

From *Scholarship Reconsidered* to *Scholarship Assessed*

Ernest L. Boyer

Ernest Boyer (1928-1995) delivered the following keynote presentation to the 1995 conference of the National Association for Physical Education in Higher Education in Palm Springs. In his presentation, Dr. Boyer revisited his report *Scholarship Reconsidered* and outlined the general framework for the follow-up report, *Scholarship Assessed*. In *Scholarship Assessed*, Dr. Boyer proposes a set of guidelines that would put into practice the theories articulated in *Scholarship Reconsidered*.

Thank you, Steve, for that generous introduction. I hate to be critical, but you forgot to mention that I was president of my eighth-grade class. For 2 consecutive years I was president of the eighth-grade class! I am delighted to be here in Palm Springs. I'm especially pleased to meet with this national association, and to see good friends. I'm also deeply touched to have my informal remarks dedicated to Dean Pease. I only know his work indirectly, but judging by the anecdotes we just heard, he is a symbol of excellence and an exemplar for us all.

Our inquiry here is not just another conference; it is the time to take our mission as educators to heart and to find ways to improve both our standards and our performance on behalf of students. I have been asked to reflect on the subject of scholarship. It may be appropriate to begin by reflecting on the fact that for more than a decade at The Carnegie Foundation, one of the top priorities has been the role of undergraduate education.

Our effort began in 1980 with a little monograph entitled *A Quest for Common Learning*, in which we inquired into the meaning of general education. In 1985, we released a report entitled *College: The Undergraduate Experience*, in which we examined the whole scope of education at the post-high school level. And then in 1989, we released a monograph entitled *Campus Life: In Search of Community*, in which we inquired into the relationships that bind us together, asking, Can we sustain in higher education a sense of stability and common purpose? In preparing all these reports, we kept coming back to one central point: All of these exhortations will be inconsequential unless we examine the role of the professoriate itself. It made no sense to talk about creating a better campus life, to give more attention to classroom instruction, or to create a sense of renewal for incoming freshmen unless faculty themselves were actively engaged. It can not be done simply by exhortation from the Dean of Students.

Ernest L. Boyer was president of The Carnegie Foundation, 5 Ivy Lane, Princeton, NJ 08540.

And so, in response to this central and most essential aspect of renewal within the academy itself, we prepared, several years ago, a monograph entitled *Scholarship Reconsidered*. The goal of this report was to confront the matter of faculty roles and rewards head on. We began by recalling that, throughout the history of higher education in the United States, we have had three great traditions. First there was the colonial college tradition, with the founding of Harvard in 1636. In the colonial college, teaching was a central, even a sacred, function; in those days the highest accolade a professor could receive was the famous one Chaucer extended to the clerk at Oxford when he wrote, "Gladly would he learn, and gladly teach." And even as late as 1869, Charles Eliot, in his inaugural address at Harvard College, said, "The prime business of American professors must be regular and assiduous class teaching."

But change was in the wind, and early in the 19th century a second great tradition was beginning to emerge in American higher education. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute was founded in 1824 in Troy, New York, and RPI's mission, according to historian Frederick Rudolph, was the building of a nation. Rudolph wrote that America needed, at that time, "railroad builders, bridge builders, builders of all kinds." It was the role of the college, so RPI thought, to help in the building of a new nation. The Land Grant Act of 1862 linked higher learning to America's industrial, technological, and agricultural revolutions. When Lincoln Steffens, the social critic, visited Madison in 1909, he said that "In Wisconsin, the university is as close to the intelligent farmer as his pigpen or his toolhouse." David Starr Jordan had just become president of the brash new university on the West Coast called Stanford, and he declared at the turn of the century that "the entire university movement is toward reality and practicality." Charles W. Eliot, still at Harvard after 40 years, referred to American institutions of higher education as filled with the modern spirit of "serviceableness." This is fascinating: from class teaching to serviceableness. I find it absolutely remarkable that just 100 years ago in this country the most distinguished academics were declaring that service was the central mission of higher learning. Even at the elite campus of Princeton University, Woodrow Wilson, its president, coined the phrase, "Princeton, in the nation's service." To put it quite simply, the tradition of teaching had been joined by the mission of service to the people—the responsibility to apply knowledge for the betterment of human welfare outside the campus walls.

