Collaborative Futures

Critical Reflections on Publicly Active Graduate Education

Edited by
Amanda Gilvin
Georgia M. Roberts
and Craig Martin

The Graduate School Press
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

Contents

Illustrations ix

Contributors xi

Foreword xix
Kevin Bott

Acknowledgments xxix

Introduction 1
Amanda Gilvin

Part One
Contextualizing Collaboration: Publicly Active Graduate Scholarship in United States Higher Education

1. The Arc of the Academic Career Bends Toward Publicly Engaged Scholarship 25
Timothy K. Eatman

2. The Land-Grant System and Graduate Education: Reclaiming a Narrative of Engagement 49
Timothy J. Shaffer

3. To Hell With Good Intentions 75
Ivan Illich

4. Publicly Engaged Graduate Research and the Transformation of the American Academy 83
Susan Curtis, Shirley Rose, and Kristina Bross

5. From *Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution;* Executive Summary with "Seven-Part Test" 103
Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities

6. Publicly Engaged Scholarship and Academic Freedom: Rights and Responsibilities — 111
Nicholas Behm and Duane Roen

Interchapter ~ Statements of the American Association of University Professors — 127
- 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with 1970 Interpretive Comments
- Statement on Professional Ethics
- Statement on Graduate Students

7. The Scholarship of Engagement — 143
Ernest L. Boyer

8. Community — 155
Miranda Joseph

PART TWO
Programs of Action: Institutionalizing Publicly Active Graduate Education

9. New Ways of Learning, Knowing, and Working: Diversifying Graduate Student Career Options Through Community Engagement — 163
Kristen Day, Victor Becerra, Vicki L. Ruiz, and Michael Powe

10. Getting Outside: Graduate Learning Through Art and Literacy Partnerships with City Schools — 183
Judith E. Meighan

11. Crossing Figueroa: The Tangled Web of Diversity and Democracy — 211
George J. Sánchez

12. The Engaged Dissertation: Three Points of View — 229
Linda S. Bergmann, Allen Brizee, and Jaclyn M. Wells

13. When the Gown Goes to Town: The Reciprocal Rewards of Fieldwork for Artists — 259
Jan Cohen-Cruz

14. Reimagining the Links Between Graduate Education and Community Engagement — 269
Marcy Schnitzer and Max Stephenson Jr.

15. Graduate Mentoring Against Common Sense 285
Ron Krabill

16. First and Lasts: Lessons from Launching the Patient Voice Project at the Iowa Writers' Workshop 301
Austin Bunn

PART THREE
A Balancing Act: Publicly Active Graduate Students' Reflections and Analyses

17. Arcs, Checklists, and Charts: The Trajectory of a Public Scholar? 315
Sylvia Gale

Interchapter ~ Specifying the Scholarship of Engagement: Skills for Community-Based Projects in the Arts, Humanities, and Design 329
Imagining America

18. Leveraging the Academy: Suggestions for Radical Grad Students and Radicals Considering Grad School 333
Chris Dixon and Alexis Shotwell

19. Collaboration Conversation: Collaborative Ethnography as Engaged Scholarship 347
Ali Colleen Neff

20. Reality Is Stranger than Fiction: The Politics of Race and Belonging in Los Angeles, California 367
Damien M. Schnyder

21. Participatory Art, Engaged Scholarship: The Embedded Critic in Nadia Myre's *Scar Project* 383
Amanda Jane Graham

Resources 401

Index 403

CONTRIBUTORS

Victor Becerra directs the Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC) at the University of California, Irvine, where he has worked since 2001. Located in the School of Social Ecology, COPC facilitates and supports engaged scholarship efforts around community development in Orange County and southern California. Mr. Becerra (C. Phil. in Urban Planning from UCLA) serves on the governing council of the Center for Collaborative Research for an Equitable California, a University of California Multi-Campus Research Program funded by the UC Office of the President.

Nicholas Behm, an assistant professor at Elmhurst College in Elmhurst, Illinois, studies composition pedagogy and theory, ancient rhetoric, postmodern rhetorical theory, and critical race theory. He teaches undergraduate and graduate courses in composition theory and rhetoric, and frequently leads workshops about composition theory, writing assessment, writing in the disciplines, and graduate education.

Linda Bergmann is a professor in the Rhetoric and Composition Program at Purdue University and directs the Purdue Writing Lab. She has published over 20 articles in such journals as *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines, Feminist Teacher,* and *A/B: Auto/Biography Studies,* and as chapters in edited collections. She is co-editor of *Composition and/or Literature: The End(s) of Education* (NCTE Press, 2006). Her textbook on research writing, *Academic Research and Writing: Inquiry and Argument in College* (Longman/Pearson), was released in the fall of 2009. She is an elected member of the Executive Council of the Conference on College Composition and Communication and of the Delegate Assembly of the Modern Language Association.

Kevin Bott is Associate Director of Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life and a part-time instructor at Syracuse University. Kevin designs and facilitates theater-based campus-community partnerships that seek to expand democratic participation. He currently leads The D.R.E.A.(M.)^3 Freedom Revival, an ongoing musical Tent Revival for Freedom and Democracy based in Syracuse, New York.

Ernest L. Boyer (1928–1995) was among the most influential figures in

American higher education in the twentieth century. He served as chancellor of the State University of New York system (1970–77), U.S. Commissioner of Education (1977–79), and president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1979–95). His Carnegie report *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (1990) helped set the stage for the emergence of the engaged scholarship movement.

Allen Brizee is an assistant professor in the Department of Writing at Loyola University Maryland and serves on the Department of English Distinguished Alumni Board at Virginia Tech. His scholarship focuses on civic engagement, empirical research, and rhetorical theory, and he has published in *Computers and Composition*, the *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, and edited collections. Currently he is working on an article titled, "Using Isocrates for Contemporary Civic Engagement."

Kristina Bross is an associate professor of English and American studies at Purdue University. She has authored books and articles on seventeenth-century European-Native contact, colonial American religious studies, and early Native literacy in New England. Together with Susan Curtis, she has been offering service-learning classes to graduate students since 2004.

Austin Bunn is an assistant professor in the Writing Department at Grand Valley State University in Grand Rapids, Michigan. His fiction and nonfiction have appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly*, the *New York Times Magazine*, *Best American Science and Nature Writing*, *The Pushcart Prize Anthology*, and elsewhere. He is a graduate of the Iowa Writers' Workshop and former Axton Fellow in Fiction and Michener-Copernicus Fellow.

Jan Cohen-Cruz is Director of Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life; author of *Engaging Performance: Theatre as Call and Response* (Routledge, 2010) and *Local Acts: Community‑Based Performance in the United States* (Rutgers University Press, 2005); editor of *Radical Street Performance* (Routledge, 1998); and co‑editor of *A Boal Companion* (Routledge, 2006) and *Playing Boal: Theatre, Therapy, Activism* (Routledge, 1993). Jan is a University Professor at Syracuse University and is currently evaluating 15 community-based visual arts diplomacy projects taking place in 15 countries through the State Department.

Susan Curtis is a professor of history and directs the American Studies Program at Purdue University. Her most recent book, *Colored Memories:*

A Biographer's Quest for the Elusive Lester A. Walton (University of Missouri Press, 2008), reflects her involvement in a local engagement project involving community partners and local archival materials, a project that provides an interface between public memory, academic scholarship, and historical awareness.

Kristen Day is a professor and head of the Department of Technology, Culture and Society at the Polytechnic Institute of New York University in Brooklyn. She was previously a professor of urban planning and Director of Engagement for the University of California, Irvine. Her research focuses on planning and design to promote health and to support diverse communities.

Chris Dixon, originally from Alaska, is a longtime activist, writer, and educator who recently received his Ph.D. from the History of Consciousness Program at the University of California at Santa Cruz. He is currently completing a book, tentatively titled *Against and Beyond*, based on interviews with anti-authoritarian organizers across the U.S. and Canada involved in broader-based movements. Dixon serves on the board of the Institute for Anarchist Studies and the advisory board for the journal *Upping the Anti*. He can be reached at chrisd@resist.ca.

Timothy K. Eatman, an educational sociologist, is a faculty member in the Higher Education Department at Syracuse University and serves also as Director of Research for the consortium Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life, headquartered at Syracuse. Tim is co -author of *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University* (Imagining America, 2008), a report that has received widespread attention within higher education as a useful resource for conceptualizing a continuum of knowledge creation that acknowledges scholarly approaches and practices beyond conventional frames. He is currently developing a study of the aspirations and decisions of graduate students and early-career publicly engaged scholars—knowledge makers both inside and outside the academy.

Sylvia Gale is Associate Director of the Bonner Center for Civic Engagement at the University of Richmond. She received her Ph.D. in English with a concentration in rhetoric and writing from the University of Texas at Austin in 2008. She serves on the National Advisory Board of Imagining America and was the founding director of IA's Publicly Active Graduate Education (PAGE) initiative. She can be reached at sgale@richmond.edu.

