

TRANSFORMING UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

**Theory that Compels and
Practices that Succeed**

Edited by Donald W. Harward

Case Studies Edited by Ashley P. Finley

ROWMAN & LITTLEFIELD PUBLISHERS, INC.
Lanham • Boulder • New York • Toronto • Plymouth, UK

Published by Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
A wholly owned subsidiary of The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.
4501 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 200, Lanham, Maryland 20706
<http://www.rowmanlittlefield.com>

Estover Road, Plymouth PL6 7PY, United Kingdom

Copyright © 2012 by Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without written permission from the publisher, except by a reviewer who may quote passages in a review.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Information Available

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Transforming undergraduate education : theory that compels and practices that succeed / edited by Donald W. Harward.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.


ISBN 978-1-4422-0674-8 (cloth : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-1-4422-0676-2 (ebook)

1. Education, Higher—Aims and objectives—United States. 2. Education, Higher—United States—Philosophy. 3. Education, Higher—United States—Administration. 4. Universities and colleges—United States. I. Harward, Donald W.

LA227.A.T73 2012

378.73—dc23

2011020661

™ The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992.

Printed in the United States of America

Contents

<i>Forewords</i>	ix
<i>Julie J. Kidd (President, Christian A. Johnson Endeavor Foundation)</i>	
<i>Sally Engelhard Pingree (President, S. Engelhard Center)</i>	
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xv
<i>Introduction</i>	1

**PART I:
The Theoretical Arguments and Themes**

3
Donald W. Harward

**PART II:
The Issues, Rationale, Constraints, and Practices**

1	A Copernican Moment: On the Revolutions in Higher Education	37
	<i>David M. Scobey (The New School, New York)</i>	
2	The Ideals of the Liberal Artisan: Notes toward an Evolving Group Biography	51
	<i>Catharine R. Stimpson (New York University)</i>	
3	The Theories, Contexts, and Multiple Pedagogies of Engaged Learning: What Succeeds and Why?	73
	<i>Lynn E. Swaner (Consultant, Former Bringing Theory to Practice National Evaluator)</i>	

1

A Copernican Moment

On the Revolutions in Higher Education

David M. Scobey

Having become aware of these defects, I often considered whether there could perhaps be found a more reasonable arrangement of circles.

—Nicolaus Copernicus, *Commentariolus*

Change does not take place in a vacuum; and neither do calls for change. The chapters in this volume offer a vision of educational renewal that is grounded in a shared sense of discontent with the current state of the American academy. The crux of that vision, in my view, is a commitment to educating undergraduates as complex, integral, social beings: educating them through practices that braid their studies *outwardly* with the world of civic responsibility and purposeful, productive work and *inwardly* with ethical reflection, emotional development, and self-authoring. The chapters draw appreciatively on some of the deepest traditions in American liberal education and some of the best practices on American campuses. Yet they compose, as the title of the book underscores, a call for transformation, not rededication.

My aim here is to set that call in historical relief, to illuminate the context in and against which it has emerged. As a partisan for change and a historian whose trade is to study it, I want to offer a map of the present moment—in the academy and in the academy's relationship with the larger society—to which the ideas and proposals in this book pose a response. How is the educational landscape evolving? To what extent do troubling trends in undergraduate education reflect larger conditions—institutional, economic, demographic, technological—that enable and constrain the possibilities of innovation in the academy? In the face of such conditions,

what type of educational reform is desirable (or possible, or inevitable) at this moment? Even under the best of circumstances, when the story is long past, historical perspective is difficult. A history of the present is much more fraught. But that is what I aim to sketch.

The most fundamental aspect of the current situation, however, is as clear as it is complicated. This book's brief for change comes at a time when the academy is in the throes of change. Partisans in current education battles may strenuously debate how to design curricula, assess learning outcomes, or make college affordable; but there is widespread agreement that higher education faces a sea change in its intellectual, institutional, technological, and economic organization. The knowledge, skills, and values for which students should be educated; the ways in which teachers are trained, certified, hired, and arrayed into faculties; the intellectual landscape of disciplines and degrees; the geographies and networks by which educational institutions are organized and sustained; the funding of teaching, learning, and research—all this promises to be profoundly different in twenty years. Some forces of change have resulted from our own inertia in the academy (for instance, the push from policy makers and funders for accountability and degree standardization). Others represent the consequences of our very success (for instance, the globalization of student bodies and curricula). Still other forces reflect broad political, market, and technological developments not primarily of our making (for instance, the growing centrality of digital media to teaching and research). Yet, taken together, these factors define a moment in which—to quote Thomas Kuhn's account of political and scientific revolutions—"existing institutions have ceased adequately to meet the problems posed by an environment that they have in part created."¹ In such a moment, the question is not *whether* the academy will be changed, but *how*. Defending or merely tweaking our current arrangements is not an option.