Meanwhile, a third great tradition was emerging. It began, perhaps most visibly, in the mid-19th century when some of America's most distinguished academic leaders studied at the great German universities and were profoundly influenced by the emerging scholarship of science. The landmark event occurred in 1876 when Daniel Coit Gilman founded what has been called the first true university in the United States, the Johns Hopkins University, modeled on the German system. Gilman built the university from scratch.

Twenty years later, Gilman retired with great distinction, and the main speaker at that event was Woodrow Wilson, still president at Princeton, who declared at this farewell address that Johns Hopkins is "a university in which the discovery and dissemination of new truths were conceded a rank superior to mere instruction." When I read that quotation a year or two ago, it occurred to me that this may have been the first moment at which the teaching versus research debate actually began: when a distinguished academic juxtaposed the discovery of knowledge with something called "mere instruction." Let the record show, however, that well

into the 20th century the Johns Hopkins' model remained the exception and not the rule. Most colleges and universities in this country still paid primary allegiance to the traditions of teaching, and secondarily, to the calling of service.

Everyone over 50 knows that World War II was a watershed in American higher education. We live in the afterglow of that period. Following World War II, through the GI Bill, American higher education went almost overnight from an "elite" to a "mass system"—to quote my friend Martin Trow in Berkeley—and we expanded, building a new campus at the rate of almost one per week. In the heyday of the 1950s I was at the University of California—Santa Barbara, and I saw that campus being transformed almost overnight from a teacher training and home economics institution to a campus of the University of California system. The faculty, who had been hired to fulfill one mission, were suddenly being held accountable to another academic culture. There was traumatic conflict as faculty tried to realign the educational purposes that they were expected to fulfill.

Since that time, I've been intrigued by the idea that we had two revolutions on a collision course. In terms of social policy and access, we were moving increasingly toward an egalitarian system. Open the doors, let many in. Diversity became the shibboleth of the system. But in terms of academic culture, the system was becoming increasingly elitist. I find it ironic that at the very time we were multiplying access, we were narrowing the definition by which faculty should be rewarded. So we said we will have many missions, but you will be rewarded only on the basis of one model. And while the catalog of every campus represented in this room, I'll wager, still pays allegiance and lip service to teaching, research, and service, the simple truth is that the reward system has been limited to honor only those engaged in research and publication.

This introduces a contradiction, and in some respects, an ethical violation of what our pronouncements are all about. The truth is that it became far more important for most professors to deliver a paper at the Hyatt in Chicago than to teach undergraduates back home. Frankly, I find it hugely ironic that in thinking about the priorities of the scholar, we give more attention to those who fly away and teach their peers than to those who stay home and inspire future scholars in the classroom. It is an educational trend that must be examined.

Driven by that imperative, we at The Carnegie Foundation prepared a report called *Scholarship Reconsidered*. We said the time had come to review the priorities of the professoriate. The time had come to reconsider our own three great traditions, to confront the tired old teaching versus research debate, and to try to give to scholarship a broader, more efficacious meaning. Reflecting on the more interesting question, "What does it mean to be a scholar?" we concluded that scholarship is not a single activity, but has four components that are inextricably interlocked. We said that, of course, the university will continue to acknowledge, necessarily and enthusiastically, the *scholarship of discovery*. If there is a single criterion that defines the intellectual life, it is the idea that cutting-edge inquiry opens up new ideas. That is a given, *sine qua non*, for what scholarship is all about, the scholarship of discovery.

But that is not the end; it is only the beginning. If you have "scholarship discovered" but do not find a way to integrate it, then you have pedantry. So that thought led to the second criterion, the *scholarship of integration*. Scholars not only discover knowledge, they have to find a place for it and integrate it into a larger pattern. Although you can have an isolated discovery, the scholar's aim is to

place it into a larger context. If there is a failure in the academy today, it is that there are fragments of knowledge without a larger pattern. So we develop our own special categories and speak only to ourselves, and we fail to give any sense of purpose or larger perspective to our students.

