

INTRODUCTION

Amanda Gilvin

IN HIS 1932 discussion of recent changes in higher education for African Americans, W. E. B. Du Bois complained of an increasingly commercial approach to learning on the part of students and the stubborn tendency of academics toward a pretense of scholarly objectivity. Such remarks may sound very familiar to those concerned with higher education reform in many parts of the world in the early twenty-first century. Du Bois argued,

College teachers cannot follow the medieval tradition of detached withdrawal from the world. The professor of mathematics in a college has to be more than a counting machine, or a proctor of examinations; he must be a living man, acquainted with real human beings, and alive to the relation of his branch of knowledge to the technical problem of living and earning of living. (71)

With this volume, we have attempted to heed Du Bois's counsel by analyzing graduate education, fully accounting for graduate students as living people who interact with other real human beings, on their campuses and in many other places. The graduate students represented in this volume are those already "alive to the relation of ... knowledge to the technical problem of living and earning a living."

With diverse scholarly and personal influences, the contributors in this volume identify their work by numerous labels. There are publicly active and publicly engaged graduate students, and their research projects may be community based, activist, radical, publicly driven and/or collaborative. Some projects found here relate to "service learning" in United States undergraduate education, but we address a much wider range of scholarship than what is included in these semester- or year-long programs that prioritize undergraduate student education. In the social sciences, and increasingly in the arts, scholars might call some of this work "applied," a term that conveys the transformation from theory into praxis. In this volume, praxis also creates theory. As editors, Georgia M. Roberts, Craig Martin, and I saw many commonalities within the aspirations, struggles, theory, methodology, and scholarship

of those who contributed to this volume. Foremost among these was a shared, future-oriented commitment to increasing collaboration between graduate students and their partners inside and outside of academia, with respect for forms of knowledge often ignored in academic scholarship.

We identify the scholarship put forth and analyzed in this volume as publicly active because this descriptor, for us, best conveys the sense of having multiple publics and communities—inside, outside, and around academia. We acknowledge and defy the frequent insularity of academic practice by embracing the term *public*. Publicly active graduate education draws upon knowledge from outside of academia, and it contributes to discourses and change outside of colleges and universities in concerted ways. The word *active* is inclusive of the wide range of strategies described by the authors. Furthermore, the term *active* insists on the dynamism, contingency, and improvisation required by graduate students who do not wait until they have faculty positions to effect changes within their institutions and disciplines, but who innovate while still in training.¹ The graduate students in this volume intend for their education to contribute to transformative social change right now. Once highlighted, the boundaries that they challenge and transgress—between one discipline and another, between student and teacher, between expert and layperson, between the university and its locale—demonstrate this need for graduate student-initiated activity within an academic system that often suffers from administrative and scholarly inertia (hooks 1994).

This volume was initiated by one of our contributors, Sylvia Gale, as one of many projects she pursued while founding director of the Publicly Active Graduate Education (PAGE) program of the Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life consortium. Since its inception in 2004, PAGE has selected 116 fellows to attend the Imagining America annual conference, and the program quickly evolved to include at the conference a graduate student summit for PAGE Fellows to discuss their publicly active scholarship with one another. Several of the authors and editors have participated in PAGE summits, and the momentum begun with these energizing conversations and others like them deserves wider reach.² It is graduate students like ourselves, and like the inspiring colleagues we have met at PAGE summits, whom we see as our primary readership and co-contributors. Although we hope for a wide readership among faculty and graduate students' collaborators, this volume is addressed to the graduate student—or potential graduate student—who is passionate about scholarship that respects knowledge created outside of academia and that seeks progressive social change in various spheres, including

but not exclusively academia.

It has been both heartening and educational to receive contributions from scholars at all stages of their academic careers. Enthusiastic authors demonstrated a broader commitment to the transformation of graduate education in the arts and humanities than we had anticipated. Senior scholars, graduate students, and junior faculty have worked together to write individual essays, and while all of the editors began as graduate students, we have benefited from the mentorship of our own faculty and from the observations of an advisory board of senior scholars. We were not the first to note the paucity of graduate students' perspectives in the ever-growing body of literature on the scholarship of engagement (and even in the larger discourse on doctoral education), but the essays bemoaning the absence of graduate students' voices appear in the very volumes that lack graduate student leadership and authorship.³

Current Discourses Around Publicly Active Graduate Education

The first discourse in which this volume intervenes highlights the contributions of Africana studies, gender and sexuality studies, post-colonial theory, and disability studies to publicly active graduate education. The ground-changing impact of African American and feminist activism and scholarship on all United States higher education in the 1960s and 1970s was in many ways foundational for the concerns charted in this volume (Aldridge and Young 2000; Collins 2000; Howe 2000; Rosen 2004). As pointed out by Timothy K. Eatman in this volume, much of the literature on publicly engaged scholarship has replicated structural inequities in higher education in its failure to acknowledge the institutional and scholarly innovations at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) that predate many of the programs now often highlighted. The theoretical contributions of W. E. B. Du Bois and many other scholars often have been appropriated without sufficient or indeed any recognition. Faculty of color and women aspire to integrate their work for social change with their scholarship to a greater degree than their white, male, able-bodied, and/or socio-economically privileged counterparts, and all of us working to promote publicly active scholarship are responsible for honoring and recognizing our debts to these intersecting scholarly interventions (Turner 2002). Africana studies, feminism, postcolonial theory, and queer theory are essential and fundamental components of contemporary publicly active graduate education.