This mix of inevitability and uncertainty is unnerving—and not only for loyalists to the academic status quo. Even for critics of mainstream practice, it is tempting to assume the stability of an older, established paradigm against which, like a whetstone, our ideas for reform have been honed. That "official" model took as normative an undergraduate regime of full-time postsecondary students and full-time tenure-stream faculty; a four-year, two-stage course of study in which general education segues into advanced majors defined by disciplinary specializations; a curriculum segmented into fungible units of labor, effort, and time called *courses*, *credit hours*, and *semesters*; a campus world segregated into academics and extracurricular student life. During most of the twentieth century, from the triumph of the system of majors and electives through the postwar

expansion of public and land-grant education, this *was* the paradigmatic architecture of baccalaureate education in the United States.² For those of us who have struggled with its negative effects—the narrow bandwidth of professors' attention to students, the instrumental goals of students, the research and status incentives of disciplinary professionalism, the siloed structure of our institutions—it made sense to critique undergraduate education as *stuck*. The goal of reform was then to act as an Archimedean lever, dislodging the academy from its satisfied, secure inertia.

Yet this is *not* the moment in which higher education finds itself. In almost every particular, the conditions that were taken for granted by the older paradigm no longer hold; and the educational assumptions that it instituted no longer seem self-evident. Only about one-third of undergraduates are recent high school graduates, attending a single four-year institution; twice as many faculty work on term contracts than in tenure-stream positions.³ The for-profit sector is burgeoning, as is online learning across *all* sectors (to my mind, a more consequential change).⁴ At the same time, the educational practices that seem to make the most difference to student engagement—so-called high-impact practices such as interdisciplinary learning communities, experiential and community-based learning, study abroad, and capstone research—are precisely those that tend to *disrupt* the established ecology of atomized courses, disciplinary courses of study, and the separation of curricular from cocurricular experience.⁵ The problem is not that the “official” paradigm of undergraduate education is constricting yet effective; it is that the paradigm is constricting and exhausted. Higher education is not in stasis but in crisis; and what is needed is not an alarm clock to awaken the academy from its dogmatic slumber but rather a star chart by which to navigate an uncertain future. We are in Kuhn's “revolutionary” moment when a new paradigm—a new institutional and epistemological regime for organizing educational practices and educational communities—feels necessary and imminent yet inchoate and up for grabs. It is a Copernican moment.

In the annals of American higher education, of course, talk of crisis is cheap. It is also persistent. For two centuries, a whole host of Cassandras and Jeremiahs have variously decried the academy's corruption, shallowness, commercialism, mandarin exclusiveness or social irrelevance, loss of moral compass or intellectual rigor or civic responsibility or nerve. Yet there is something different, I want to argue, about the current moment; the discourse of discontent is more widespread and wide ranging. “It is time to be frank,” warns the 2006 report of Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings' Commission on the Future of Higher Education:

Among the vast and varied institutions that make up U.S. higher education, we have found much to applaud but also much that requires urgent reform. . . . We may still have more than our share of the world's best universities. But a lot of other countries have followed our lead, and they are now educating more of their citizens. . . . History is littered with examples of industries that, at their peril, failed to respond to—or even to notice—changes in the world around them. . . . Without serious self-examination and reform, institutions of higher education risk falling into the same trap.⁶

The Spellings Commission report takes aim especially at the problems of assessing learning outcomes and enforcing institutional accountability; by contrast, Mark Taylor's *Crisis on Campus* decries what he sees as the looming intellectual (as well as fiscal) bankruptcy of the educational status quo. Taylor's provocative proposals for deconstructing the disciplinary collegium in favor of problem-based curricula and electronically networked learning communities could not be further from the commission's concern with standards and standardization. Yet his framing of the current situation is strikingly resonant with the commission's rhetoric:

American higher education has long been the envy of the world. . . . But in the past four decades, this situation has gradually deteriorated. The quality of higher education is declining; colleges and universities are not adequately preparing students for life in a rapidly changing and increasingly competitive world.⁷

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

This discourse of discontent is diverse, in part, because “the education crisis” that it registers is actually a manifold of different problems. It may help to tease them apart. Most obviously, higher education is in fiscal crisis. Over the past quarter century, we have seen a shrinkage of public funding at just the same time that academic institutions have expanded their scale and the complexity of their missions—and at precisely the same time, again, as they have faced rising costs in health care, energy, campus infrastructure, and faculty salaries. There has been, to use the cliché, a perfect storm of fiscal pressure; and it has yielded the sharp rises in tuition that seem so irrational and are so burdensome to taxpayers, tuition payers, and other stakeholders.