I am intrigued that the world famous physicist, Victor Weisskopf, when asked, "What gives you hope in troubled times?" replied, "Mozart and quantum mechanics." There is something about the beauty of both. Quantum mechanics and Mozart, believe it or not, have something in common. Aesthetic discoveries are at the heart of scientific inquiry: Science and art are in fact interlocked. In the academy, we pretend that they are in two separate worlds. Yet, I am convinced that in the 21st century, we are going to have new paradigms of knowledge, simply because the new questions don't fit the old boxes. Some of the most interesting work going on today is what Michael Polanyi at the University of Chicago calls, "the overlapping [academic] neighborhoods." That is where the really exciting work is going on, and, in my view, those of you in this room represent one of the truly integrated disciplines—one that looks at the whole of the human body, the human mind, and the human spirit.

The scholarship of discovery, which leads inevitably to the scholarship of integration, is still insufficient. In the end, scholarship has to be applied, because if we don't apply knowledge, it becomes irrelevant. Scholarship ultimately must be useful—useful spiritually, useful physically, useful economically. We argued strongly for a reaffirmation of what our colleagues in the 19th century affirmed as service, or the *scholarship of application*. It is ironic that in the past 100 years we have brought into the academy schools of medicine, law, business, education, physical education, nursing, and the like—all of them based on the assumption that knowledge should be applied. Yet we give no credit to those scholars for the essential work that they are called upon to do. When you receive tenure in a medical school, it is not to heal patients, but to do another research project. When you get tenure in the school of education, it is not to go out and work with children in the schools, but to do another research project.

So the application of knowledge was diminished, and yet not to apply knowledge is to define scholarship as irrelevant in the social context. Then it occurred to us that this situation is still not sufficient. Discovery, integration, and application are not enough. What is needed, finally, is the *scholarship of teaching*, or transmission, in order to keep the flame of scholarship alive. If there is any reality about scholarship, it is that it is a communal act. It only takes on life when it is shared. The test of scholarship is whether someone else can make sense of what you are doing. Tenure isn't awarded for research alone, but for research *and publication*. This is an interesting point because publication is a teaching act—teaching through the printed page. So in the very structure of the narrow paradigm, we have inserted teaching, but we have not called it that. At the very time we were broadening the mission after World War II, we were narrowing the paradigm of scholarship and diminishing the reward system. In addition, we paid a deep price for the contradictory signals that were sent to our colleagues, to our students, and to the public. I am convinced that if we wish to revitalize the academy we must somehow broaden the reward system by broadening the definition of what it means to be a scholar and reaffirming the great traditions that brought us to where we are.

Now, I must confess that I did not expect *Scholarship Reconsidered* to become one of Carnegie's most widely discussed reports. It has been espe-

cially gratifying to me that, in the last few years, campuses have been reexamining their faculty reward systems. In fall 1994, we surveyed every college and university in the United States and asked them whether they were reviewing, renewing, and revising their reward system. Two-thirds of all colleges that responded have said that in the past 5 years they have, in fact, been revising and renewing their system of faculty rewards. Sixty percent of the campuses responding to our survey said that *Scholarship Reconsidered* had played a role in their discussions.

One thoughtful critic of the current climate, a colleague on the board of The Carnegie Foundation, observed that campuses are not simply giving more weight to teaching, they are redefining the roles faculty perform and are coming to what he called a more inclusive definition of what both teaching and research entail. And I might add parenthetically, that from my reading of the tea leaves, service is being rediscovered, too.

Increasingly, I am asked to speak on campuses about how service can also be defined as scholarship and how it can be more adequately rewarded.