Amanda Gilvin is a doctoral candidate in the history of art at Cornell University, where she also completed a master's degree in Africana studies. She first studied in Odumase-Krobo, Ghana, in 1999, and her 2006 master's thesis was entitled "The Fire Is Too Hot for Them: Gender and Change in the Krobo Bead Industry." In 2009 and 2010, she was a Fulbright-Hays Dissertation Research Abroad Fellow in Niger and France, and she is currently writing her dissertation, which is tentatively entitled "The Warp of a Nation: The Exhibition and Circulation of Nigerien Art, 1920–Present." Her research interests include African art, the taxonomy of art and craft, museum studies, gender studies, and textiles.

Amanda Jane Graham is a doctoral candidate in the graduate program in visual and cultural studies at the University of Rochester. A former New York City public school teacher and community organizer, Graham has an M.A. in communication and culture from York University and an M.S. in education from Brooklyn College. Her essay "Abstract Division: Tracing Nadia Myre's Scar Trajectory" appears in *Nadia Myre: En[counter]s* (Éditions Art Mûr, 2011).

Ivan Illich (1926–2002) was an Austrian-born philosopher and social critic. He was ordained a Catholic priest in 1951. His major work in the philosophy of education is *Deschooling Society* (1971).

Miranda Joseph is an associate professor of gender and women's studies at the University of Arizona. She is the author of *Against the Romance of Community* (University of Minnesota Press, 2002) as well as a number of essays, including "Accounting for Interdisciplinarity" (in *Interdisciplinarity and Social Justice,* SUNY Press, 2010) and, with Sandra K. Soto, "Neoliberalism and the Battle over Ethnic Studies in Arizona" (in *Thought and Action*, 2010). Her current project, *A Debt to Society*, explores techniques and sites of accounting as performative practices that attribute credits and debts and thus sustain or transform social relations.

Ron Krabill is an associate professor of interdisciplinary arts and sciences and Faculty Coordinator of the M.A. program in cultural studies at the University of Washington Bothell. He is also affiliated with the Department of Communication, the African Studies Program, and the Graduate Interdisciplinary Group on Public Scholarship at the University of Washington, Seattle. He is the author of *Starring Mandela and Cosby: Media and the End(s) of Apartheid* (University of Chicago Press, 2010).

Craig Martin is an assistant professor of religious studies at St. Thomas Aquinas College, editor of the *Bulletin for the Study of Religion*, and Executive Secretary of the North American Association for the Study of Religion. His books include *Masking Hegemony: A Genealogy of Liberalism, Religion and the Private Sphere* (Equinox, 2010), *A Critical Introduction to the Study of Religion* (Equinox, forthcoming), and *Religious Experience: A Reader*, co-edited with Russell T. McCutcheon (Equinox, forthcoming). Craig's research interests concern social theories of religion and ideology, with a particular focus on how "religion" is imagined in modern thought and popular discourses.

Judith E. Meighan is an associate professor of the history of art in the College of Visual and Performing Arts at Syracuse University. Dr. Meighan is an expert in nineteenth- and twentieth-century art and specializes in the beginnings of modern art in Italy. She received her B.A. from Swarthmore College and her M.A., M.Phil., and Ph.D. degrees from Columbia University. Before joining the SU faculty in 1993, she worked at the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) in New York. Dr. Meighan has been a curator and frequent advisor at Syracuse's Everson Museum of Art, where she is also a popular lecturer. A resident of Syracuse, she has forged links between SU's College of Visual and Performing Arts and the Syracuse City School District.

Ali Colleen Neff, a cultural studies Ph.D. student at the University of North Carolina, is committed to documenting, amplifying, and celebrating the musical creativity of young people throughout the Black Atlantic. Her work in Mississippi and Senegal is manifest in her book, *Let the World Listen Right: The Mississippi Delta Hip-Hop Story* (University Press of Mississippi, 2011) and her website, www.ethnolyrical.org.

Michael Powe is a postdoctoral research associate at the University of California, Irvine. His research explores the capacity of urban policy and planning to address issues of urban inequality and social exclusion in urban neighborhoods. He is currently developing a book, tentatively titled *Loft Living in Skid Row: The Contradictions of Planning in a Contested Community*, based on interviews with more than 70 city officials, business representatives, social service providers, and Skid Row residents.

Georgia M. Roberts is a Ph.D. candidate in English at the University of Washington, Seattle, and a predoctoral lecturer in interdisciplinary arts and sciences at UW Bothell. She has held several teaching positions

across the humanities: in English, the comparative history of ideas, and as a director and instructor for the UW study abroad program in South Africa. Her research interests include global hip-hop culture, American and comparative cultural studies, critical race theory, and public scholarship.

Duane Roen is Assistant Vice Provost for University Academic Success Programs at Arizona State University. In the School of Letters and Sciences at ASU, he serves as head of technical communication and head of interdisciplinary and liberal studies. Active in the field of rhetoric and composition, he currently serves as president of the Council of Writing Program Administrators.

Shirley K. Rose is a professor of English and directs Arizona State University Writing Programs in the English Department on the Tempe campus, where she has taught since 2009. She has published several book chapters on archival studies in rhetoric and composition, exploring topics such as writing program administrators as archivists, George Wykoff's professional narratives as representation of WPA intellectual work, and recognizing the rhetorical work of professional archivists. Professor Rose has taught graduate seminars in archival methodologies, team-teaching with colleagues in American studies and with professional archivists at the Tippecanoe County Historical Association and at the Purdue University Archives and Special Collections.

Vicki L. Ruiz is Dean of the School of Humanities and a professor of history and Chicano/Latino studies at the University of California, Irvine. An award-winning historian, she is the author of *From Out of the Shadows: Mexican Women in Twentieth-Century America* (Oxford University Press, 1998) and *Cannery Women, Cannery Lives* (University of New Mexico Press, 1987). She is past president of the Organization of American Historians and the American Studies Association.

George J. Sánchez is a professor of American studies and ethnicity and of history at the University of Southern California. He is the author of *Becoming Mexican American: Ethnicity, Culture and Identity in Chicano Los Angeles, 1900–1945* (Oxford University Press, 1993), and coeditor of *Civic Engagement in the Wake of Katrina* (University of Michigan Press, 2009) and *Los Angeles and the Future of Urban Cultures* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005). Past president of the American Studies Association in 2001–02, he currently serves as director of the Center for Diversity and Democracy and Vice Dean for Diversity and Strategic

Initiatives at USC College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences.

Marcy H. Schnitzer is a research associate at the Virginia Tech Institute for Policy and Governance. She holds a Ph.D. in government and international affairs from Virginia Tech, where she was formerly Assistant Director of the Service-Learning Center. She has conducted research in intergenerational engagement, nonprofit philanthropy, peacebuilding, and disaster management.

Damien M. Schnyder completed his degree in anthropology with a concentration in the African diaspora from the University of Texas at Austin. Damien is currently working on a book manuscript that analyzes prisons, education, masculinity, resistance movements, and Black culture. In addition to serving on the board of the Southern California Library, Damien is a member of Critical Resistance and sits on the editorial board of *Black California Dreamin': Social Vision and the Crisis of California's African American Communities*.

Timothy J. Shaffer is a Ph.D. candidate studying adult and extension education at Cornell University. His research focuses on historical and contemporary examples of higher education's public purposes and work, primarily within the land-grant system. Specifically, he is interested in questions about democracy, expertise, knowledge, and passion—both for academic professionals and for citizens.

Alexis Shotwell is an assistant professor in philosophy and English at Laurentian University in Sudbury, Ontario. Her academic work addresses racial formation, unspeakable and unspoken knowledge, gender, and political transformation. Her engagement in political struggle focuses on indigenous solidarity, ending war, and feminist community education. She has recently completed a book entitled *Knowing Otherwise: Race, Gender, and Implicit Understanding* (Penn State University Press, 2011). She can be reached at ashotwell@laurentian.ca.

Max Stephenson Jr. directs the Institute for Policy and Governance and is an associate professor in the School of Public and International Affairs at Virginia Tech. He is the author of more than 40 articles and book chapters in his areas of research interest, as well as three monographs and several edited published symposia. He and Professor Laura Zanotti (also of Virginia Tech) will publish a book and an edited volume in the coming year: *Community-Based NGOs, Peacebuilding and the Challenges of Post-Conflict Governance* (Kumarian Press, 2012) and *Building Walls and Dissolving Borders: Alterity, Community and*

Securitizing Space (Ashgate, 2012).

Jaclyn M. Wells is an assistant professor of English and directs the River Bend Writing Project at the University of Southern Indiana. She received a Ph.D. in English from Purdue University. Wells has published and presented in the areas of community engagement, public rhetoric, and writing program administration. She is currently working on a project about military veterans in the writing classroom, as well as a collaborative book with Allen Brizee about the CWEST project.

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, postcolonial 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 socioeconomically 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 professsoriate.* 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.