Beyond the direct costs to students and institutions, the fiscal crisis has imposed secondary effects that undermine educational quality and equity.

It has amplified the need for colleges and universities to rely on part-time and contingent faculty labor. It has encouraged undergraduate "credit shopping" and transfers, incentivizing students to make instrumental choices in crafting their course of study at the expense of community, continuity, and shared reflection. The fiscal crisis has also reamplified class divides thought to have subsided during the decades of educational expansion after World War II. It has reinforced the tendency of selective colleges and universities to jockey for status according to the dynamics of luxury-goods markets rather than Smithian cost discipline. These pricey, price-inelastic institutions assert their desirability by driving up costs through a "rankings arms race" for the best amenities and services, star professors, and merit-based scholarship aid. Even more important, the tuition bubble has tended to shut poor and working-class students out of college altogether or to displace the burden of paying for it onto student loans. Anya Kamenetz has persuasively argued that the expansion of student borrowing over the past two decades is a core element of the academy's growth model—and an unsustainable one.⁸ One need not concur with her alternative vision of "do-it-yourself universities" with informal, electronically mediated learning networks to second her trenchant analysis of the centrality of debt to our current situation—and the threat it poses to democratic access, student well-being, and educational community. For too many students, the most important cocurricular "others," the activities that preoccupy them when they are not at study, are not sports or Greek life but loans and work. Any reform agenda must engage and change that reality.

Put another way, the costs of the crisis are more than just monetary. Budget cuts, tuition hikes, and debt burdens make manifest (and to some extent obscure) a crisis of *legitimacy*: a growing sense that, as the "official" undergraduate paradigm has frayed, the academy has betrayed its commitments to, and turned away from, the larger society. This legitimization crisis has a complex etiology, rooted in both the historic achievements and recent problems of higher education.⁹ After World War II, universities and university systems grew vaster and more opaque; disciplinary professionalism enforced a hiring and tenure regime that prompted scholarship to become hyperspecialized and esoteric. At the same time—and partly in reaction against this specialization—technical and political shifts in the production of knowledge destabilized the organization of disciplines, catalyzing interdisciplinary fields such as neuroscience and gender studies. And after the 1960s, these institutional and intellectual developments took place in the context of a deepening political gulf between a progressive professoriate and an increasingly conservative public.

There is always a social compact that regulates the relationship between the academy and the larger society, a compact that legitimizes the

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

This crisis of legitimacy represents, I think, one of the most crucial factors in our current situation. It has fueled the atmosphere of mistrust that pervades public debates over higher education and the current rash calls for external assessment and accountability. Within the academy, it has generated a broad literature of complaint and reform, not simply from conservative dissenters such as Allan Bloom and radical critics such as Marc Bousquet but also from mainstream scholars and leaders.¹⁰ Books such as Derek Bok's *Our Underachieving Colleges*, Charles Muscatine's *Fixing College Education*, and the recent *Academically Adrift*—not to mention this volume—base their specific (and quite disparate) critiques in the assumption that undergraduate education as a whole has failed to deliver on its promise and its promises.¹¹ “[C]ollege costs too much . . . [and it is] impossible for many students of low income to attend at all,” laments Muscatine in *Fixing College Education*:

But there is terrible irony in the fact that these are not . . . even the most serious defects in the system. . . . [T]he truth is that the teaching and learning that go on in our colleges are actually not very good at all. The main problem of our colleges is poor education.¹²

Precisely what needs fixing, however, is highly contested. For some critics—we might call them traditionalist reformers—the purely curricular and cognitive goals of the “official” undergraduate paradigm have remained tried and true: the teaching of critical thinking, communications skills, and subject mastery that leads to professional or career preparation. The problem is that higher education has abandoned these goals in favor of fostering a faculty culture of research and disciplinary status seeking and a student culture of low expectations. The majority report of the Spellings Commission, with its call for uniform, objective standards enforced by strict assessment and accountability, represents one voice in this camp. So does *Academically Adrift*, whose authors argue that more time in class, more demanding academic work, more stringent assessment, and more consequences for failure are needed to change an anemic culture of “limited learning” on campus. For another set of critics, by contrast—pedagogical radicals such as Mark Taylor and Charles Muscatine—the crisis of legitimacy requires more than a renewal of rigor or an enforcement

of standards. What is needed is "a new curriculum for the twenty-first century" (to use Muscatine's subtitle), a kind of Liberal Education 2.0, more intellectually holistic, personally integrative, and integrated with the larger world of work and citizenship.

