speaking only of my experience at University of Illinois Chicago, I came in as head of sociology in 1986 in the college of liberal arts and sciences where there were about 500 faculty positions. Today, there are 330 faculty positions and you know this is what we are working with. It is very graphic, I mean it is not you know way up there, it is down on the ground.

When there is a loss of resources, some departments are protected more than others and those tend to be departments like biology or even psychology and the social sciences, which is rationalized, while they bring in a lot of money. The latest dean's report is, brings in lot of money, so this is on the ground stuff that is really happening that you have to deal with at the universities.

Second, you know I have been aware, I have not studied this issue, but have been aware of the growing gap between the resources of private universities and then a handful of public universities - Michigan, Texas, Ohio State, and public universities that you know that is happening. You have the private plus a few public and then the other public. It is not just, I mean it is evidence, I guess we all get interested in what the respective salaries are, but more than the salaries it seems to me is what is happening is an affect on our students at the public schools. The students of public schools simply do not have the resources or the opportunities that the students have at private schools. This is not abstract. It means that in our words students of private schools can go study abroad into nicely funded programs that can't happen to students of public universities where you can have various kinds of programs, small grants for students and so on. That can happen at private schools, that can't happen at public universities. It means that, you know, in the end it is going to result in stratification, but on a day-to-day basis they are just the absence of the failure resources and it's affecting the education of these kids and the kids who come to schools like mine are not even aware of what they aren't getting.

Third, just to kind of capture this, this is the historian in me, post-World War II there was this kind of massive growth in public education and public universities and making, you know, development of the middle class. What in effect is happening,

as you tell your stories, is were being rolled back to the age of elite schools, back to the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and that's a terrible thing. That should make many, many people angry.

Okay, now, next point. What's missing, I mean it comes in tangentially, what is missing is this kind of, and I hesitate to say it because it is kind of depressing, is the global restructuring of the economy and the effects of educational institutions. China is now able to invest a lot more money in its universities than we are in the United States and I think the effect is going to be, I mean we can fight all of the fights we want between, in the growing gap between private and public schools here, but other countries where this restructuring has happened have more money, to you know, to fund their educational institutions and that is going to have, it seems to me, a profound effect as well.

And last, and this is kind of I asked myself the question, the old Leninist question, "What can be done?" I saw my colleagues this year at UIC when the dean was fighting, you know fighting, we got to cut this and we got that. Many of my colleagues were on the front line, really working hard and fighting back and they, in the words of the head of my department, Barbara Riseman, there was push back and they managed to save some things. The real question is to you, "What can be done on the ground at a single school given the trajectory of these kinds of changes?" "What can be done in terms of mass politics?" "What can students do?" "And what can teachers do to somehow resist this in an effective way?"

ROBERT PERUCCI: Okay, I am going to use my time just to do a couple of things, oh sorry, we got one here. We have got two of them. I am blinded by the light.

First, I will want to reinforce something that Sheila Slaughter said and several people have commented. Whenever we examine higher education it is extremely important that we recognize that it is a highly stratified system. If we really want to understand what is happening in higher ED., we have to look at it in its stratified form. There are about 2000 colleges and universities out there. There are about 200 so-called research one universities and then there may be 20 or 30 "elite universities." Okay? Life is very different in those settings whether you are talking about salary, who does what, who you know does anything. You have to analyze it in terms of that structure. I mean, that is just sort of essential.

The other thing I want to do is just leave you with a couple of historical markers that maybe will help you to ask questions about where we are today as our presenters described it. It is not a happy picture, but I think the problems of higher education have preceded the current crisis. They have been boiling for quite some time and their related in my view to the stratification of higher education, but I would like to give you a couple of historical markers, because they are sort of amusing, but you could maybe ask the question, "What happened?"

In 1967 John Kenneth Galbraith published a book called *The New Industrial State*. In that book, Galbraith described, among other things, the shift in the center of power in American society was moving from those who control the wealth to those who controlled knowledge and he said those who controlled knowledge are what he called the scientific and educationalist state. He really meant Harvard, but he was too much of a gentleman to say so, okay. But he said the shift of power was profound. He somehow did not recognize that well of course the shift of power was taking place, but if you have wealth, maybe you buy knowledge, maybe you can find a way to get the benefits of knowledge. What Galbraith was saying that knowledge was suddenly being recognized as a powerful commodity that had payoff, major payoff, and so people started thinking about how can I benefit from that knowledge, okay. That's the first historical marker in 1967.