This brings me to the essence of my remarks. Soon after *Scholarship Reconsidered* was published, something strange—even mildly irritating—began to happen. The ink was hardly dry on our report when we started to get calls and letters that said, in effect, “It is one thing to give scholarship a larger meaning, but the real issue is how can scholarship be assessed?” and “Can we develop agreed upon procedures and standards by which these redefinitions you propose can be used operationally?” Many said they liked the new typology of *Scholarship Reconsidered*, but they also said it wouldn’t go very far without some agreed upon standards and procedures by which faculty performance could be measured. We began at the Carnegie Foundation about 2 years ago to reflect on the possibility of a companion volume to be called *Scholarship Assessed*. It is a work in progress.

I would like to reflect this morning on four issues that relate the theory of *Scholarship Reconsidered* to practical concerns that every faculty committee inevitably must confront. Here are, tentatively, four conclusions. First, we are concluding that evaluating scholarship requires a consideration of the personal and professional qualities of the professor. I know this is very touchy ground. And yet, as we surveyed the literature, I was struck that some of the most compelling references to scholarship focus not on what scholars do, but on what scholars *are*, or the quality of their lives and minds, as delicate—and even as dangerous—as that concept might be considered.

Scholarship was mentioned in Sumerian tablets as early as 4,500 years ago. The translation of these tablets was made by a professor of Assyriology at Berkeley. We learned from these translations that young students who aspired to be scribes—that is, to learn how to put knowledge down on clay tablets—were considered scholars. I was told that is probably the most appropriate translation. In preparing to become scholars, students were given these admonitions: “You must sit still for scholarship; you must concentrate day and night.” And then they ended with this observation: “You must be humble.” Now there is a personal quality and one that strikes me as appropriate for aspiring scholars. At least until you pass your final orals—or maybe until you secure tenure—you must be humble! But is humility merely a facade until you get there? Or does it remain an inherent personal characteristic throughout life? Are scholars, by definition, humble people who always remain sure that there is more to know?

Scholarship is also mentioned in a collection of sayings attributed to Confucius more than 2,500 years ago. Confucius sternly warned at that time, "The scholar who cherishes the love of comfort is not fit to be deemed a scholar." Incidentally, last fall, a distinguished Chinese scholar was in residence at The Carnegie Foundation, and we asked Professor Chang how he would define the qualities of a scholar. He immediately replied, "Good character." Would that show up in your tenure committee considerations as a first criterion, as the basis for granting tenure to your colleagues?

In modern times, some of the most insightful observations about scholarship were made by Columbia professor C. Wright Mills. In his essay "Intellectual Craftsmanship," Mills writes, "Scholarship is a choice of how to live as well as a choice of career." A scholar, Mills declares, constructs a character that has, at its core, the qualities of a good workman. We are still talking not about the checkpoints by which an article can be written, but the qualities by which a life might be lived. I especially liked the way Wayne Booth of the University of Chicago described the scholar. In Booth's essay "The Scholar in Society," he writes that at the very heart of a scholar's professional life are essential attributes that he calls "habits of rationality." These include such virtues as courage, persistence, consideration, humility, and of course, honesty. I would submit to you that one of the quickest ways for any colleague in the academy to define disgrace is the charge of plagiarism, or lack of integrity. We still acknowledge that no matter how much performance you do, there is something fundamental about integrity and honesty. If I were to choose just three of the characteristics that I think mark a scholar, but not necessarily a performer, I would say knowledgeability, integrity, and persistence. One might also add creativity to the list. You can define your own list, but what I am suggesting is that the evaluation of scholarship relates, in the first instance, not to a catalog of accomplishments, but to a quality of character—to the habits of rationality that so intrigued Wayne Booth. I recognize that these may be the most difficult to measure, but still I am convinced they are the most essential.

Several years ago, I was thinking about the great teachers that I had. They included a literature professor, a high school history teacher, and my own first-grade teacher. As I was reflecting on what these superior teachers had in common—I'm even inclined to say what these superior scholars had in common—I concluded they were great not only because of what they did or how they taught, but especially because of who they were. Let the record show, I'm not talking about examining the private lives of professors. I worry a lot about prejudice, about not allowing idiosyncrasies, and about gender and race discrimination. Those have no place in the world of scholarship. But I am suggesting that in defining scholarship, we must consider first those human characteristics that give dignity and integrity to the profession. Simply stated, scholarship is, as C. Wright Mills put it, a choice of how to live.