It is among these reformers—for whom liberal education represents an unfinished and transformative educational project—that I would situate the contributors to this volume. They do not focus on the fiscal or policy ramifications of the current moment of crisis and change. Rather, they are concerned with its distressing effects on the minds and hearts of undergraduates, the practices of teachers, the shape of curricula, and the local organization of campuses. The book maps an educational landscape marked by students' disengagement and instrumentalism toward their studies; by alarmingly high levels of student depression; by a disciplinary balkanization that has thinned out faculty-student relationships; by a reward system that privileges research and disciplinary status over teaching and campus leadership; by the segregation of the life of study from "student life," understood as a domain of customer service rather than educational growth; by the disconnection of both the (specialized) curriculum and the (consumerized) extracurriculum from community and civic bonds. Taken together, the chapters in *Transforming Higher Education* offer a portrait of the dysfunctional consequences of the older undergraduate paradigm and its decomposition under the pressure of change.

And yet this is all too bleak a picture of the current situation. For if the past quarter century has eroded the taken-for-granted assumptions, economic stability, and sheer self-confidence of the academy, it has also been an era of remarkable (and often unremarked) innovation. The rise of academic civic engagement and community-based learning offers a vivid example. What began in the 1980s as an earnest but often unreflective commitment to community service and service learning—more broad than deep—has grown into a mature academic movement, characterized by a broad network of campus-based centers and programs and national consortia. Faculty, staff, students, and community partners have developed models of sustained, collaborative projects and courses that are at once academically rigorous and socially transformative. Indeed there is a broad commitment to public engagement *not only* in individual courses but also across the curriculum and the institution as a whole—as well as a commitment to engagement that links community work to systemic issues of policy, power, and justice.

The "civic turn" is only one of a broad array of educational innovations that have emerged (with striking simultaneity) over the past twenty-five years. I have already mentioned the scholarly development of new

interdisciplinarity: some grounded in social justice and identitarian movements (women's studies, ethnic studies), some in scientific cross-pollination (bioengineering, neuroscience), some in theoretical and interpretive boundary crossing (cultural studies). Other innovations were more strictly student centered: writing across the curriculum; first-year courses that melded interdisciplinary themes, seminar (and sometimes writing) pedagogy, and academic advising; multicourse or residential learning communities; undergraduate research programs (and the concomitant expansion of capstone research); internships and other forms of experiential pedagogy; and study abroad programs. Nearly all these initiatives followed developmental patterns similar to the growth of civic engagement: pioneering experiments, proliferation via scholarly and institutional networks; national convenings or associations, and the coalescing of a community of practice that debated best practices and deepened program building.

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

The history of the current moment, in short, is one of creativity, not simply change and crisis. Indeed it is a story of creativity responding to, and sometimes making use of, the conditions of change and crisis sketched in the first part of this chapter. First-year seminars and learning communities, for instance, were designed precisely to overcome the balkanization and disengagement that have plagued undergraduate learning and campus culture. Civic engagement courses were designed to repair the breach between the academic classroom and the larger society, activating learning in public problem solving and culture making. Study abroad programs have served as a pedagogical laboratory for how best to impart intercultural and global competencies in an interdependent world. To be sure, these innovations have too often been siloed and ad hoc. Yet

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

Two aspects of this more hopeful side of the current moment are notable. First of all, the innovations I have sketched correspond almost exactly with the repertoire of high-impact educational practices that, according to George Kuh's influential research, have proven most consequential for undergraduates.¹³ They are not simply creative but also *effective* in engaging and transforming students. Second, they have done so largely on the margins or in the interstices of mainstream rules and structures. I do not mean that ordinary faculty, staff, and administrators have opposed innovation. Quite the opposite. The new practices have been a labor of love for thousands of academics. But sustained innovation has generally succeeded by working around, and sometimes against, the protocols of departments and curriculum committees, the grid of distribution and concentration requirements, the temporal ecology of credit hours and semesters, and (perhaps most of all) the incentives of the faculty reward system. High-impact practices tend to live simultaneously within, across, and against the traditional disciplines; within, across, and against the traditional academy calendar; within, across, and against the boundary that separates the campus from local, global, and digital publics. To a disheartening extent, the most exciting and effective initiatives of the past twenty-five years have had to swim upstream, so to speak, against the inertial habits and repetition compulsions of ordinary academic practice. Georgetown literary scholar Randy Bass, a leading theorist of campus pedagogical innovation, hilariously titled a conference workshop Low-Impact Practices (Formerly Known as the Curriculum).