2

The Land-Grant System and Graduate Education: Reclaiming a Narrative of Engagement

Timothy J. Shaffer

IN 2012 WE celebrate the sesquicentennial of the passage of the first Morrill Act. But for many Americans, "Morrill Act" has little meaning. Clarifying that this act, signed into law in 1862 by President Lincoln, created what became known as land-grant colleges and universities does little to help with this confusion. Let me tell a story to illustrate this.

Someone recently asked me about my research. I began to mention how I was interested in the civic mission and purposes of land-grant universities and cooperative extension as embodied in the work of academic professionals. There was a pause. The individual who asked me this question didn't know what I was talking about. He vaguely knew what extension was, but only thought that it had something to do with agriculture. "Land-grant," however, didn't mean anything.

I responded by mentioning that land-grant colleges and universities are in every state and several U.S. territories (109 institutions, to be exact).[1] These include Ohio State University, Pennsylvania State University, the University of Wisconsin, and Cornell University (my own institution). They were founded to be open and accessible to all people. They were the embodiment of a belief in education being a central element to democracy. With an explicit mission to educate students in practical disciplines such as agriculture, home economics (now human ecology), mechanic arts (now engineering), and the liberal arts, these institutions afforded citizens the opportunity to be part of what were called "democracy's colleges" (Ross 1942). These institutions offered students—both undergraduate and graduate—an opportunity to explore diverse disciplines of study while also belonging to a particular type of academic environment that had roots in serving an explicit public mission. The Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, tasked with identifying needed responses to structural change in public higher education, notes that a serious

challenge we face is a disconnect between the land-grant's historical roots and its current manifestation (Kellogg Commission 2001). These institutions have tremendous resources and create new knowledge, but to what end? The authors of the Kellogg report note that the public's complaints "add up to … a perception that, despite the resources and expertise available on our campuses, our institutions are not well organized to bring them to bear on local problems in a coherent way" (Kellogg Commission 2001, 13). Land-grant universities may have missions to engage the public, but how that engagement occurs has not been clearly articulated.

Back to my conversation about my research: The response was not all that atypical for me when I speak about my work: "Well, that's interesting. We need to educate people and, I mean, I'm glad we have scientists figuring out how to fix our problems. This world's a mess."

I tell this story for two reasons. First, higher education's role in the mind of the American public isn't clear. For many, higher education is seen as an opportunity to improve one's economic status. It serves as a seemingly necessary step for social mobility and freedom to pursue interests of one's choosing. This attitude is increasingly moving beyond undergraduate education, as graduate degrees become necessary for many professions and positions. But connecting higher education to a notion of democracy is difficult, especially if "democracy" transcends categories that define it simply as a political structure rather than a way of life. David Mathews calls democracy "a way of living to maintain a good life in concert with others" (1999, 13) and Harry Boyte says a "democratic way of life" is "created through public, political work of the people" (2004, 93). For our purposes, I would suggest that we think of democracy as public relationships with other citizens. These relationships are challenging but necessary if we are to live in ways that go beyond isolated existence and what Michael Sandel calls "consumeristic" existence (2000, 80). Higher education's role is to help shape and inform citizenship through the development of students as well as through engagement work on the part of academic professionals.

Second, those within colleges and universities are often perceived as scientists or more broadly as "experts" who solve problems. They fix things. Their role is to provide information and resources for citizens and elected officials to make decisions. In many ways this is true. But what's absent from such a definition of academic professionals (and aspiring graduate students) is a view that situates land-grant institutions and those within them as civic actors.

We are more accustomed to thinking of academic professionals being detached from the world in some lab instead of viewing them as

political actors engaged in communities. Such a narrative is pervasive and has been called the heroic metanarrative of land-grant universities (Peters 2007). Yet there are counter-narratives to such a view. Re-storying the narrative about land-grant institutions and the individuals within them helps academic professionals and graduate students take seriously the public nature of their work and the types of relationships that help to foster a more democratic society. We can learn a great deal about graduate education if we can look beyond the dominant narrative about what it means to be affiliated with land-grant institutions. This is a very important theoretical and practical issue because the culture of these institutions cultivates and/or challenges such narratives. As faculty members mentor and influence graduate students through the educational process, identifying the paradigms that shape how academic professionals view and engage in their work is of import. The dominant narrative of experts providing information shapes how many within and outside higher education see its role. Higher education, and the land-grant university specifically, is much more complicated than that.

This chapter is comprised of three parts. First, I will provide a very brief survey of the history of land-grant universities and the federal legislation that has supported the development of research and outreach programs, with an emphasis on graduate education. Because this is a survey, limitations of space mean that critically important issues and themes will not and cannot be addressed. I will sketch out some of the pivotal elements of the land-grant history, identifying the major milestones that shape these institutions. I also will note how the major elements of land-grant history have implications for publicly engaged graduate education.

Second, I raise questions related to what it means to be a graduate student at a land-grant institution and a contributor to the always-contested mission and public purpose(s) of these institutions. I take up what Scott Peters recognizes as the "main problems with the prevailing view of the historical nature and significance of the land-grant mission" (2008, 123). Peters' contention is that the history of the land-grant mission has been narrowly understood, raising questions not only about the historical accuracy of how we speak about and understand the land-grant system, but also about the ways in which land-grant institutions fulfill their public purpose of being the "people's universities" (123).

Third, I will identify some of the challenges and possibilities for contemporary graduate education at land-grant universities. In doing so, I will explore briefly how graduate education fits within this contested and conflictual view, understanding, and interpretation of

the land-grant mission.

Land Grants and Democracy: The Morrill Act of 1862 and Its Impact

A common way to speak about the development and role of land-grant colleges and universities is to highlight some of the significant events that have helped to shape the identity of these institutions. I will follow in this tradition and then I will critique it, explaining why it is important in order to understand the complexity of these institutions, especially as we explore questions related to graduate education and the experience of graduate students.

In the early nineteenth century, the United States economy and culture were agricultural in focus, with 85% of the population (of European descent) living in rural communities along the East Coast (Eddy 1957, 1). It is fitting that these lines are found at the beginning of the first general account of the development of the land-grant movement, because the Morrill Act recognized agriculture as central to the development of the United States.

During the first half of the nineteenth century, there were two types of colleges and universities: publicly controlled and privately controlled. European universities where American professors had trained and taught previously greatly influenced these institutions. They were designed to serve a stratified society with limited democratic aspirations. College education was primarily reserved for "the leisure classes, the government leaders, and members of the professions" (Brunner 1962, 1). In many ways, this meant upper-class white men. Higher education institutions in the United States functioned in a similar fashion and maintained a classical curriculum, with only slight adaptations to the needs of a "pioneer people" (Brunner 1962).

In the United States, programs of graduate study first took root in three kinds of institutions: "new ones like Hopkins, Clark, and Chicago; strong private colleges like Harvard, Columbia, Yale, and Cornell; and such strong public institutions on the rise as California, Michigan, and Wisconsin" (Berelson 1960, 9). The modern public American research institution traces its roots to a handful of universities: the Universities of Georgia, North Carolina, Vermont, South Carolina, and Virginia. But the "real signal of public commitment" to university-based research came from the Morrill Act of 1862 (Rhoten and Powell 2011, 317).

Justin Morrill, a representative and then senator from Vermont, sponsored the Land Grant College Act, which was signed into law by President Lincoln.[2] Morrill had previously proposed similar legislation, eventually passed by Congress but vetoed by President Buchanan in 1859. Morrill, who had no formal education beyond secondary school,

believed education could provide people access to a better way of life and make them better citizens. In a speech in 1888 about the Land Grant College Act, Morrill said that "the fundamental idea was to offer an opportunity in every state for a liberal and larger education to larger numbers, not merely to those destined to sedentary professions, but to those needing higher instruction for the world's business, for the industrial pursuits and professions of life" (Morrill 1888, 11).

The establishment of a national system of universities that blended liberal and practical education challenged the transplanted European approach to higher education. The Morrill Act gave each state 30,000 acres of federal land for each congressional representative from that state. These lands were federally owned and, if states did not have enough land, they were able to use property in other states, or to give land-grant funds to already-established agricultural or normal schools, which were then renamed. In all, nearly 17.5 million acres were distributed (Cohen and Kisker 2010, 115). That land was then sold to create endowments to support and maintain

> at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts … in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life. (Eddy 1957, 3)

Morrill recognized that American society (and its economy) needed both to address the changes taking place with increasing industrialization and to meet the agricultural demands of a booming population. It is important to note that the federal government did not have the ability to provide funds at this time. Thus, providing federally owned land was essential to establishing collegiate education, with the government functioning more as a real estate promoter than a funding source (Eddy 1957, 36). There was a need to educate new farmers in better agricultural practices as well as afford the opportunity to students for them to have both a practical and liberal education. These new colleges and universities did just that.

While states were charged with the task of creating new academic institutions, some had previously established colleges of agriculture. The precursor to Michigan State University often served as the example of what the land-grant colleges and universities might become (Clute 1891). These newly created public education institutions were designed to be "elite without being elitist, to provide access to knowledge and education to those previously denied such

access" (Simon 2010, 100). Before this period, higher education was typically limited to white men from affluent backgrounds. These new institutions were to challenge that social norm and to expand educational opportunities for rural citizens as well as women and minority population.