This leads me to issue number two. First, we considered the qualities of the person. Second, we asked what are the criteria that you actually use to assess faculty performance. We must have clearly defined standards by which his or her work can be measured, not just in research, but in teaching and in service, too. But is it possible to agree upon criteria that would be the benchmarks of performance and excellence in all of these various measures of scholarship itself?

Let me say parenthetically that when we asked some of the publishers of journals what standards they use for research publications, we got a blur of an-

swers. There are no agreed-upon criteria regarding research, even within the academy. What is agreed upon is a process. Below the surface, you will discover that, even in evaluating research, the emperor has few clothes. There is more of a sense of, "Well, my peers say it is all right," rather than, "These are criteria that we have agreed upon." And indeed, year after year, in our surveys of faculty, we discovered that about 40% of them say that on their campus research publications are just counted, not professionally evaluated.

So we are not all that successful at having standards for performance, even in research. And certainly it is true that we have hardly any standards when it comes to evaluating teaching, and none for service. In searching for the answers to questions concerning what standards should be used, we decided to look at current practice. We pulled together in our Princeton office a whole file cabinet full of faculty handbooks and teacher evaluation forms. We then asked the editors of 31 scholarly journals and the directors of 58 scholarly presses to tell us the criteria they used in judging the merits of scholarship. At first we saw no pattern in this pile of paper. When it came to assessing scholarship in all of its forms, it seemed that every campus, every discipline, every form of scholarship, and, to some degree, every publishing house and every journal was marching to a different drummer. No agreed-upon standards could be found.

Then, as we began to study the documents more closely, we began to see a pattern. We discovered that six standards of excellence were mentioned time and time again in faculty handbooks, in teacher evaluation forms, in university press guidelines, and the like. It occurred to us that these standards might in fact provide a common framework against which all forms of scholarship might be measured. I can discuss each one of these at length, but let me summarize them for you in just a few sentences. The six standards that might be used to evaluate scholarship in all of its forms could be stated this way: First, did the scholar have clearly stated goals? Second, did the scholar follow well-defined and appropriate procedures? Third, did the scholar have adequate resources and use them in effective ways? Fourth, did the scholar communicate effectively to others? Fifth, did the scholarly effort lead to significant results? And sixth, did the scholar engage in reflective self-critique?

Let me pause on that sixth and final point. It seems very clear that we are able to advance scholarship only to the extent that those who engage in the act—whether it is research, teaching, or service—culminate their effort in self-reflection: look back, define strengths and weaknesses, and then move forward to a higher level of performance.

When I put all of this together, I can imagine a grid in which the four forms of scholarship—discovery, integration, application, and teaching—are placed horizontally across the top; running vertically down the sides are the six standards by which all forms of scholarship might be measured: clear goals, appropriate procedures, adequate resources, effective communication, significant results, and careful and thoughtful self-critique.

This brings me, then, to issue number three. In addition to pursuing the qualities of a scholar and defining the standards of evaluation to be used, we considered, in our development of *Scholarship Assessed*, What are the sources of evidence for assessment? In the Carnegie report we conclude that there are only four sources to be used. The first and most essential source of evidence is the scholar, the one who has actually done the work. Ernest Lynton, of the University

of Massachusetts, makes the point that this self-assessment should include a thoughtful, explanatory essay describing the professor's view of what has been done, in addition to what Lynton calls "work samples and products," which might include journal articles, course outlines, videotapes of teaching, or in the case of service, evidence of fieldwork and documented results.

The second source of evidence is peer evaluation. You not only have the professor report on her or his own progress, you have peers observing and making judgments, too. We use this comfortably when it comes to research, but we are much more skittish when it comes to teaching. I don't know of any institution engaged in evaluating service in a peer review. The problem is that we do not like our colleagues "snooping around" too much. It is all right to snoop around in a printed article, but not in a classroom. We have developed an attitude on our campuses that academic freedom means closed doors, instead of open minds. I wish that academic freedom could mean open classrooms, where everyone could come in and where it would be as comfortable to evaluate a college class as it is a kindergarten class. If we gave as much openness in the college class as we give in the elementary school, that, too, would bring in some fresh air and dry out the musty attitudes.