How does it feel to be at a threshold in time, on the cusp of transformations that may turn out to be revolutionary? When Nicolaus Copernicus began developing his radical new model of the cosmos, early in the sixteenth century, the inadequacies of the Ptolemaic system had grown increasingly clear. Ptolemy and other ancient astronomers had from the first constructed an elaborate theory of planetary "epicycles," "eccentrics," and "equants" to explain the discrepancies between the geocentric model and their observations of the night sky. During the Renaissance, an explosion of new astronomical research further documented and amplified these anomalies, dimming the aura of authority that had surrounded the Ptolemaic system; scholars and scientists (most famously, Leonardo da Vinci) were beginning to speculate about a heliocentric theory without being able to discern or elaborate its lineaments. It was in this moment—the exhaustion of the older system in the face of anomalous new phenomena, the intuition of a new system toward which the anomalies gestured—that

Copernicus undertook his work. "Having become aware of these defects [in Ptolemy's system]," he writes in the preface to the *Commentariolus*, his early précis of the heliocentric theory, "I often considered whether there could perhaps be found a more reasonable arrangement of circles."¹⁴

U.S. higher education is on the threshold, I believe, of such a Copernican moment. As I have argued here, an older "official" paradigm of undergraduate education has exhausted itself, partly under the pressure of external revolutions (economic, political, technological, intellectual) that undermined its structures and norms, partly under the weight of mounting evidence (whether from depression rates, student surveys, or external assessments) that underscored its educational inefficacy. Reformers and critics have anatomized these failures from a variety of viewpoints and warned—or crowed—of dramatic changes to come. Meanwhile, in just the same years that the older paradigm was fraying, an array of new educational practices has emerged. Disparate and unassimilated, at odds with traditional practice, and yet remarkably robust, these innovations are something like the anomalous points of light that the Renaissance astronomers observed in the night sky. They illuminate the inadequacies of the older undergraduate system, and they point the way toward "a more reasonable arrangement of circles," as Copernicus put it.

What will that future paradigm look like? I am not so foolish as to offer anything like a full answer. Even if I could, it would surely be wrong, for educational models, perhaps more than astronomical ones, need to be tested and revised iteratively. Yet it seems to me that we can discern something of the future possibilities by extrapolating from the double story of disruptive change and counternormative creativity I have offered here. How do we build out from the achievements of the current moment? How do we respond to its crises?

On the one hand, I would argue, we want an educational future that draws on, and draws out, the implications of the new high-impact practices. Such a model would provide students with an arc of learning experiences—active, collaborative, boundary-crossing, and integrative—that interweave intellectual, professional, civic, and personal growth. Faculties and courses of study would be organized around interdisciplinary issues or domains of cultural practice—perhaps remapping them periodically—rather than a fixed, departmental topography of specialized fields. The professoriate would be trained and rewarded for teaching and advising more fully than today's faculty. Many more would be expert in project-based, collaborative, and interdisciplinary forms of pedagogy. Academic institutions would encourage heterodox forms of knowledge creation, culture making, and creative work—including public, practitioner, and digital scholarship—that are generally devalued by disciplinary professionalism.

Students would be expected to develop a broader array of proficiencies than simply the writing requirements of the old paradigm: digital literacy, civic practice (including public speaking), the application of their studies to professional practice, and teamwork. Their course of study would engage them in learning communities that extend beyond the boundary of the classroom or lab: work-based networks, community partnerships, global or intercultural encounters, and online classes. Knowing how to learn from, learn with, work with, and argue with a wide array of significant others would be a key learning outcome of the liberally educated person. And just as the classroom would no longer be privileged as the spatial "atom" of learning, so too the new model would emancipate itself from an academic calendar in which the semester course and its metronomic rhythm of weekly meetings were the atomic building blocks of educational time. Semesters, courses, and contact hours may be efficient ways to administer faculty labor and student credit acquisition; but they militate against the integration of learning experiences into shared, reflective pathways. The new calendar would be flexible and distributed, weaving together synchronous and asynchronous curricula, long-form and intensive learning experiences.