The second historical marker is about 1970. I have taught organizational theory for many years, but in 1970, the most frequently used description of higher education as a form of organization came out of the system's literature and the term was called "a loosely coupled system." Higher ED. was "a loosely coupled system." It meant that interactions, connections among units, among people were weak, were uncoordinated. There was little effort to take measure of things. There is a marvelous quote, I always attribute to Art Stinchcombe, I believe he said it, I do not know, but he was commenting on, you remember the Edsel car that Henry Ford Junior thought he was going to make his mark. It was the ugliest car ever built and it was recognized immediately that it was a dog. Nobody would buy it, okay? So the Edsel disappeared, just like that from the production line. Well Art Stinchcombe's brilliant insight was, he said, "You know, if the Edsel had been an academic department it would still be there." That was in 1967, okay? That was the era of loose coupling and loose coupling was a powerful feature of higher ED, because it was felt to be a strength of higher ED, this loose coupling, because it led to innovation. It led to risk taking. It led to reduction of failures throughout the system. If your unit tried something new and it bombed it did affect anybody else, you just bombed and forget about it, okay. That is two historical markers, Galbraith and loose coupling an organization theory.

Then in 1973, the Carnegie Commission releases for the first time a pecking order in higher education. The Carnegie classification of research institutions and I do not think it is an accident, but I know that I am not a conspiracy type, that, that Carnegie classification occurs then. What Carnegie sets in motion the beginning of what is going to become 30 years of measurement, classification, metrics, how to get the most out of everything, that is the type coupling takes place. Loose coupling shifts to type coupling, thus now the resources have to be husbanded or overseen. So, we have 1967, 1970, and 1973 with Carnegie. If you put all that together in a view of a highly stratified system of higher education, my argument is that what we are seeing today is a product of intense competition among elite universities, among Gaye Tuchman's wannabes, who are in that set of 200, and they're all playing the same game to try to get the most that they can out of the knowledge that they are producing. Knowledge production, knowledge transmission, that takes place in only a relatively small number of schools, okay? Most everybody else is out of the game. They may be trying hard, they're

Gaye's wannabes, but they are not even close, but they still play the game. They still come up with their strategic plans. They come up with their metrics of measurement and every president says were going to join the top, "mmm" you know by the end of the "mmm" year. And that is it. I mean that is impossible, right? It ain't gonna happen, right? Who is the guy in Minnesota, is it Minnesota, where everybody's above average? Well you know it is crazy. It is just insane. Anyway what else can I say? If you want to know more about this I have a paper with two colleagues David Whitlock (sp), I want to advertise them, and Monjula Subramaniam (sp). We have a paper on Social Closure, Intellectual Closure, and Knowledge and Power in the Corporate University, where we tell the whole story, all the dirty secrets, okay. Thank you.

ALESSANDRO BONANNO: I am going to be incredibly brief. It is very clear that public universities are under attack, but it is also very clear as Bob just said that there are many different types of universities in this country and the presentations that we heard talked primarily about research 1 institutions. Our greatest students that are present here that will present papers at this conference will find jobs mostly not in research 1 institutions, but in other universities. So I think we need to pay attention to this differences and also we need to pay attention to a number of challenges that are in effect part of the university system, but also part of the so-called broader market. I come from Texas and we in Texas pioneered the market system, at least in the new era of the 21<sup>st</sup> century and a member of the higher education coordinating board theorized to me that Texas should not invest in PhD programs, because PhD programs lose money, so what we need to do is, instead ask other states to train our PhD students and then they will come to Texas because we have money, and they will come to work for us, but we do not have to pay for them. That is very dangerous. I think that is something that perhaps our panelists have in their notes, but it did not say and I think it is very, very, very dangerous.

The other dangerous thing I think that did not come out from the discussion, but I would like the panelists to comment on is the other type of attack. Another member of the Texas Coordinating Board said that the best way to do education these days is to have online courses, teach all of our major classes online, because we do not need a place-based university. In other words we do not need the buildings. We do not need campuses. We do not need our offices, because everything is going to be online, so think about these savings.

This is an incredible attack, because it is happening. It is not a theoretical proposition, it is an empirical fact and what is happening there is an attack from private institutions that have nothing to do with higher education even though they use the word higher education they call themselves universities and the use name of important cities in this country.

Well, what they do basically, they take out of our system what is profitable, perhaps it is true that PhD programs do not make money, but it is also true that large undergraduate programs that bring a lot of involvement, can bring money to universities. They do bring monies to the universities, but these are the targets of these outfits. They

come and suck blood out of universities, so it is not just public funding. It is the entire system that has brought about by the idea of the instrumentalization of education through the market. So, it is clear from the presentations and the comments tonight that this is a system that needs to be changed. What seems to me that is unclear is how do we do it. How do we fight back, because we have all kind of ideas, but we need to bring up the instruments to bring these ideas to fruition.