Cornell University, home to New York State's land-grant colleges while also existing as a privately endowed university, was open to both men and women of all races and challenged many of the social conventions in the 1860s. Before World War I, the Cornell student body included "representatives from every quarter of the globe" and included many international students from Canada, Mexico, Cuba, China, and Japan, among many others. When graduate students were taken into account, "a still greater diversity and considerably larger total would be manifest (Von Engeln 1924). Told this way, Cornell appears to be welcoming of all peoples.

But in practice, women didn't come to Cornell's campus until 1870 and it was not until 1873 that the first woman graduated. In 1929, Ezra Cornell's founding ideal of "any person, any study" was put to the test in the person of Ruth Peyton, an African American undergraduate from Olean, New York., Peyton was denied residency in the women's dormitory because, as President Livingston Farrand wrote to Peyton's mother, "the placing of a colored student in one of the dormitories inevitably cause[s] more embarrassment than satisfaction for such a student…. [W]hile I have great sympathy for your feeling, I cannot order a change in the procedure of the Dean of Women, under whose jurisdiction the matter falls" (Farrand 1929). Students from around the world attended Cornell at the time, but some of those closest to home suffered discrimination because of their skin color. "Any person, any study" articulated a vision the university was not yet prepared to embrace in practice. In short, higher education offered an opportunity for women and minority populations, but institutions struggled to transcend cultural norms and practices of the middle-to-late nineteenth century well into the twentieth century. Rhetoric and reality sometimes remained quite distinct, as this quick look at Cornell's history reveals.

In many ways, the land-grant idea was a bold experiment. It "transformed higher education through the concept of service and direct links with industry and agriculture … and expanded access to higher education" (Altbach 2011, 17). Many institutions were slow to embrace graduate education. Michigan Agricultural College (now Michigan State University) adopted a statute in 1861 that stated it could confer Master of Science degrees, and by 1881 was creating a more structured process for graduate education (Dressel 1987, 167). By the 1890s graduate education was flourishing, with one in ten students

seeking a master's degree (Kuhn 1955, 236). But it was not until the 1920s that graduate studies (with doctoral programs for seven scientific disciplines) moved beyond its secondary status in the curriculum of the college behind undergraduate education (Widder 2005, 171). Ohio State University, founded in 1870, did not begin accepting graduate students until the 1880s. This delay in implementing graduate education was common for land-grant colleges at the time. While institutions such as Cornell University were founded with graduate education as part of their mission, few graduate programs existed in the late nineteenth century. Increasingly, however, graduate education was becoming part of the educational experience of land-grant colleges and universities, initially in scientific and agricultural disciplines and then later in the humanities and the social sciences.

The first mention of graduate work by the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities occurred in 1897, in the form of a resolution that stated graduate students should have access to and use of the Congressional Library, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Museum, and the scientific bureaus of the various departments of the government for the purpose of research and study (Rees 1962, 1). In many ways, land-grant colleges and universities began the development of science and technology in the United States (Carmichael 1961, 67). Within these institutions, the development of graduate education was founded on the central paradigm that one's worth was based on research.

One innovation of land-grant universities was the establishment from the late nineteenth century of agricultural experiment stations, which receive considerable federal, state, and private funding for research that informs educational work, both through teaching at the universities and in engagement work through cooperative extension. Experiment stations have been and continue to be deeply engaged with the teaching and training of graduate students whose work serves a public purpose, especially scholarship related to agricultural issues. Yet the way this public purpose is defined fits narrowly within the heroic metanarrative embodied by the service intellectual tradition. This tradition views one's work through the lens of creating knowledge for others to use (Peters 2010, 24–32). The service intellectual tradition also features characteristics of what is often assumed about the work of scholars: that social scientists (or other academics) must maintain a stance of disinterested and unbiased neutrality about their work. In this tradition, the proper function for the academic is the answering of scientific questions with scientific knowledge (Peters 2010, 26).

While these institutions were created to afford opportunities to

citizens of lower classes who had previously been unable to attend college, to democratize higher education by opening its doors to those otherwise excluded, and to engage in research with a public purpose, many remained marginalized within these colleges and universities. Some of the most striking examples of discrimination took place in the southern states. This led to the Second Morrill Act, 28 years after the original creation of the land-grant system.

The Second Morrill Act of 1890 and the Equity in Education Land-Grant Status Act of 1994

Northern members of Congress passed the First Morrill Act when members from southern states were absent because of the Civil War. After the Civil War and the reintegration of the Confederate states, there was a need to address the reality that southern states continued to have racial segregation. While some states used funds provided by the Morrill Act of 1862 for the education of African Americans at private institutions such as Virginia's Hampton Institute and South Carolina's Claflin University, as well as Mississippi's public Alcorn University, the majority of southern states took no action until they were "induced to do so under the terms of the Second Morrill Act of 1890" (Eddy 1957, 258).

The Second Morrill Act stipulated that "no appropriations would go to states that denied admission to the colleges on the basis of race unless they also set up separate but equal facilities" (Rudolph 1962, 254). This legislation provided funds and resources to historically Black colleges and universities creating educational opportunities for African Americans in southern states despite a prevailing climate of inequality (Spikes 1992). However, it should be noted that although most of these institutions were established following the Civil War and before 1900, their growth and development was restricted by lack of financial resources. This was true regarding general support for these institutions as well as for their explicit land-grant research well into the 1970s. Finally, in 1972, institutions that received funds subsequent to the 1890 legislation became part of the USDA's regular annual appropriation for agricultural research rather than receiving funds through a special grant renegotiated each year (Christy, Williamson, and Williamson 1992, xvii–xxi).[3]

B. D. Mayberry noted that the initial and most significant contribution of the 1890 institutions was to provide the mechanism for "4 million negroes (former slaves) to move into the mainstream of American society as citizens with all the rights and privileges embodied in citizenship through education" (Mayberry 1991, 36). Education was and continues to be a central factor in shaping human development.

Thus, the creation of these institutions afforded African Americans opportunities that had previously been available only from private institutions.

The institutions funded under the Second Morrill Act remain actively engaged in carrying out the tripartite land-grant mission of teaching, research, and service while maintaining commitments to those disadvantaged by racism and prejudice.[4] With slavery only recently abolished, the 1890 institutions had to address the low educational levels of African Americans by admitting students with only elementary or secondary levels of preparation (Humphries 1992, 4). This posed a severe challenge to what were in design and purpose tertiary institutions, but within a few decades graduate education also became a concern. Beginning with Prairie View A&M University and Virginia State University in 1937, and followed two years later by North Carolina A&T State, the 1890 institutions initiated graduate programs. In 1953, Florida A&M University established schools of law, pharmacy, liberal arts, agricultural education, home economics, and other disciplines, with master's-level education being the most popular (Humphries 1992, 6). Other institutions followed suit, though some, such as Alcorn State University and the University of Maryland Eastern Shore, did not create graduate programs until decades later—in 1975 and 1978, respectively (Christy, Williamson, and Williamson 1992, xx).

In a similar spirit, the Equity in Education Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 provided land-grant designation to 33 tribal colleges for Native Americans in Western and Plains states. This provided federal funding for teaching, research, and outreach, responding to the specific needs and interests of the Native American populations these institutions serve. Because many of these institutions and populations are geographically remote, the 1994 Act provided funds to increase extension work in areas such as agriculture; community resources and economic development; family development and resource management; 4-H and youth development; leadership and volunteer development; natural resources and environmental management; and nutrition, diet, and health.

What makes these institutions slightly different from their predecessors is the fact that these tribal colleges include community colleges, four-year institutions, and some institutions with graduate-level courses and programs. This group within the land-grant system continues to play an important role in increasing social and economic opportunities for Native Americans through affordable education as well as programs that respond to the particular needs of Native American communities.

While access and affordability have helped to define public higher education, the research and service dimensions of the land-grant mission are addressed through the work of campus faculty and the application of resulting knowledge via cooperative extension.

The Hatch Act of 1887, the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, and Earlier Engagement

The ability to realize the public mission of land-grant institutions relies, in part, on the Hatch and the Smith-Lever Acts. The Hatch Act established the agricultural station system in each of the colleges under the Morrill Act of 1862 to "aid in acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects connected with agriculture, and to promote scientific investigation and experiment respecting the principles and applications of agricultural science" (Eddy 1957, 97). This act established and expanded experiment stations across the country on the campuses of land-grant colleges and universities.[5] Most faculty in land-grant colleges of agriculture have appointments that connect their research to experiment station work, and include "Hatch" research funds for original work on issues impacting the agricultural industry and rural life (Committee on the Future 1995, 8). Hatch funding has not been limited to commercial agriculture; the Rust2Green project in older at-risk industrial cities in New York State serves as an example of action research initiatives partially funded through Hatch grants.[6]

The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 established a system of cooperative extension service involving the United States Department of Agriculture, land-grant colleges and universities, and local communities, with the goal of educating and working with citizens through programmatic initiatives. Often cooperative extension shared information with citizens about current developments in agriculture, home economics, and other relevant subjects. But cooperative extension also engaged in work with citizens, seeking to address challenges facing individuals and communities that went beyond situations that only required technical expertise and knowledge. Cooperative extension's role goes beyond the application of research-based information to include important community work and leadership development.