Like all education, publicly active graduate education is inevitably and fundamentally shaped by dynamics of race, gender, and class. In

1990, Ernest Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* suggested that the paucity of minority graduate students in American universities might be an indictment of American higher education. Institutions still have not adequately redressed these discrepancies. Boyer's indictment must now be confirmed, over 20 years after his comments, when American graduate programs still fail to reflect the racial and ethnic diversity of the population. Stephen Quaye (2005), an insightful voice of graduate student authorship in the published conversation about graduate students, insists that universities commit themselves to hiring more diverse faculty—which requires a more diverse undergraduate and graduate student body. We call for more investigations of the intersections of racial, gendered, and class discrimination in higher education, from the perspectives of potential students, undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty. It is then incumbent upon universities, departments, and individuals to act on what they learn.

Meanwhile, the panicked descriptions of the “Crisis of the Humanities” have grown only more frantic since we began work on this volume, and the impact of the global economic crisis on college and university budgets has added urgency to a discourse on the purposes and utility of the humanities. With Evan Carton, Gale (2005) has noted elsewhere that this crisis is a chronic one, and we would be better served to reconfigure the humanities as something that we *do*, as a practice. By framing the humanities as dynamic and exploratory knowledge production instead of rigid disciplinary and disciplining traditions, we may disrupt the persistence of canons and open up space for publicly active forms of scholarship (Amor 2008). This perceived crisis may be chronic, but all graduate students in the United States' universities face challenges unique to this period of time in American higher education. The casualization of teaching labor, the corporatization of the university, and the consumerization of students all challenge our collaborative scholarly and personal aspirations.

Thomas Bender's contribution to *Envisioning the Future of Doctoral Education: Preparing Stewards of the Discipline* (2006) emphasizes the need for all historians to attain a kind of bilingualism that enables them to succeed in academia and to translate for other audiences. In the same volume, Catherine Stimpson declares that “the heroic and original humanist has been a solitary one.... Collaborative practices, common to the sciences, must now take hold in the humanities” (2006, 410). Many graduate students already practicing various kinds of bilingualism and collaboration subvert heroic narratives to imagine and become more human humanists. Seeking social change through the arts and the humanities is not ancillary or recreational—for many of us, it is

precisely why we do our work within these fields. In response to well-positioned critics who exhort publicly engaged scholars in the humanities to *Save the World on Your Own Time* (Fish 2008), we insist that our scholarship is “our own time,” and while we have no naive visions of a saved world, we do want a better one.

We wish to add our voices to the important conversation on graduate educational curriculum in the arts and humanities and its potential dissonance with graduate students’ careers after graduate school. In order to address the perceived overproduction of Ph.D.’s and the often dim academic employment prospects for many graduates, the Woodrow Wilson Foundation began the Responsive Ph.D. initiative in 2000 to explore how schools could train doctoral students for a wider range of careers, especially those that would contribute to a perceived public good. The Responsive Ph.D. promoted publicly active graduate education, but only once such efforts were organized and institutionalized, and especially as a method of preparing students for nonacademic careers. For example, the Responsive Ph.D. lauded the University of Washington’s Institute of the Public Humanities and the University of California at Irvine’s Humanities Out There.⁴

The initiative portrayed graduate students as blank slates to be shaped and written upon by a strongly administrated graduate school. Scholars David Huyssen (2007) and Marc Bousquet (2002) have criticized the Responsive Ph.D. for failing to question university labor practices, while putting the onus on graduate students to either choose insecure, overworked academic jobs or corporate nonacademic employment. In a scathing critique of American doctoral education in which he defends graduate students’ rights as workers, Bousquet characterized completed Ph.D.’s as the “waste matter” of higher education, for it is the cheap labor of graduate students that many universities seek to exploit; ironically, it is only upon graduation that many scholars find themselves unemployed.

Also responding to the ways that universities around the world are changing, the transnational Edufactory Collective has produced an important and fascinating body of work online (<http://www.edufactory.org/wp>) and in meetings, based upon the understanding that institutions of higher education are crucial places of progressive activist and socially transformative organizing. According to the Edufactory Collective (2009), students and faculty must work together to recognize systemic injustices and insist on institutional change, rather than accommodating a system that might just be waiting to excrete its student-laborers.

Patricia Limerick (2008) acknowledges the constraints for young publicly active scholars, but regretfully gives her readers advice that is

not acceptable for many of us and is not possible for the many graduate students who will never find tenure-track jobs, even if they write that “conventional dissertation”:

Here is the upshot: to become a university-based public scholar, a young person may well have to put that ambition into cold storage for a decade and a half. Go to graduate school, write a conventional dissertation, get a tenure-track job, publish in academic journals and in university presses, give papers at professional conferences to small groups of fellow specialists, comply with all the requirements of deference, conformity, and hoop jumping that narrow the road to tenure while also narrowing the travelers on that road, and *then* take up the applied work that appealed to you in the first place. You may need to write yourself a thorough and eloquent memo, early in this process and store it in an easily remembered and retrievable place, to remind yourself of the postponed and mothballed ambition to connect with the world that got you psyched for this career in the first place.