VICTORIA JOHNSON: I am going to briefly follow up on some of the comments made by the other panelists as well as the people who presented papers. I am at the University of Missouri right now and our goal is not so much to be a wannabe, it is what the provost said to me just recently in a provost faculty council gathering, that if we are \$40 million in the hole next year we are not going to be here and in light of that concern the use of the economic recession and Missouri has been under-funding its educational system for quite a long time. The idea of, you know being thrown out, that Cornell now has a new curriculum, market-driven model of business that we might have to go all online. I noticed you laugh Clarence, surprise, because the provost was talking about that.

So, I am just want to say briefly in light of what has been said here is that we are recognizing the degradation and the quality of education. We are seeing discrimination, we are seeing impression management by administration that things look fine, you know, at least in Missouri that is what I see through the legislature, everything is fine and dandy as we are being eroded from within. We are seeing fragmentation; we are seeing less tenure-track faculty. And a lot of this is undermining the quality of education. All of the rhetoric about change and innovation that's being thrown out to change the university is driven by economic interest. I hear no one asked about the quality of education or how well students learn in distance courses, etc. And to me the bigger question that was coming up in terms of, for example collapse of empire that was being noted, that the university is part of a larger development that Clarence was alluding to with values or cultural hegemony of neoliberalism and I was not hearing that directly addressed that over the last 30 years we have seen a proliferation of think tanks. We have seen media outlets formed and political discourse that is producing generations of people who, it is difficult for them to conceptualize what the public is or that public interest has any real meaning other than some condescending smile.

Now, the media is now owned by about five major conglomerates and there is very little public interest coverage on the media. University is the next step institutionally, the last kind of bastion where we can produce knowledge that is critical of the economic or political system. A market driven strategy undermines that and it also undermines the kind of education essential for citizenship for critical thinking, for the production of knowledge that can make sense of what is going on in the world around us.

So, what I am taking from this and what it appears to be is that there is this much larger issue and challenge that the challenge for the universities is not just about more funding for us, although I do think that would actually help quite a bit, but it

is challenging the entire ideology of neoliberalism and the idea that the market is market determinism that the politicking no longer exists that the public is some kind of fiction that everything can be fixed and more efficient and happier and more prosperous if we all use these market strategies in academia which are disastrous and more research needs to be done on that, but so that is what I would argue and we need to move toward and too much more engagement with the public, national strategies by professional associations as well as a professional, I mean discipline-based associations as well as professional faculty associations and also some universities are thinking about different kinds of tenure now for the non-tenure-tracked faculty who you know work years after years after years and that might be something else that would be a little bit more innovative that could guarantee tenure in the short term to some of these faculty.

EVELYN NAKANO GLENN: Thank you very much. I think we are down to a few minutes and I was originally going to open up the microphones, but what I suspect it is kind of a burning issue for the you know commentators and perhaps for the audience is for the presenters to maybe suggest what can be done, what in the form of activism, you know are there pockets of hope out there, so that we don't necessarily end with what is kind of daunting.

It is daunting and we at the University of California, you know at Berkeley, have save faculty organization and so the question is what is going to be happening within the next year, so perhaps each of you can make a brief kind of statement of what you think needs to be done, can be done.

GAYE TUCHMAN: I do not think it is all a question of China is able to and we can't. China chooses to and we do not. I think that Chris figures on where the money has been increasing are very telling. One of the best ways to get more money to the universities is to legalize marijuana and I am really serious about that, because when you have rules, laws, that say 3 strikes and you are in there forever for having a little bit of marijuana on you, you have just taken an immense amount of money away from education and the person who is sitting in there in jail would do much, much better if he or she got to go to university.

I think it would be possible to take money away from athletics. Athletics departments, you don't even know what kind of money they have and I mean that seriously, because there is no uniform way of budgeting athletics. I sat on the athletics committee at my university for a while and there are all kinds of things tucked here and there that were quite impressive.