Cooperative extension increased human and monetary capital for public work. But the idea of extension has roots deeper than the Smith-Lever Act. C. Hartley Grattan notes that "the first quarter-century of land-grant college history was one of toil and struggle, complicated by uncertainty of direction and unclear ideas about what and how to teach the students drawn to the colleges, and how to make the cumulating knowledge available to dirt farmers" (Grattan 1955, 201). Students who

attended land-grant colleges went on to become faculty and administrators at these institutions, with Liberty Hyde Bailey being one of the most striking examples. Originally a farmer, Bailey became a student at Michigan Agricultural College and then went on to shape both academic life and the lives of many rural people and communities at the turn of the twentieth century as a faculty member and eventually dean of Cornell's College of Agriculture.

Bailey helps us to think critically about the history of land-grant institutions and cooperative extension because he saw agricultural education as a means to awaken in rural people a new view of life, rather than simply as a conduit of technical information (Peters 2006). He saw the colleges of agriculture and experiment stations having an important role in the "future welfare and peace of the people" to a degree that was then unforeseen (Bailey 1915, 98). For him, the role of these institutions was to help citizens to see the world differently and to act differently.

> The college may be the guiding force, but it should not remove responsibility from the people of the localities, or offer them a kind of co-operation that is only the privilege of partaking in the college enterprises. I fear that some of our so-called co-operation in public work of many kinds is little more than to allow the co-operator to approve what the official administration has done. (Bailey 1915, 100)

Bailey was suspect of much that his contemporaries identified as engagement with citizens. Land-grant universities had an important role to play and the faculty within them were important contributors to society, but the ways that university faculty and extension educators worked with citizens could vary widely. In some situations faculty expertise was utilized appropriately, while in others education was confused with the dispensing of facts. Peters quotes Bailey from a speech given on December 13, 1899, to the annual Farmers' Convention in Meriden, Connecticut:

> We know that we can point out a dozen things, and sometimes thirteen. But after all, it is not the particular application of science to the farm which is the big thing. The big thing is the point of view. The whole agricultural tone has been raised through these agencies. People are taking broader views of things and of life. Even if we did not have a single fact with which we could answer these people, it is a sufficient answer to say that every agricultural college and every agricultural experiment station,

> with all their faults, has been a strong factor in the general elevation of agriculture and the common good. The whole attitude has changed. It is the scientific habit of thought and no longer the mere extraneous application of science. (qtd. in Peters 2006, 212)

The role of the land-grant university (particularly the colleges of agriculture) and the experiment station was not just to provide information. It was also about working with citizens to help realize a different way of seeing the world. This is what Bailey called the "scientific spirit." Defining one's work in such a way challenges a dominant narrative about what land-grant universities were doing during this formative period around the turn of the twentieth century, when there was need of a "system capable of proving to farmers that 'book farming' was not a joke and that agricultural science, properly applied, would produce a better life for them and their families" (Scott 1970, x). There were competing agendas: some suggested that the technical skills of university scientists were alone sufficient to meet the need, while others adhered to the essential belief that citizens should apply their own knowledge in concert with new information from research.

In the early 1890s Pennsylvania State College, Cornell University, and the University of Illinois lent impetus to the extension concept by adapting techniques of adult education from the then-flourishing Chautauqua movement to engage farmers. By 1907, at least 39 land-grant colleges were "doing *something* in the way of extension" (Grattan 1955, 202; emphasis in original). The approaches to programming were diverse. They included lectures, short courses, summer schools, bulletin reports, circulars, cooperative experiments, exhibits at fairs, and demonstrations on farms.

Before and after the Smith-Lever Act, Seaman A. Knapp's demonstration method was foundational to the educational methods of land-grant colleges and cooperative extension. While Knapp placed much emphasis on economic gains, he was not solely focused on efficiency and technical expertise. Rather, his ultimate aim was "the development of a vibrant rural civic and cultural life" (Peters 1998, 133).

The language of the Smith-Lever Act reflects Knapp's demonstration model of education in its pronouncement that extension "shall consist of the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home economics." This approach was employed in order to "aid in the diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and

home economics" (Smith and Wilson 1930, 365). Importantly, the language of the Smith-Lever Act was not exclusively aimed at rural people. Rather, it was intended for all people within the United States. Today, much of cooperative extension's work takes place within urban and suburban settings addressing and responding to the needs of these communities.

In 1914, there was significant debate and disagreement over exactly "why a national system of agriculture was needed, what it was specifically supposed to accomplish, and how it ought to go about accomplishing it" (Peters 1998, 25). In short, there was never a unified mission or purpose for land-grant institutions or cooperative extension. Since their respective origins, how these institutions should fulfill their public mission has remained in question, despite the dominance of the heroic metanarrative and the false sense of univocality and directionality it imparts.

Recognizing this contested beginning for extension is imperative because the narrative often told about it is that of a single purpose—to transfer knowledge from experts at universities to people in communities. This becomes an important point, especially as we consider the role of graduate students and graduate education within this context. In short, the Hatch and the Smith-Lever Acts enabled land-grant institutions to fulfill their public mission by sharing knowledge with communities, while simultaneously creating opportunities for citizens to share their own knowledge—with other citizens but also with extension educators, through whom they help to inform future research within the universities and to cultivate active and engaged citizenship.

The Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890 and the Equity in Education Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 have created a system of higher education in all 50 states and several U.S. territories rooted in the understanding that there *was* and *is* a need to have what many refer to as the "People's University" (Sherwood 2004, 2). Additionally, the Hatch Act of 1887 and the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 provided some of the mechanisms necessary to empower the vision of educators to create a system of higher education reaching well beyond the confines of a college campus into neighborhoods and communities across the United States. Higher education's role in American democracy goes well beyond the classroom, and extension has been one of the most important—if not most forgotten—forms of community based education and development in this country.

To many, land-grant colleges and universities have been "the most celebrated and successful example of the articulation and fulfillment of the service ideal" (Crosson 1983, 22). The Smith-Lever Act

institutionalized the public service mission, and the land-grant university continues to embody that ideal (McDowell 2001, 15–27). George McDowell writes that while there is some ambiguity about terms such as public service, outreach, extension, extended education, and engagement, the choice of wording depends more on one's audience and immediate discursive community than on significant semantic distinctions (2001, 15). Yet just this type of homogenizing statement contributes to confusion about what public engagement is and how it might be classified (Doberneck, Glass, and Schweitzer 2010). Such statements are problematic in that they frame the mission and purpose of land-grant institutions in particular ways. In order to speak to graduate education within the land-grant context, it is important to briefly explore the contested views of these universities and the individuals who comprise them.

Which Mission?

In quickly touching on the elements that have shaped land-grant institutions since their founding, we have made an implicit assumption. While we acknowledge the multiple avenues for academic professionals to contribute to public life, the differences are important. To create a new type of seed at the agricultural experiment station is one thing; engaging communities through the use of deliberative forums is another. Both are examples of engagement on the part of academic professionals within land-grant universities, but we would be remiss not to acknowledge considerable differences between the two. Our goal is not to judge between them, but to consider how we might broaden our conception of the mission and purpose of these institutions and the academic professionals and students within them.

With respect to graduate education, we can see these tensions play out today. While much support—both institutional and external funding sources—is given to those conducting research on issues of great importance, such as climate change and nanotechnology, work engaging citizens in participatory and democratic ways does not warrant the same support. A graduate student at Cornell who is working with New York City residents on community gardens faces different challenges than the graduate student who has received funding from a corporation developing nanotechnologies. The creation of new knowledge is central to the work of land-grant institutions as research institutions, but serious engagement with communities in the messy work of democracy also belongs. A challenge we face, as illustrated by the story I told at the beginning, is that land-grant institutions have been defined narrowly. The story is flat, misleading, and simply inaccurate. If we are only scientists saving the world, where

do citizens and entire communities fit into this scheme?

Peters takes issue with the way in which the story of the land-grant system has been understood in the United States. He argues that "for more than a century, many scholars in land-grant colleges … have taken up such roles by becoming engaged in public work that addresses not only the technical, but also the social, political, and cultural aspects of agricultural and environmental problems" (Peter 2008, 121). Yet the official rhetoric of land-grant institutions has most often expressed their mission as being reactive, one-directional, instrumental, and apolitical. The identity and role of an academic, on this view, is to have a "nonpolitical stance of unbiased and disinterested objectivity" (Peters 2010, 52). Vulnerable graduate students often adopt the same position. This issue transcends land-grant universities and is a serious concern for those invested in the civic role of higher education generally (Saltmarsh and Hartley 2011).