I have my fingers crossed that I have this all wrong. (14)

She does. With this volume, and with the graduate scholarship analyzed within it, we are working to make sure that she is wrong.

In liminal positions with special advantages and vulnerabilities in the academic system, graduate students have unique perspectives to offer to an already lively conversation on publicly active scholarship. These include several volumes on engaged scholarship written from a social science perspective (Van de Ven 2007). *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship*, edited by Charles Hale (2008), and *Higher Education for the Public Good*, edited by Adrianna J. Kezar, Tony C. Chambers, and John Burkhardt (2005), share many concerns and themes with our own, but neither focus on graduate education. The recently published *Handbook of Engaged Scholarship: Contemporary Landscapes, Future Directions* (Fitzgerald, Burack, and Seifer 2010) is concertedly didactic in nature, and analyses of graduate education pervade the many insightful essays, including several authored by graduate students. Amanda L. Voyel, Caroline Fichtenberg, and Mindi B. Levin observe that the focus on administration, faculty, and institutions has “marginalized students’ past contributions to the movement” (2010, 370), and Diane M. Doberneck, Robert E. Brown, and Angela D. Allen commend the PAGE Fellows Program and the Emerging Engaged Scholars Program as “intentional, collaborative, and engaged leadership by graduate students” (2010,

401). Eric J. Fretz claims that “Graduate students are required to check their public imaginations at the door as they enter their graduate studies” (2010, 311). But those of us who snuck past the public imagination security are here, and we are part of the conversation on how to nurture a space for public imagination in graduate education. KerryAnn O’Meara’s encouragement of all publicly engaged scholars to move beyond a pessimistic obsession with the challenges, risks, and problems of conducting publicly engaged scholarship resonates well with our forward-looking representation of publicly active graduate education (2010, 277).

Critical Reflections on Publicly Active Graduate Education in the Arts and Humanities

This volume is organized in a way that we hope will foster reflections on the reader’s own work. In the first section, “Contextualizing Collaboration: Publicly Active Graduate Scholarship in United States Higher Education,” authors provide both historical and contemporary contexts for what might be understood as movements to promote publicly active scholarship, and specifically, publicly active graduate scholarship. They also argue for directions in which we can work together to effect further change. Next, in “Programs of Action: Institutionalizing Publicly Active Graduate Education,” authors address important efforts to create lasting change in graduate education by founding formal programs and initiatives. We conclude with graduate students’ and former graduate students’ reflections on their education, their work, and their lives in “A Balancing Act: Publicly Active Graduate Students’ Reflections and Analyses.”

In the first section, “Contextualizing Collaboration: Publicly Active Graduate Scholarship in United States Higher Education,” we consider some of the major historical and contemporary discourses that have contributed to and continue to shape the experiences and choices of publicly active graduate students. Timothy K. Eatman introduces the important research that he has been conducting on publicly engaged scholarship, emphasizing the components that address graduate education. Drawing on this recent research, as well as his collaborations with Julie Ellison on Imagining America’s important Tenure Team Initiative and the resulting publication, *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University*, Eatman demonstrates the rigorous scholarly potential of publicly engaged scholarship. His and Ellison’s concept of a continuum of scholarship values diverse spheres of knowledge while simultaneously demanding excellence. Based on his research on higher education in the United States and on the

histories, motivations, and self-definitions of publicly engaged scholars, Eatman offers concrete strategies for individuals, departments, and institutions to expand and improve their scholarship through public engagement.

Scholarship in Public sketches out possibilities in its “Pathways for Public Engagement at Five Career Stages,” which is reprinted in Eatman’s essay (p. 34). This work is absolutely essential if we are to see change in how publicly active scholarship is (or is not) recognized by disciplines, departments, and universities. We hope that universities continue to heed the report’s recommendations, and that more evaluations for granting tenure take publicly active scholarship into account. Eatman’s work answers the need for institutional analysis and advocacy by established scholars. By gathering the voices of publicly active scholars at various stages, this research also can orient students who feel isolated in their departments or institutions toward more supportive scholarly networks.

Faced with conflicting narratives about the land-grant institution where he studies, Timothy Shaffer looks at the history of United States land-grant universities to promote a graduate education that nurtures democracy and social justice. By examining different agendas from which land-grant institutions have emerged and developed over the past 150 years, Shaffer places graduate students and other scholars within diverse communities as civic actors, rather than “technocrats” and “experts,” labels that evoke partial people whose research and knowledge isolates and insulates them from the aspects of their world that their research could be used to address. These are also the people Eatman tells us may shut down the “independent thinking mechanisms of the human brain.” By creating space for multiple narratives about land-grant graduate education and its history, Shaffer recasts graduate students as participants in institutions constantly being renegotiated, thus refusing the image of burgeoning experts just waiting for that diploma so that they can start distributing their expertise through convoluted, but decidedly one-way, channels to the public.