I think that would also be possible to get more money by changing how one deals with the middle managers. Every time we hire a middle manager the middle manager gets a secretary and administrative assistant. So, one is hiring 3 people, not one people. One of my colleagues was on a committee with someone whom we had recently hired and the new middle manager said have your secretary call my secretary

and my colleague was up going, huh? You know, there are 26 of us who do not have a secretary, you know. As for the online courses, I do not think that is going to make money at all. I personally manage a small department of 4 graduate students who are my TAs in a course of 320 people. I consider myself as supporting the folks over in biology. There is no way that anybody can teach 320 people online like that. Teaching online is labor-intensive. Teaching large courses is not labor-intensive. It is very silly to think that online is going to solve it and as for the issue of the media I do not think that the question is the ownership, though the ownership problem is extraordinarily severe. The other problem is the new technologies and the 24/7 news cycle, which absolutely guarantees shovelware that is to say people sitting in news offices cribbing from other news sources. These days a reporter is, a hard news reporter is responsible for 5 or 6 stories a day. When I wrote Making News, a reporter, a hard news reporter was responsible for one story a day and thought that was really an awful lot of work. The people these days who have some kind of leeway in the news that they produce are of all people the people who were doing feature stories. They only have to do 2 stories a week.

VICTORIA JOHNSON: Let me just clarify we are talking about Fox News and right-wing talk radio, which is about 95% of talk radio right now.

GAYE TUCHMAN: Oh, okay.

VICTORIA JOHNSON: That's, that's what I meant, there are new outlets in the last 15 years.

GAYE TUCHMAN: Well I don't, they're not even the worst, because even if you have those disgusting conservative outlets, the problem is that when you have a certain kind of uniformity, which is what we now have and the kind of information that is being shoveled from one newspaper to the next or one television station to the next. There are very, very few alternative sources of information that people have available.

SHEILA SLAUGHTER: Just a few things, and one thing is sadly a lot of students want to go to university, because they want to get jobs that pay and we have to remember that when we say we want to change the world and things like that I mean we were the economists, we could blame them, human capital theory and all of that, but that is a reason that we have mass higher education along with federalization and everything else, so we can't forget that students even if they want to explore liberal arts and sociology and all of that also want to end up with a job and that we, we have to think about that I think, which we often don't.

The other thing I think is in the media that somebody what can be done now. The only thing that I can ever think of at research universities since that's where most of us are, is to organize by college not wait to organize the way people are organizing now, because it won't happen. You are not going to organize the University of California into a university, because too many people aren't going to play, but there are parts of the University of California that would organize, but that calls for a new

approach to how we think about how you can bring faculty together and it would call for faculty then to be able to say the things like Gaye is saying and we don't want athletics and things like that and see what happened, but, you know, I think faculty have to do more than lobby for their own fields, which is primarily and sadly what professional associations do now. Sorry about that.

CHRIS NEWFIELD: You know, 2 things very quickly. First is, what is to be done. Faculty have to start fighting for their money. For transparency, for clarity about cross subsidies for the end of certain kinds of back deals and corruption that are hurting us and that are hurting our students. I think it is just sort of willful ignorance and passivity and also a lot of us at research universities especially a lot of individual side deals that have allowed faculty to get away with not doing that. This is what my talk was really about is budgetary clarity that would reverse, will keep us from being so poor. I mean that is the first thing.

The second thing is the flipside to that. We have been playing defense my whole adult life. I mean I was in college during the period that your really good book Clarence is about prop 13 and the beginning of the first great victory for the right against public services and against public development, common development, and what the other thing has to happen on all of our campuses and we are going to be doing it in different ways and in spite of the fragmentation that you quite rightly described as a major structural problem is articulating what our positive vision is and I have tried to start to do that today, which is egalitarian mutual development. The first middle class, if you want to call it that, the inclusive, the multiracial for a country that can actually live in the world without having to dominate it and without having to spend its last dollar doing that. I mean that is what we stand for. We stand for forms of invention, forms of vision, forms of work, pleasure, and of satisfaction and placement in society; that is who we are. And we have not done a good job of describing our positive vision - who we are, why we are in this, why the university matters, and why the university is going to get us out of a death spiral.

ROBERT PERUCCI: Just one minute. I would like to just say something positive as well. I think there is hope for real change in what is now, you know, in universities referred to as service learning programs, engagement programs, because I think they have the potential for permitting faculties, departments, colleges to form new alliances, new links, primarily with underserved populations, underserved groups. I am talking about the aged, the homeless, the incarcerated. I think that there is great potential for new, I don't want to call it linkages, ties, affiliations between academic programs and these marginalized groups that exist in all communities in large cities and those are sources of power, whether you believe it or not. Those are sources of power if they can be mobilized and university faculty, some, if they are inclined, can work to mobilize those groups.

EVELYN NAKANO GLENN: Well, thank you very much, both to the panelists and to the commentators for a really thought-provoking session. It was

everything that Clarence and I had hoped for and raises a lot of the basic questions about citizenship that is the theme of the meetings. So, thank you very much.