I'd like to see peer review become a common practice, but I have to caution you that it can only happen in a supportive climate. If you bring in a peer review as a last-minute source of evidence when I am up for tenure, I am going to have anger and stomach cramps. What we need to do is create a climate on campus in which younger scholars, from the very day they arrive, are being helped along by mentors who guide them and observe them. Senior faculty should observe colleagues in the classroom, talk with clients, review publications, and submit their findings both orally and in writing. By the time tenure and promotion come, review has been a part of the culture, not a threatening invasion. So when I talk of peer review, I'm talking of a culture of academic caring.

Third, in addition to self-evaluation and peer evaluation, we need student evaluation, especially when it comes to teaching. Incidentally, during my time teaching at the Woodrow Wilson School, every semester in every class every professor was evaluated, and the results were sent directly to the dean. So I have had some experience with student evaluation, and I have to admit that there were some students who failed to discover the erudition and insights of my effort. Occasionally, I was angered by a critique, but when I was more sober, I knew they were right. There were areas in which my performance had not been sufficient.

Overall, the pattern of student opinion reveals very much. The only caution I make is that the only way for student evaluation to be authentic is for students to be carefully oriented to the process itself. To drop a questionnaire on them at the end of the course and say "Fill this out," without adequate time, or any thoughtful discussion devoted to why they should do it, is going to result in "garbage in, garbage out." They will take it as casually as we present it. But let us imagine that every freshman coming in would have as part of the orientation a half-day discussion on faculty evaluation. This is what we do in this place; this is why it is important; these are the criteria that we use; this is as important to the professor as the professor's evaluation of you will be for you; this is an ethical act in which you are engaged. Let us discuss this questionnaire, maybe help shape it. Then, when they are asked to do it, it is in the context of credibility, and they are prepared for it. So

student evaluation, just like faculty evaluation, needs to be conducted in a context of credibility and respect.

Incidentally, you can also survey former students. I have had faculty say time and time again, "Wait a minute. Students don't appreciate me now, but 10 years from now, they are really going to discover my brilliance and my contribution." Well, let us test that claim. I think it was at Dades College, several years ago, that they told me that they never give tenure without first surveying students who graduated 6 years before. They send letters to them and say, "We are going to make decisions about this professor. Would you now reflect on the meaning of those classes?" Students will often very conscientiously reply.

Finally, documenting scholarship also should include evidence from clients or others who have worked with faculty in professional service. School teachers, clinicians, government officials, or business executives may be interviewed or may present a written evaluation or other relevant evidence.

Let me conclude this by saying that while I see four sources of evidence, I would like to see the four sources working against the same six criteria that I have already mentioned so we do not have a hodgepodge of evaluations. Let us have the standards clear and explicit, and then let us ask four different sources to comment. If we can get the criteria straightened out, then we have a grid of commonality by which those who provide the evidence can give us a common pattern.

One final point in our report: In addition to the matter of the character of the professor and the standards to be used and the sources of evidence, the final issue to be debated is what type of evidence should be drawn together. We find in our report that the documentation of scholarship must be rich and varied. Today, interest in documentation is focused most intently on the "portfolio," which has become a kind of metaphor for the dissatisfaction we all feel with the current system. In reality, of course, a portfolio is only a place to put things, and Russell Edgerton, president of the American Association for Higher Education, is on target when he says: "Campuses are turning to portfolios as the latest management fad without careful thought as to what the contents of a portfolio might be." The question is, What do you put in that portfolio? I do support the idea of trying to get diverse evidence. You can think of your own list—certainly published articles would be on it. But that is only the beginning. Why not course syllabi? How about personal descriptions? Maybe written testimony from others, taped interviews, videos of classroom teaching, musical scores, recordings, or paintings?