As Eatman demonstrates, many publicly active graduate students participated in service learning as undergraduates, and Ivan Illich’s speech delivered at the Conference on InterAmerican Student Projects in Cuernavaca, Mexico, in 1968 historicizes the contemporary vogue for undergraduate service learning in the Christian missionary and idealistic educational projects of the 1960s—and although now dated, its challenges to the paternalism inherent in many service-learning projects remain legitimate and important. Illich’s contribution forces us to consider the differences between the publicly active scholarship to which we aspire and “service learning.” Much undergraduate service

learning in the United States remains lacking in critical thought, and the nature of students' schedules prevents long-term participation for most. We include it here to challenge our contributors and readers to envision and practice publicly active graduate education that attempts genuine collaboration and self-reflexivity.

In Illich's terms, we wish for graduate students the courage and integrity to work with people who can and might tell us to go to hell. In other words, although relatively powerless within the academy, graduate students enrolled in American graduate programs must reckon with their own power and privilege relative to those without the monetary, educational, or other resources to access what enrollment in universities afford us to varying degrees. For though even well-funded graduate students' stipends are not large by United States income standards and many more students rely on student loans, these American incomes still far surpass those of many of our collaborators, who may be in the United States or elsewhere. Travel, library cards, conferences, mentorship, funding sources: although the challenges and difficulties faced by graduate students are real and numerous, so too are the resources that many of us can access only in our roles as scholars enrolled in or hired by universities. In the words of Chris Dixon and Alexis Shotwell in this volume, we can and must leverage the resources of the university.

In an effort to recuperate the term *service learning* and improve the scholarly rigor associated with it, Susan Curtis, Shirley Rose, and Kristina Bross advocate for the implementation of service-learning projects on the graduate level. Answering the calls of the Kellogg Report for public land-grant universities to return to their founding aspirations to serve the American public, they designed a graduate-level service-learning course, and their discussions of its multiplying outcomes supports their argument that articles in academic journals and books published by university presses are not the only kinds of productive scholarship. The authors suggest that the Social Gospel movement that lasted from the 1890s through the 1920s offers lessons for implementing cultural and institutional change in American higher education that recognizes value in community-based scholarship. In addition to their central proposal that tenured faculty offer service-learning graduate courses, they advise others to publish widely in diverse outlets; to work with artists, labor unions, and activists; and not to wait for permission to conduct innovative teaching and scholarship. Curtis, Rose, and Bross demonstrate that widespread change to scholarship in the United States requires innovation on the part of individual students and professors — and advocacy and legitimization from institutions and organizations, such as the Kellogg Report and the Tenure Team Initiative.

As argued by Curtis, Rose, and Bross, as well as by Nicolas Behm and Duane Roen, the Kellogg Report has exerted great influence on American higher education, most forcefully upon the land-grant institutions about which and for which it was written. Although the excerpts from the report included in this volume address land-grant institutions, they provoke all of us to consider the influence of institutions on scholarship—and how those institutions might be improved. Addressing the perception that United States higher education institutions are unresponsive despite their research accomplishments and the unparalleled wide access they afford, the Kellogg Commission insists that land-grant universities, long known for their outreach, service, and extension programs, implement institutional plans for “engagement.” Emphasizing reciprocal learning with partners, the report offers “a seven-part test” of engagement that provides useful benchmarks for any institution. Although firmly grounded in institutional portraits and recommendations, the Kellogg Report in many ways legitimated the work of publicly engaged scholars and administrators, and as noted by Curtis, Rose, and Bross, many scholars used it to promote their projects and to accomplish change within their universities.

Nicholas Behm and Duane Roen observe the changes that have occurred in American higher education since the publication of Ernest Boyer’s essay, “The Scholarship of Engagement,” and the Kellogg Report. They call for scholars to use documents published by the American Association of University Professors to advocate for and reflect upon their publicly engaged work. By drawing upon widely accepted guidelines for responsible scholarship established by the AAUP, graduate students can address the questions regarding the rigor of publicly active scholarship discussed by Curtis, Rose, and Bross. Yet most graduate students know little about the AAUP. Just as the Kellogg Report draws upon the historic purposes of land-grant institutions to encourage contemporary innovation, Behm and Roen look to the conventional guidelines established by the AAUP to give young scholars the authority and language to initiate dialogue with potentially resistant programs or institutions. Even for those graduate students who do not intend to become professors, these documents may be useful because they specifically address the roles and rights of graduate students within the university.

Ernest Boyer’s essay, “The Scholarship of Engagement,” was first presented as a presidential address at a Stated Meeting of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching on October 11, 1995, and its subsequent circulation, along with Boyer’s already influential and aforementioned book *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the*

Professoriate (1990), greatly impacted the Kellogg Report, *Imagining America*, and many other initiatives to encourage engaged scholarship. In *Scholarship Reconsidered*, Boyer had challenged United States higher education's increasing valuation of research and publication by proposing that the following kinds of scholarship be equally valued: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of teaching. He too emphasizes the history of land-grant universities, and he sounds the call the report of the Tenure Team Initiative has begun to answer by noting that engaged scholarship can endanger faculty careers. He insists that colleges and universities involve themselves more in K-12 schools in the United States, and doubtlessly would have commended programs such as UC Irvine's Humanities Out There and Syracuse University's course *Literacy, Community, Art*, both of which are discussed in this volume. In his historical reflections and prescriptions, Boyer presents a nationalist vision that belies the global scope of the engaged scholarship for which he had just coined a term, and his vision is also rooted in a nostalgia for land-grant universities with specific capitalist and nationalist ends.