In short, we might extrapolate from the "creative anomalies" of the current moment to sketch a sort of Liberal Education 2.0. On the other hand, however, we need to extrapolate from the crises and dislocations of the current moment as well: to include in our account of the future a tough-minded acceptance of the realities that are transforming the educational landscape. Our new paradigm must meet the needs of a student majority that will attend more than one institution and balance studies with wage earning and borrowing. That may mean slimming down the amenities of liberal education to lower its costs; it will certainly mean embedding liberal learning with opportunities for paid work and professional apprenticeships. Similarly we will need to create promotional pathways, professional support, and intellectual collegia for faculty who will not, by and large, work on tenure tracks. And we will need to create curricula, pedagogical styles, and forms of sociability for institutions in which online learning and networked student communities compose as important a context as campus-based and on-site experiences. Too often, reform-minded liberal educators have simply abstained from figuring out how to include nontraditional students—adult or part-time learners, working-class transfers, online students—within the ambit of our vision. In the future, we will need to commit ourselves to creating models of teaching and learning that can flourish when the taken-for-granted conditions of liberal education—compact campus places, expansive student time—are absent.

I have ventured here a historical account of our current situation in higher education, paying special attention to the weave of change, crisis, and innovation that has characterized the past quarter century. When the next quarter century is over, and a new generation of historians and critics look back, to what situation will *they* have to respond? The landscape of academic life will surely be dramatically altered; *someone's* new paradigm will have taken hold. Will it be an economistic and instrumental regime, efficiently driving masses of students to degree completion and populating them across that era's global division of labor? Will it have instituted an "American Bologna Process" in which standardized disciplinary degree programs have been "tuned" in siloed isolation from one another? Or will we have created a model of undergraduate education in which (like the Polish monk's epic act of decentering and recentering) both the new conditions and the creative anomalies of our present moment will have moved from the margins to the heart of academic practice? Will we have created a "Copernican revolution" worthy of the name?

Notes

1. Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 92.
2. Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University: A History* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1962), 287–482; John R. Thelin, *A History of American Higher Education* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004), 205–316.
3. Association of American Colleges and Universities, *Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College* (Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002), 1–10; American Federation of Teachers, *The State of the Higher Education Workforce 1997–2007* (Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers, 2009), 10.
4. Elaine I. Allen and Jeff Seaman, *Online Nation: Five Years of Growth in Online Learning* (The Sloan Consortium, 2007).
5. George D. Kuh, *High-Impact Educational Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access to Them, and Why They Matter* (Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2007).
6. U.S. Department of Education, *A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 2006), ix, x, xii.
7. Mark C. Taylor, *Crisis on Campus: A Bold Plan for Reforming Our Colleges and Universities* (New York: Knopf, 2010), 3.
8. Anya Kamenetz, *DIY U: Edupunks, Edupreneurs, and the Coming Transformation of Higher Education* (White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing Company, 2010).
9. I give fuller treatments of this view that a legitimation crisis characterized the history of U.S. higher education since the 1980s in "Legitimation Crisis: The

Spellings Commission and the Civic Engagement Movement" (unpublished manuscript, 2006) and "The Arts of Citizenship in a Diverse Democracy: The Public Work of the Arts and Humanities" (unpublished manuscript, 2007).

10. Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987); Marc Bousquet, *How the University Works: Higher Education and the Low-Wage Nation* (New York: New York University Press, 2008).

11. Derek Bok, *Our Underachieving Colleges: A Candid Look at How Much Students Learn and Why They Should Be Learning More* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006); Charles Muscatine, *Fixing College Education: A New Curriculum for the Twenty-First Century* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009); Richard Arum and Josipa Roksa, *Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011).

12. Muscatine, *Fixing College Education*, 1-2.

13. Kuh offers the following catalog of "high-impact educational practices," based on analysis of student response data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE): first-year seminars; common intellectual experiences; learning communities; writing-intensive courses; collaborative assignments; undergraduate research; diversity/global learning; community-based learning; internships; and capstone courses and projects.

14. For a good nontechnical introduction to the context and key elements of Copernicus's work, see Jack Repcheck, *Copernicus' Secret: How the Scientific Revolution Began* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2007). Additionally, an English translation of Copernicus's *Commentariolus* is available at <http://dbanach.com/copernicus-commentariolus.htm>.