The point is that we should have evidence as diverse as the scholar's performance. I've been intrigued for years by Howard Gardner's book *Frames of Mind*, in which he reminds us that we not only have linguistic intelligence, but also logical-mathematical intelligence, bodily-kinesthetic intelligence, musical intelligence, spatial intelligence, interpersonal intelligence, and intrapersonal intelligence. Yet when we come to assessment we focus on the linguistic and forget the full breadth of intelligences that makes us truly human! What if we had types of evidence as broad as the dimensions of our own intelligences? In summary, the documentation of scholarship should be as rich and as varied as scholarship itself. Let me underscore the point that documentation should be a moving picture, not a snapshot, and that the evidence should be gathered over time.

In conclusion, I suggest that the scope of scholarship should be broadened to include the discovery of knowledge, the integration of knowledge, the application of knowledge, and the teaching of knowledge, and that all forms of

scholarship should be rewarded. But for this to be accomplished, we should define with clarity the criteria by which the work of scholarship in all its forms will be assessed. I have suggested six standards: clear goals, well-defined plans, effective use of resources, good communications, significant results, and thoughtful critique. However, let me caution you at the end that none of this will work if the process is not trusted. We can develop all the right formulas, we can have all the right standards, and forget that the lives of people are at stake. What they really need to have is confidence in the decisions because they have confidence in the people, not in the checklist. The success of faculty evaluation depends most profoundly on the credibility of the process. We must have clear standards and good documentation, but what counts the most is the degree to which professors have confidence in the arrangements, feel the process to be fair, and believe that those who make the critical decisions can be trusted.

I have two brothers. I called one of them the other day and asked him about the faculty reward process on his campus—a large land grant university—and he gave me insight when he said, “I don’t know the process, but I know the people.” Well that, in the end, is what it is all about. Universities are people places. They should not be process places alone.

This leads me to a question I am often asked—whether the faculty reward system will ever change. And my response is that this is really the wrong question. The simple truth is that nothing is ever static, conditions are always changing. This is the one truism of life itself. So the real question is not will it change—of course it will! The last 30 years defined the current paradigm. Don’t tell me that now we are fixed on a model that will never shift; it is always in transition. The only two questions that matter are, In which direction is it changing, and how long will it take?

I may be a bit optimistic because I’m in Palm Springs, but I do believe that, from what I have seen, there is no question that the paradigm of faculty rewards is moving toward greater recognition of teaching. I could document that for several hours because we have the evidence in our office. I also have this sense in my bones that service is going to reemerge with greater vitality than we have seen in the last 100 years, simply because the university must be engaged if it hopes to survive. The social imperative for service has become so urgent that the university cannot ignore it. I must say that I am worried that right now the university is viewed as a private benefit, not a public good. Unless we recast the university as a publicly engaged institution I think our future is at stake.

So I have no doubt that the two dimensions of our own tradition that have recently been neglected—teaching and service—will reemerge as priorities within the academy itself. As for the speed of the change, how long do we have to wait? I can only tell you that if a decade ago you had told me that in my lifetime the Berlin Wall would collapse, the Soviet Union would no longer exist, Arafat and Begin would sign a peace accord on the lawn of the White House, and Nelson Mandela would be president of South Africa, I would have said, “You’re crazy!” And yet, we of the academy persist in the belief that, “Oh, it will never change,” while all of these cataclysmic, earth-shaking, unbelievably transformative events have occurred within a decade. Why are we so timid? It is not difficult for me to imagine that in the next decade or two the priorities of the professoriate will be reordered. I’ll make it 30 years, and therefore I won’t have to defend my claims.

But the larger point I would like to make is that none of this has been chiseled in stone. We sit back and pretend that change is going to happen outside us.

The truth is that it will happen within us. We are the transformers of our own academy, and if there is to be change, it is in this group and not in the stars. I believe that this is an exhilarating time for higher education. For the first time in 40 years, faculty are seriously discussing their own mission in faculty roles and rewards. I have a feeling that we are beginning to find a common language, one that will revitalize research, integrate the disciplines, and give dignity to teaching. I truly hope, as well, that the academy becomes more responsive and more serviceable to the global problems that threaten our very survival.