I admire the optimism and hope in Boyer's work, for as Paulo Freire argues, "hope is an ontological need" (1994, 2). It is these attitudes in combination with a diplomatic clear-sightedness that have inspired so many in his audience, despite the relative vagueness of his observations and recommendations. He speaks of the "community" as a site where the university can "engage," and he takes heart in what was then a novel attempt by even large research universities to claim to be "communities" (Boyer 1990, 56). Many of us can attest to the difficulties in adjusting to these "communities," whether because of class, race, nationality, culture, sexuality, or disability. It is for these reasons that increasing diversity in higher education is so crucial, as argued by George Sánchez in this volume and by Stephen Quaye in *Higher Education for the Public Good: Emerging Voices from a National Movement*. Boyer and the Kellogg Report too easily romanticize the university as a "community" (Quaye 2005, 293-307). In analyzing why, despite its sheer meaninglessness, this term so ubiquitously reassures all actors despite their manifestly conflicting agendas, Miranda Joseph demonstrates how even the most well-intentioned invocations of "community" are frequently bound up in coercive, violent, and capitalist power.

As one of fiction writer Alice Munro's perspicacious characters observed of her neighbors bent on having a widow's unsightly house razed, the universities, colleges, and scholars who easily invoke "community" may be "the people who win, and they are good people; they

want homes for their children and they help each other when there is trouble and they plan a community – saying that word as if they found a modern and well-proportioned magic in it, and no possibility anywhere of a mistake” (Munro 1968). Munro’s character, Mary, concludes that “there is nothing you can do at present but put your hands in your pockets and keep a disaffected heart.” Joseph demands instead that graduate students acknowledge the messily proportioned realities in which we work and recognize that a word like “community” can be wielded as a weapon perhaps more easily than it can inspire transformative education and personal growth.

In the second section, “Programs of Action: Institutionalizing Publicly Active Graduate Education,” the authors profile work to institutionalize public scholarship in colleges and universities. While this section is not prescriptive, the essays detail how scholars have implemented different kinds of projects, which may aid readers in their own planning and assessment. Kristen Day, Victor Becerra, Vicki L. Ruiz, and Michael Powe demonstrate ways that scholars and institutions can heed Boyer’s demand that they become more involved in K-12 schools. The Humanities Out There and Community Scholars programs at UC Irvine represent important innovations in graduate education that other schools might consider emulating.⁵ Key to the success of such programs is the funding of graduate student labor. Importantly, these contributions explore the changing terrain of the career paths taken by graduate students who earn Ph.D.’s in the humanities. Not all of us will become professors. Not all of us want to become professors, and while we decry the casualization of teaching labor, our educational opportunities can and should enrich and prepare us for the spectrum of work that we may do. The authors offer another list of skills that can be constructively compared with the “Pathways for Public Engagement” compiled by Imagining America and included here in Eatman’s essay, and they conclude with firm recommendations for institutional and cultural changes for graduate students in the humanities.

In “Getting Outside: Graduate Learning Through Art and Literacy Partnerships with City Schools,” Judith Meighan profiles the publicly engaged undergraduate and graduate class that she has taught, while making the case for public engagement as a way to diversify the skills that graduate students develop. Her careful documentation of the steps that she took to implement and sustain her course demonstrate potential obstacles—and the persistent strategies she used to educate Syracuse University students while educating *with* them in the public schools of Syracuse, New York. The extensive quotations from students attest to the importance of faculty-led engagement projects, which can

attract students who might not otherwise attempt publicly active scholarship.

In what was originally delivered as a Dewey Lecture at the University of Michigan's Ginsberg Center for Community Service and Learning, and later published in *Imagining America's Forseeable Futures* series, George Sánchez focuses on civic engagement and the urban university. He lauds programs that take undergraduate and graduate students into neighboring schools to provide arts education, but forcefully reminds scholars and teachers that "true service-learning" requires interrogation of the lack of arts education (and often, even basic quality instruction in other subjects) in many American public schools. The discrimination against K-12 students based on gender, race, and class affects access to university education later – and access to graduate school, faculty positions, and tenure after that. Sánchez emphasizes the importance of assembling a diverse group of students for public engagement projects. For him, this required an active recruitment of students for work in the Boyle Heights neighborhood of Los Angeles. To transgress literal and symbolic boundaries like Figueroa Avenue requires tenacity and strategy far beyond the crafting of an appealing class description. To advocate for principles of justice in Meighan's "outside" and Sánchez's other side of the street, universities and scholars must demonstrate those principles on campus too.