A nonpolitical role for academic professionals and graduate students supports their contributions to democracy, but only through the sharing of information and facts without regard for what those facts might mean or impact. This view of the academic professional fits in what Peters calls the service intellectual tradition, referred to above. It is not that these individuals do not care about their work; it is that they feel their role of an academic disqualifies them from being passionate and concerned citizens.

Noting how others have viewed their own work, Peters writes that some extension educators in the land-grant system have positioned themselves as both "responsive experts and proactive social critics and change agents" (Peters 2008, 129). That is, they have sought not only to provide technical advice, but to change the behaviors, attitudes, values, and ideals of their rural constituencies.

Liberty Hyde Bailey challenged the dominant narrative of the land -grant mission and saw self-sustaining agriculture as having technical, scientific, moral, cultural, political, and even spiritual dimensions. Bailey argued in 1907 that land-grant colleges contribute to the public in a way that goes far beyond the "technique of agricultural trades" (Peters 2008, 130). In 1930, two scholars writing about the development and institutionalization of agricultural extension took note of the

> new leaven at work in rural America. It is stimulating to better endeavor in farming and home making, bringing rural people together in groups for social intercourse and study, solving community and neighborhood problems, fostering better relations and common endeavor between town and country …

> broadening the vision of rural men and women. (Smith and Wilson 1930, 1).

For Smith and Wilson, the "leaven" of land-grant institutions was to cultivate what was already within a community. Building on the expertise of scholars and extension agents, the land-grant mission was broadened when the knowledge-imparting expert was paired with the social critic who sought to create opportunities and support initiatives that foster a sense of community through engagement. These were individuals who were educators, not simply "experts" with facts.

Peters contends there are three stories in regard to the democratization of higher education: a dominant heroic metanarrative about technical and economic progress; a tragic counter-narrative about cultural, economic, political, and environmental oppression and destruction on the part of experts towards citizens; and a prophetic counter-narrative about the struggle for freedom and sustainability, with experts and citizens working collaboratively and relationally (Peters 2007, 6). While the metanarrative has dominated and the tragic counter-narrative has supplemented the history of land-grant institutions, the prophetic counter-narrative provides a voice for those seeking to develop a new rural civilization worthy of the best American ideals; land-grant colleges would catalyze this change rather than provide the answers. While many in higher education (not just land-grant institutions) are trying to more fully engage communities, there is a history that contrasts public work with service, two terms that are not synonymous with one another in this context. Public work is relational; it brings together individuals from different socioeconomic classes and draws on their strengths (Boyte 2004). Service, conversely, reinforces and encourages a demarcation between professionals and "ordinary" citizens. Looking to scholarship on the relationships within service learning can help our thinking about the importance of both language and practice (Clayton et al. 2010).

Thus, we must look back to the prophetic story of the land-grant mission in order to reclaim and reconstruct much of the work that has taken place in this system, especially after the Smith-Lever Act established cooperative extension. Peters argues that it is this narrative that "we most urgently need to learn and tell," especially as agribusiness and commercialization continue to dramatically change the landscape of rural America (2007, 22). The societal benefit of land-grant universities, their experiment stations, and their extension systems are "too often viewed as being only economic in nature" (Peters 2008, 145–46). A tremendous challenge that faculty and graduate students face is to think about the public's benefit from work

that helps to build community in the Bronx through community gardens rather than only turning to economically profitable projects. Further, private investment in research also shapes what is and is not worthy of support. As higher education increasingly turns to private funds, the public mission of colleges and universities—especially land-grant universities—must be more than simply a vapid phrase on a website or in a brochure. Many institutions commit to engagement rhetorically, but fewer actually embody such claims.

This is not to say that many involved in the work of land-grant institutions do not see themselves as providers of expert knowledge for the general public. The metanarrative has attained that position for obvious reasons. However, there are other aspects foundational to the mission of the land-grant system that offer another way of seeing higher education's role in American democracy.

There are many who contribute to the prophetic narrative of land-grant institutions by working with citizens to address public problems rather than simply solving problems for them. Identified as civic professionals (Boyte and Fretz 2010; Peters 2003, 2004; Sullivan 2003, 2005), citizen professionals (Boyte 2008a), and/or democratic professionals (Dzur 2008), these public-spirited individuals acknowledge and embrace an approach to democratic life that situates them as co-creators of solutions in partnership with citizens, moving away from an inward orientation to one's institution or profession to one that is directed towards common goods (Peters 2010).

Many graduate students in courses I have taken at Cornell embody the desire to engage in public life through their professional work. At conferences sponsored by Imagining America and during the Emerging Engagement Scholars Workshop held at the National Outreach Scholarship Conference, I am encouraged by the many graduate students at other institutions who are committed to being engaged scholars. The challenge is to help foster and develop such public-spiritedness in graduate students while they complete course assignments, dissertations, and job applications.

Approaching one's work in this way shifts the academic professional's role from that of provider to that of catalyst; from offering solutions to "being partners, educators, and organizers of cooperative action" (Boyte 2008a, 15). such For graduate students, this relational shift can be empowering to those who want to engage in scholarly work that "builds and sustains our basic public goods and resources … solves common problems and creates common things" (Boyte and Kari 1996, 16). This approach highlights the public dimensions of work, both individually and institutionally. It makes the distinction between "experts" and "citizens" problematic because *all*

are citizens, with each bringing different skills, knowledge, and capabilities to the public work.

Today, as Boyte notes, "intellectuals inside and outside the academy have begun to challenge technocracy with citizen-centered politics"(Boyte 2008b, 87). The role of higher education in this context is to support a larger societal conversation about what is taking place within communities, drawing upon knowledge when needed rather than creating a division between academic experts and everyone else. Academics must be intellectuals as part of the world, not detached from it. But their work must be more than simply talk. It must include action. The broadest challenge of higher education is to advance democratic values and to join in movements that build citizen-centered democratic societies. It is only through this type of public work, Boyte argues, that higher education professionals—who often see themselves as outsiders with respect to civic life—can be brought back into a "common civic life" (Boyte 2008b, 102).

Still, the longstanding problem remains of dealing with the tension between expertise and democracy and how professionals have embraced or challenged this tension. At its core, this is a question about identity, for both individuals and institutions. William Sullivan writes that "Higher education seems to have lost an animating sense of mission. There is talk of reform, but mostly of an administrative and financial nature, with little attention to content and purpose" (Sullivan 2000, 21). Seeking to democratize relations between academics and others engaged in public work is not about returning to a golden era. Rather, it is about helping to usher in an ethic of lifelong learning that values and respects the diversity we find in our world today (Kellogg Commission 2001, 21–22).

As we think about the mission and purpose of land-grant universities (and higher education more broadly), we should take seriously the dominant narratives that shape the discourse about what institutions do, how they engage in their work, and where graduate students fit into this work. If we perpetuate the narrative that academic professionals are to contribute to democracy only through the creation and dissemination of knowledge, a more active and engaged approach to scholarship is unlikely to take hold. However, if we reclaim and reshape some of the narratives from early in the land-grant and extension history, we may reconceptualize what it means to be an engaged scholar. In short, we re-story the institution and the individuals within it. Concretely, such a re-storying helps to support those academics and graduate students who take seriously the public purpose of their work and the types of relationships that help to foster a more democratic society. These are not fads or completely new and

untested ideas. They have long and rich histories, although somewhat lost.

We can challenge the dominant narrative about what it means to be a graduate student. This raises the possibility of developing new scholars who embody commitments to engagement through their scholarly work (Allen and Moore 2010). We now turn our attention explicitly to the role of graduate education in land-grant universities.

The Place of Graduate Education and Its Future Prospects

There are many dimensions we could explore in relationship to graduate education. I want to focus on how we *story* graduate education in land-grant institutions and what we might learn by not limiting that story to the familiar and expected. As was noted above, different narratives about the impact of academic professionals shape our experience of land-grant universities. We can view the institutions and those within them heroically, that is to say, as providers of knowledge and expertise. In this story, academic professionals and graduate students have answers the world needs and they contribute to the public good by providing those answers. In some contexts, this is completely appropriate and expected. In others, however, this approach is detrimental and destructive. We must learn how to respond to what is needed and/or wanted.

There are other ways we might think about the impact of academic professionals and graduates students, particularly as being in relationship with those they serve. Indeed, language such as "those they serve" begins to lose meaning in a context where we position academic professionals and graduate students in a collaborative role rather than as experts in a top-down paradigm. As more and more graduate students embrace scholarship that positions them in relationship with communities, listening to their own stories about such work can be critically important. Questions about what is appropriate for graduate research continue to function as hurdles for students who want to work with citizens in meaningful ways that position them as partners rather than traditional experts or researchers. One place where this challenge emerges is the graduate student's own relationships with his or her supervising faculty.