Linda S. Bergmann, Allen Brizee, and Jaclyn M. Wells support Sánchez's description of the increased attention, rigor, and evaluation needed to avoid the paternalism identified by Illich. Highlighting the professional skills that Brizee and Wells brought with them to graduate school, the authors also demonstrate that the work included training and practice in skills usually ignored in humanities graduate education. They advocate for empirical research in engagement projects so that the merits of those projects are measurable. Brizee also valorizes the personal relationships required with collaborators in order to create knowledge that will empower all participants.

As with traditional approaches to the humanities in United States higher education, graduate education in the arts has relied on exclusionary and insular narratives that discourage art intended to reach too far beyond the fences around academia and other parts of the mainstream art world. Like Meighan, Jan Cohen-Cruz outlasted the critics in her department, which should serve as further encouragement to ignore Limerick's advice, get our hands out of our pockets, and write entirely different memos to ourselves! Yet our hearts, disaffected or not, must be strong for the kinds of joint risk-taking and critical frameworks that Cohen-Cruz, like Sánchez, insists are essential for reciprocal,

productive, community-based university education in the arts and humanities.

Marcy Schnitzer and Max Stephenson also take up reciprocity, arts programs, and nonprofit organizational capacity-building in an essay profiling the aims, methods, and partnerships of the Virginia Tech Institute for Policy and Governance. They advocate for strong institutional backing of what they term publicly driven engagement, while also supporting those programs initiated by faculty and students. They conclude with a list of elements essential to fostering publicly active graduate education: mentoring, institutional support, students supporting students, and community members as peers and co-learners. We know that all publicly active graduate students do not benefit from this assistance, but we second Schnitzer and Stephenson's call for the broad implementation of these components of graduate education.

Reiterating Curtis, Rose, and Bross's point that tenured faculty have significant responsibilities and powers in the transformation of publicly active graduate education, Ron Krabill sifts through the conventional advice that warns graduate students against publicly engaged scholarship. He offers a model for radically collaborative graduate mentoring, in which faculty advisors recognize the considerable knowledge and important perspectives that a graduate student brings to her scholarship. Likewise, in this model, both the mentor and student honor and value the knowledge of collaborators outside of the academic sphere. He also calls for institutional and systemic changes, and gives frank but encouraging advice to potential and current publicly active graduate students.

Austin Bunn founded the Patient Voice Project as a graduate student, and he too attests to the importance of institutional support, quipping that in this case, "a top-down ethos met a bottom-up idea." Reflecting on how the program was founded and continues to be sustained, Bunn frankly discusses both his perceived failures and his documented successes. He presents the Patient Voice Project as a transferable model, but others of his observations apply broadly to potential and current publicly active graduate projects. Like Bergmann, Brizee, and Wells, Bunn developed a well-researched pedagogy—despite founding the program before appreciating the need for one. Like Cohen-Cruz's faith in actors in prison, Bunn trusts that chronically ill writers have something to say, but seek the craft with which to do it. Bunn's experience represents the improvisatory nature of much publicly active graduate education, and demonstrates that the most important element is the passionate graduate student.

In the final section, "A Balancing Act: Publicly Active Graduate Students' Reflections and Analyses," graduate students affirm again

and again our desires for graduate education to contribute to our growth as whole, living people, or for what bell hooks refers to as self-actualization (1994, 165). This demands a self-reflexive understanding of one's own professional motivations and aspirations, but also an idea about and a focus on, as Gale puts it, what we are *for* in all dimensions of our lives. The education required to emulate the vulnerable observer and the wounded healer in Ruth Behar's work (1996), or a transgressive teacher in the tradition of bell hooks, is infinitely more difficult (and rewarding) than Boyer's reassuringly clear categories of scholarship depict. To paraphrase Behar's comments on her commitment to the discipline of anthropology: it requires heartbreak, but that is the only kind of graduate education that is worth it to me.

Gale now feels that, in her promotion and education of graduate students under the auspices of *Imagining America*, she inadvertently ignored the most pressing priorities of PAGE summit participants – including her own. Her contribution to this volume offers a sensitive analysis of why, even within the supportive and innovative environment of *Imagining America*, systemic pressures shaped her views of her own goals, and those of the *Imagining America* PAGE program. Thus, while the inclusion in this volume of excerpts from *Scholarship in Public* and the document “Specifying the Scholarship of Engagement” responds to much the same pressures, Gale's contribution reveals the stakes: not just education and scholarship, but the futures of graduate students as living people engaged in public work with other real human beings. Gale's mapping exercise offers a challenging and dynamic way to visualize our careers, instead of (or perhaps in addition to) the linear arcs and trajectories of her title.

“Specifying the Scholarship of Engagement” is at once a daunting and an inspiring document. It is particularly useful in this section, in that graduate students can reflect on which skills they already possess, which their various projects may require, and which they should plan to acquire or refine. *Imagining America* seeks to validate the many sophisticated abilities on the list that are not frequently associated with conventional artistic work or humanities scholarship – and are certainly not explicitly included in graduate education in the arts and humanities. Many of these skills are ones that students learn *before* graduate school; others we cobble together as we need them, as Bunn, Gale, Dixon and Shotwell, and Neff all recount. The recognition of these various abilities as legitimate and important supports and guides those of us who might need to be both proficient weavers and critical theorists, who must hunker down in isolation long enough to write that “accessible prose,” but also nurture the “purposeful relationships and networks” in our lives, along with the myriad other skills that

Imagining America proposes make up the scholarship of engagement.

Through concrete suggestions drawn from their own experiences, Dixon and Shotwell demonstrate the ability and the need of graduate students to seek transformative social change that, while acknowledging the unique challenges of our “apprenticeship” in academic life, draws on the resources and platforms that we can access only as graduate students. They offer particularly insightful comments on the need to critically question professionalization and individualism. While we may learn academic expectations of authorship and self-presentation that may be at odds with our priorities and understandings of self, a recognition of the class-based, racialized, and gendered power dynamics underpinning what we present *and* what we wear at conferences can improve the critical rigor we bring to our research.

Ali Colleen Neff agrees with Dixon and Shotwell that graduate students, uniquely positioned to innovate in their scholarship, are at the vanguard of publicly active graduate education. Historically this is a familiar location for them, as evidenced by the participation of graduate students in the anti-racist, anti-war, and feminist social and scholarly movements of the 1960s and 1970s. Through her ethnographic work on popular music in Mississippi and Senegal, Neff has taken inspiration from musical improvisation to innovate in her scholarly practices. Exploring ethnography as a method for social transformation, she explains that she has learned how to pursue multifaceted publicly engaged scholarship by listening to her collaborators’ priorities and goals.

Damien Schnyder articulates the very personal motivations for his scholarly research. In this section, graduate students aver that an intellectual *and* emotional appreciation of our own desires, fears, and perspectives contributes to a far more rigorous scholarship than would a pretense of intellectual detachment. Schnyder’s account also demonstrates the impact of sophisticated theoretical training in the graduate classroom on public work. It was the writing of Black theorists that he encountered at the University of Texas at Austin that equipped him to most fully engage with interlocutors like Malcolm Rapp and Hector Chavez, whose perspectives attest to the systemic globalized racism that Schnyder describes in exploring the connections between Mexican racial politics and those in Los Angeles.

Amanda Jane Graham, too, brings herself as a vulnerable observer to her scholarship that recognizes systemic and government-sanctioned injustices. Nadia Myre’s collaborative artwork, *The Scar Project*, becomes a vehicle for Graham to experiment with a more collaborative and personal kind of scholarship than she encountered in her graduate seminars. Graham poses questions that resonate beyond art praxis and

art criticism, challenging the paradigmatic single authorship of artworks and scholarly writing: “How can anyone say what she is still learning to feel?” Like the actors Cohen-Cruz meets in prison and the writers participating in Bunn’s Patient Voice Project, Graham shows that graduate students, too, bring rich experience and knowledge, but seek craft to most fully express that experience and knowledge as part of their scholarly work. Graduate school is more readily characterized as a place for learning to think, but drawing upon feminist theory, Graham demonstrates that thinking and feeling are inherently intertwined, and that our emotions and personal motivations are fundamental aspects of our scholarship.

Although it brought additional pressures to my own balancing act in graduate education, working on this edited volume consistently has motivated me as I developed and pursued an unusual, multifaceted dissertation project. As graduate student and blogger Jonathan Senchyne explained in his response to a recent spate of columns advising against graduate education in the humanities (2011), for many of us—whether for reasons of class, gender, race, sexuality, or disability—graduate education provides life and career opportunities we likely would not have been able to obtain with any other form of preparation. Also, as the Edufactory Collective suggests, higher education is a key site of innovation, conflict, and change in our globalized, neoliberal world. Even the dwindling budgets of recession-era universities offer many resources we can leverage. Publicly active graduate education is messy, risky, and heartbreaking. We make ourselves vulnerable in all kinds of ways. Yet radical collaboration, scholarly rigor, and academic integrity may just require this vulnerability, especially if we are to achieve the greater critical thought and social justice to which all contributors to this volume aspire. Graduate education is not the only, or even the most important, site of political and social training, activism, and intervention, but it is a potentially significant one, as many collaborators and participants documented in this volume can attest—whether they are third-grade art students, medical patient writers, imprisoned actors, or graduate students. Following Curtis, Rose, and Bross’s advice to public active scholars to publish in order to normalize and legitimize their work, we hope that this volume bolsters a broadly hopeful and critically sophisticated discourse on publicly active graduate education.

Notes

1. See Boyer in this volume, as well as Boyer 1990.
2. Other notable conferences and programs include the Emerging

Engagement Scholars Workshop (<http://www.outreachscholarship.org/Initiatives/EmergingEngagementScholarsWorkshop.aspx>) and the 2006 conference, “Civic Engagement and Graduate Education: Preparing the Next Generation of Engaged Scholars,” organized by the Upper Midwest Campus Compact Consortium.

3. Damrosch, for example, asserts the importance of graduate student participation in the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate, but concedes that “only faculty—and senior faculty at that—have been commissioned to write essays for this collection [Golde and Walker 2006], one small sign of the pervasive updraft that silently reinforces our profession’s built-in hierarchies” (2006, 41). George Walker makes similar comments in the same volume (419). Fretz and Longo (2010) also criticize volumes on engaged scholarship that do not adequately address or listen to graduate students.