The development and mentoring of graduate students by faculty advisors and mentors has a profound effect on the academy. Because many academics position themselves and their work as part of the service intellectual tradition, many graduate students learn to function in similar ways—viewing their contributions to society through the creation of knowledge and sharing it through publications and presentations. Unless graduate students are afforded opportunities to

take courses or conduct research that situates their work in and with communities, it will be difficult to broaden the ways that they think of themselves as civic actors or professionals. The academy is "far away from a cultural norm that evokes engagement as a normal outcome of scholarly practice" (McDowell 2001, 181). Because many graduate students view faculty as models for their own scholarly development, engagement's lack of value within the research-intensive environment of graduate training reinforces a position that privileges scholarship serving the public good only in the most narrow terms. Graduate students mature into young scholars under the discipline of an "expert" model that tolerates *service to* society but discourages active *engagement with* civic life.

There have been various attempts to challenge this approach. The Kellogg Commission's report on the future of state and land-grant universities calls for a new kind of institution, one that commits to supporting such keys reforms as

- Educational opportunity that is genuinely equal with respect to admissions
- Learning environments that meet the civic ends of public higher education
- Graduate education that is responsive to pressing public needs
- Using expertise and resources for social problems (Kellogg Commission 2001, 34–35)

One of the challenges is to push back against the dominant of models of engagement that fit within the heroic metanarrative, especially with regard to funding and resources. Land-grant institutions have deep roots and traditions. These colleges and universities have engaged communities and have shaped higher education for 150 years. They have helped to address public problems by drawing on expertise as part of a democratic response. They have also widely embraced a model of education focused on a student's technical expertise to the detriment of civic orientations. There is need for a paradigm shift in how higher education positions itself as a political entity. What this means is that scholars and students must take seriously the complexity of the most pressing issues and the absence of easy or technical fixes. These problems are "wicked" (Rittel and Webber 1973), with few "right" and "wrong" answers and instead more questions that must be addressed within the context of relationships in communities. If graduate students want to do relevant work, they must take seriously the concerns, questions, and perspectives of communities (Stoecker 1999).

Because graduate programs are so demanding with respect to academic requirements and expectations, there is inevitably too much to do in a program and too little time to do it—unless engagement is embedded in one's program or research. An additional challenge is that many research (including land-grant) universities often see themselves as institutions focused on basic rather than applied research (Stanton and Wagner 2010, 413). The reliance on sponsored research has long shaped what is of value to scholars (Gumport 2011). For many graduate students, the idea that they might be "civic professionals" is not one that connects with the notion of being a scientist, academic, expert, or scholar. But if graduate students who are aspiring to become academic professionals are to respond to public issues, they must acknowledge that problems are difficult, multifaceted, and require more than technical knowledge. What is needed is not another technocrat, but someone who wants to function as co-creator of solutions to problems.

The story of land-grant universities can easily be about solving the world's problems. The dominant narrative within the land-grant tradition has been that academic professionals have provided information for the public good. We have many examples of faculty members and graduate students contributing to the public in this way. They are doing important work. But if we only tell the story about discoveries in laboratories and not the graduate student working with community members in the Bronx, we are missing an important element of the land-grant story.

Notes

1. For a complete list of land-grant institutions and maps, visit http://www.csrees.usda.gov/qlinks/partners/state_partners.html#maps.

2. It should be noted, however, that Morrill was not the first to press this agenda. Jonathan Baldwin Turner suggested that federal land grants be given to states in order to establish industrial universities in the early 1850s. Turner championed the establishment of a state industrial university in Illinois (Nevins 1962).

3. For information about the history of research at 1890 institutions, see Mayberry 1976.

4.Tuskegee University is usually classed with the 16 official 1890 land-grant institutions. In 1881 an act of the Alabama legislature created what was then called the Tuskegee Institute, only to have the state establish and incorporate a board of trustees and name the school private. Nevertheless, it was granted 25,000 acres of land by the United

States Congress in 1899 and is a cooperating partner with Auburn University and Alabama A&M University with respect to extension work. For these reasons, Tuskegee is generally included in lists of 1890 institutions.

5. In Connecticut and New York experiment stations are located off campus; elsewhere they are situated at land-grant institutions.

6. Visit http://www.rust2green.org for more information about this project.

References

Allen, A. D., and T. L. Moore. 2010. Developing emerging engagement scholars in higher education. In *Engaged scholarship: contemporary landscapes, future directions,* edited by H. E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, and S. D. Seifer. Vol. 2, *Community-campus partnerships*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Altbach, P. G. 2011. Patterns of higher education development. In *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges,* edited by P. G. Altbach, P. J. Gumport, and R. O. Berdahl. 3d ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bailey, L. H. 1915. *The holy earth*. New York: Scribner.

Berelson, B. 1960. *Graduate education in the United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Boyte, H. C. 2004. *Everyday politics: Reconnecting citizens and public life*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Boyte, H. C. 2008a. *The citizen solution: How you can make a difference*. Saint Paul, MN, and Dayton, OH: Minnesota Historical Society Press in cooperation with Kettering Foundation Press.

Boyte, H. C. 2008b. Public work: Civic populism versus technocracy in higher education. In *Agent of democracy: Higher education and the HEX journey,* edited by D. W. Brown and D. Witte. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.

Boyte, H. C., and E. Fretz. 2010. Civic professionalism. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 14 (2): 67–90.

Boyte, H. C., and N. N. Kari. 1996. *Building America: The democratic promise of public work*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Brunner, H. S. 1962. *Land-grant colleges and universities: 1862–1962*. Washington, DC: GPO.

Carmichael, O. C. 1961. *Graduate education: A critique and a program*. New York: Harper & Bros.

Christy, R. D., L. Williamson, and H. Williamson. 1992. Introduction: A

century of service—The past, present, and future roles of 1890 land -grant colleges and institutions. In *A century of service: Land-grant colleges and universities, 1890–1990,* edited by Christy and L. Williamson. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Clayton, P. H., R. G. Bringle, B. Senor, J. Huq, and M. Morrison. 2010. Differentiating and assessing relationships in service-learning and civic engagement: Exploitative, transactional, or transformational. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 16 (2): 5–22.

Clute, O. 1891. The state agricultural college. *Bureau of Education Circular of Information.* No. 11, *History of higher education in Michigan*, edited by A. C. McLaughlin. Washington, DC: GPO.

Cohen, A. M., and C. B. Kisker. 2010. *The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system.* 2d ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Committee on the Future of the Colleges of Agriculture in the Land Grant System, National Research Council. 1995. *Colleges of agriculture at the land grant universities: A profile*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Crosson, P. H. 1983. *Public service in higher education: Practices and priorities.* Vol. 7. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Doberneck, D. M., C. R. Glass, and J. Schweitzer. 2010. From rhetoric to reality: A typology of publically engaged scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 14 (4): 5–35.

Dressel, P. L. 1987. *College to university: The Hannah years at Michigan State, 1935–1969*. East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Dzur, A. W. 2008. *Democratic professionalism: Citizen participation and the reconstruction of professional ethics, identity, and practice*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Eddy, E. D. 1957. *Colleges for our land and time: The land-grant idea in American education*. New York: Harper.

Farrand, L. 1929. Letter to R. C. Peyton, July 22. Livingston Farrand Papers. Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.

Grattan, C. H. 1955. *In quest of knowledge: A historical perspective on adult education*. New York: Association Press.

Gumport, P. J. 2011. Graduate education and research: Interdependence and strain. In *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges,* edited by P. G. Altbach, P. J. Gumport, and R. O. Berdahl. 3d ed.

Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Humphries, F. 1992. Land-grant institutions: Their struggle for survival and equality. In *A century of service: Land-grant colleges and universities, 1890–1990,* edited by D. Christy and L. Williamson. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. 2001. *Returning to our roots: Executive summaries of the reports of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Kuhn, M. 1955. *Michigan State: The first hundred years, 1855–1955*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Mathews, F. D. 1999. *Politics for people: Finding a responsible public voice*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Mayberry, B. D. 1991. *A century of agriculture in the 1890 land-grant institutions and Tuskegee University, 1890–1990*. New York: Vantage Press.

Mayberry, B. D., ed. 1976. *Development of research at historically Black land -grant institutions*. Tuskegee, AL: Bicentennial Committee of the Association of Research Directors.

McDowell, G. R. 2001. *Land-grant universities and extension into the twenty-first century: Renegotiating or abandoning a social contract*. Ames: Iowa State University Press.

Moreland, W. D., and E. H. Goldstein. 1985. *Pioneers in adult education*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Morrill, J. S. 1888. *State aid to land grant colleges: An address*. Burlington, VT: Free Press Association.

Nevins, A. 1962. *The origins of the land-grant colleges and state universities*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Peters, S. J. 1998. *Extension work as public work: Reconsidering cooperative extension's civic mission.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Peters, S. J. 2003. Reconstructing civic professionalism in academic life: A response to Mark Wood's paper, "From service to solidarity." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 8 (2): 183–98.

Peters, S. J. 2004. Educating the civic professional: Reconfigurations and resistances. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning* 11 (1): 47 –58.

Peters, S. J. 2006. "Every farmer should be awakened": Liberty Hyde Bailey's vision of agricultural extension work. *Agricultural History* 80 (2): 190–219.