4. Kristen Day, Victor Becerra, Vicki L. Ruiz, and Michael Powe analyze University of California at Irvine’s Humanities Out There in this volume.

5. For more analysis of the impact of Humanities Out There, see Lupton 2008.

References

- Aldridge, Delores P., and Carlene Young. 2000. *Out of the revolution: The development of Africana studies*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Amor, Monica. 2008. On the contingency of modernity and the persistence of canons. In *Antinomies of art and culture: Modernity, postmodernity, contemporaneity*, edited by Terry Smith, Okwui Enwezor, and Nancy Condee. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Behar, Ruth. 1996. *The vulnerable observer: Anthropology that breaks your heart*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Bender, Thomas. 2006. Expanding the domain of history. In *Envisioning the future of doctoral education: Preparing stewards of the discipline*, edited by Chris M. Golde and George E. Walker. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bousquet, Marc. 2002. The waste product of graduate education: Toward a dictatorship of the flexible. *Social Text* 70 (1): 81–104.
- Boyer, Ernest L. 1990. *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. 2d ed. New York: Routledge.

- Damrosch, David. 2006. Vectors of change. In *Envisioning the future of doctoral education: Preparing stewards of the discipline*, edited by Chris M. Golde and George E. Walker. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Doberneck, Diane M., Robert E. Brown, and Angela D. Allen. 2010. Professional development for emerging engaged scholars. In *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions*, edited by Hiram E. Fitzgerald, Cathy Burack, and Sarena D. Seifer. Vol. 1, *Institutional change*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. 1932. Education and work. *Journal of Negro Education* 1 (1): 60–74.
- Edufactory Collective. 2009. *Toward a global autonomous university*. New York: Autonomedia.
- Fish, Stanley Eugene. 2008. *Save the world on your own time*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fitzgerald, Hiram E., Cathy Burack, and Sarena D. Seifer, eds. 2010. *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions*. 2 vols. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Freire, Paulo. 1994. *Pedagogy of hope*. Translated by Robert R. Barr. New York: Continuum.
- Fretz, Eric J. 2010. Student learning in the engaged academy. In *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions*, edited by Hiram E. Fitzgerald, Cathy Burack, and Sarena D. Seifer. Vol. 1, *Institutional change*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Fretz, Eric J., and Nicholas V. Longo. 2010. Students co-creating an engaged academy. In *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions*, edited by Hiram E. Fitzgerald, Cathy Burack, and Sarena D. Seifer. Vol. 1, *Institutional change*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Gale, Sylvia, and Evan Carton. 2005. Toward the practice of the humanities, *The Good Society* 14 (3): 38–44.
- Golde, Chris M., and George E. Walker, eds. 2006. *Envisioning the future of doctoral education: Preparing stewards of the discipline*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hale, Charles R., ed. 2008. *Engaging contradictions: Theory, politics, and methods of activist scholarship*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- hooks, bell. 1994. *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Howe, Florence. 2000. *The politics of women's studies: Testimony from*

- thirty founding mothers*. New York: Feminist Press.
- Huyssen, David. 2007. Response to the "Responsive PhD." *Academe* 93 (3): 49–51.
- Kezar, Adrianna J., Tony C. Chambers, and John Burkhardt, eds. 2005. *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Limerick, Patricia. 2008. Tales of Western adventure. In *Practicing public scholarship: Experiences and possibilities beyond the academy*, edited by Katharyne Mitchell. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lupton, Julia Reinhard. 2008. Philadelphia dreaming: Discovering citizenship between the university and the schools. In *Practicing public scholarship: experiences and possibilities beyond the academy*, edited by Katharyne Mitchell. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Munro, Alice. 1968. The shining houses. In *Dance of the happy shades*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.
- O'Meara, KerryAnn. 2010. Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship: Promotion and tenure. In *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions*, edited by Hiram E. Fitzgerald, Cathy Burack, and Sarena D. Seifer. Vol. 1, *Institutional change*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Quaye, Stephen Jon. 2005. Let us speak: Including students' voices in the public good of higher education. In *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement*, edited by Adrianna J. Kezar, Tony C. Chambers, and John C. Burkhardt. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rosen, Robyn L. 2004. *Women's studies in the academy: Origins and impact*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Senchyne, Jonathan. 2011. Working classes. *Bread yes, but also roses* (blog). July 28. <http://jsench.wordpress.com/2011/07/28/working-classes/>.
- Stimpson, Catharine R. 2006. Words and responsibilities: Graduate education and the humanities. In *Envisioning the future of doctoral education: Preparing stewards of the discipline*, edited by Chris M. Golde and George E. Walker. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Turner, Caroline Sotello Viernes. 2002. Women of color in academe: Living with multiple marginality. *Journal of Higher Education* 73 (1): 74–93.
- Van de Ven, Andrew H. 2007. *Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vogel, Amanda L., Caroline Fichtenberg, and Mindi B. Levin. 2010.

Students as change agents in the engagement movement. In *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions*, edited by Hiram E. Fitzgerald, Cathy Burack, and Sarena D. Seifer. Vol. 1, *Institutional change*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.