Peters, S. J. 2007. *Changing the story about higher education's public purposes and work: Land-grants, liberty, and the Little Country Theater*. Foreseeable Futures, no. 6. Ann Arbor, MI: Imagining America.

Peters, S. J. 2008. Reconstructing a democratic tradition of public scholarship in the land-grant system. In *Agent of democracy: Higher education and the HEX journey,* edited by D. W. Brown and D. Witte. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.

Peters, S. J. 2010. *Democracy and higher education: Traditions and stories of civic engagement*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Rees, C. J. 1962. *Graduate education in the land-grant colleges and universities*. Baltimore: Division of Graduate Studies, Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities.

Rhoten, D. R., and W. W. Powell. 2011. Public research universities: From land grant to federal grant to patent grant instutions. In *Knowledge matters: The public mission of the research university,* edited by D. R. Rhoten and C. Calhoun. New York: Columbia University Press.

Rittel, H. W. J., and M. M. Webber. 1973. Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences* 4 (2): 155–69.

Ross, E. D. 1942. *Democracy's college: The land-grant movement in the formative stage*. Ames: Iowa State College Press.

Rudolph, F. 1962. *The American college and university: A history*. New York: Knopf.

Saltmarsh, J., and M. Hartley, eds. 2011. Introduction: "To serve a larger purpose." In *"To serve a larger purpose": Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education*, edited by Saltmarsh and Hartley. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Sandel, M. J. 2000. The politics of public identity. *Hedgehog Review* 2 (1): 72–88.

Scott, R. V. 1970. *The reluctant farmer: The rise of agricultural extension to 1914*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Sherwood, J. E. 2004. The role of the land-grant institution in the twenty-first century. CSHE Research and Occasional Paper Series 6.04. Accessed October 14, 2011. http://escholarship.org/uc/item/1dp6w2cc.

Simon, L. A. K. 2010. Engaged scholarship in land-grant and research universities. In *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions,* edited by H. E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, and S. D. Seifer. Vol. 1, *Institutional change*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Smith, C. B., and M. C. Wilson. 1930. *The agricultural extension system of the United States*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Spikes, D. R. 1992. Prefaceto *A century of service: Land-grant colleges and universities, 1890–1990,* edited by R. D. Christy and L. Williamson. London: Transaction.

Stanton, T. K., and J. Wagner. 2010. Educating for democratic citizenship: Antecedents, prospects, and models for renewing the civic mission of graduate education at research universities. In *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions,* edited by H. E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, and S. D. Seifer. Vol. 1, *Institutional change*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Stoecker, R. 1999. Are academics irrelevant? Roles for scholars in participatory research. *American Behavioral Scientist* 42 (5): 840–54.

Sullivan, W. M. 2000. Institutional identity and social responsibility in higher education. In *Civic responsibility and higher education,* edited by T. Ehrlich. Westport, CT: American Council on Education/Oryx Press.

Sullivan, W. M. 2003. Engaging the civic option: A new academic professionalism? *Campus Compact Reader* (summer): 10–17.

Sullivan, W. M. 2005. *Work and integrity: The crisis and promise of professionalism in America*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Von Engeln, O. D. 1924. *Concerning Cornell.* 3d ed. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Co-operative Society.

Widder, K. R. 2005. *Michigan Agricultural College: The evolution of a land grant philosophy, 1855–1925*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

9

New Ways of Learning, Knowing, and Working: Diversifying Graduate Student Career Options Through Community Engagement

Kristen Day, Victor Becerra, Vicki L. Ruiz and Michael Powe

> We should expect holders of the highest academic degree not simply to know a great deal but to know what to do with what they know….
>
> —Woodrow Wilson Foundation, *The Responsive Ph.D.*

INCREASINGLY, graduate students in U.S. social sciences and humanities programs are gaining employment outside of traditional, tenure-track positions and indeed, outside of colleges and universities.[1] This shift reflects many factors, including an oversupply of candidates in many fields; decreased state and local funding to universities and subsequent institutional consolidation with fewer tenure-track positions; and a search for greater relevance among some students, including many students of color. The need to prepare graduate students for success in a broad array of nonacademic fields has captured the attention of authorities such as the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, with its Responsive Ph.D. program (Woodrow Wilson Foundation 2005; see also American Association of Universities 1998; Clement and Crider 2006; Nyquist and Wulff 2006). Many universities are reexamining graduate education on their campuses in light of changing career opportunities and the relevant skills and experiences these require.

For graduate students, community engagement can provide valuable professional skills and experiences that lead to nonacademic careers in business, government (including federal and state agencies), nonprofit organizations, and cultural institutions, and to non-faculty careers on campus in research organizations, outreach, and government relations. In this chapter, we examine how community engagement may help graduate students in the humanities and social sciences prepare for successful careers outside of academia. Preparing for nonacademic careers in humanities and social sciences presents special challenges compared to seeking nonacademic jobs in science and

engineering, since the latter may be more prevalent and also more aligned with traditional graduate student preparation and focus on research.

Our analysis draws on two case studies from the University of California, Irvine: Humanities Out There (HOT) and the Community Scholars program. Together, the two programs provide graduate students from the humanities (especially English and history) and the social sciences (especially urban planning and public policy) with experience and training in areas such as curriculum development, K–12 classroom teaching, public speaking, grant proposal writing, applied research, report writing, and program evaluation. We examine these cases to highlight opportunities and challenges in linking graduate student engagement to nonacademic career preparation. Issues include the appropriate focus for graduate student activities, faculty support for nonacademic career paths and for graduate student engagement, the need for additional and distinct mentors for graduate students, and institutional funding support. We conclude with recommendations for employing engagement initiatives in ways that enhance graduate students' readiness for careers outside academia.

We define engagement as "the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; For graduate students, community engagement can provide valuable professional skills and experiences that lead to nonacademic careers in business, government (including federal and state agencies), nonprofit organizations, and cultural institutions, and to non-faculty careers on campus in research organizations, outreach, and government relations. In this chapter, we examine how community engagement may help graduate students in the humanities and social sciences prepare for successful careers outside of academia. Preparing for nonacademic careers in humanities and social sciences presents special challenges compared to seeking nonacademic jobs in science and engineering, since the latter may be more prevalent and also more aligned with traditional graduate student preparation and focus on research.

Our analysis draws on two case studies from the University of California, Irvine: Humanities Out There (HOT) and the Community Scholars program. Together, the two programs provide graduate students from the humanities (especially English and history) and the social sciences (especially urban planning and public policy) with experience and training in areas such as curriculum development, K–12 classroom teaching, public speaking, grant proposal writing, applied research, report writing, and program evaluation. We examine these cases to highlight opportunities and challenges in linking graduate

student engagement to nonacademic career preparation. Issues include the appropriate focus for graduate student activities, faculty support for nonacademic career paths and for graduate student engagement, the need for additional and distinct mentors for graduate students, and institutional funding support. We conclude with recommendations for employing engagement initiatives in ways that enhance graduate students' readiness for careers outside academia.

We define engagement as "the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching, and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good" (Civic Engagement Benchmarking Task Force 2005; in Bloomfield 2005, 3). Engagement involves activities such as service learning, community-based and applied research, and outreach.

Changing Career Opportunities for Graduate Students

Career opportunities for graduate students (especially doctoral students) are changing. At one time, doctoral education in most fields was regarded primarily as training for tenure-track faculty positions in colleges and universities. The likelihood that graduates will land tenure -track positions has decreased in recent decades (American Association of Universities 2001; Martin 2007). The percentage of full-time faculty positions that are tenure track has declined from 56% in 1993–94 to 49.6% in 2005–06 (IES, National Center for Educational Statistics, 2008; see also American Association of Universities 2001; Martin 2007). In the social sciences (including history), only 63.4% Ph.D. recipients were tenured or in tenure-track positions when surveyed five years after completing the Ph.D. (Nerad et al. 2007). Increasingly, tenure-track positions are replaced by contingent positions (part time, contract, or non-tenure-track). In 2003, fully 65% of all faculty positions were contingent (Martin 2007). Contingent positions are generally less desirable than tenure-track jobs, since contingent positions often offer lower rates of compensation, reduced job stability, and limited opportunities for participation in the full range of academic responsibilities (including research and service as well as teaching).

There are other signs of a changing job market for graduates of doctoral programs. A growing number of Ph.D. recipients are still seeking positions upon completion of their doctoral programs (American Association of Universities 1998). The number of doctoral graduates going into post-doc positions rather than permanent employment is also rising.

At the same time, the percentage of new Ph.D.'s working outside of academia is significant. In 2006, of those doctoral recipients who had firm commitments of employment upon graduation, only about half (54%) planned to work at educational institutions (Survey of Earned Doctorates 2009). A significant number of these Ph.D. recipients (18.2.%) were instead employed in business, government, or nonprofit organizations.

Doctoral students of color are even more likely to seek nonacademic careers than are their non-minority peers (Golde and Dore 2001; in Woodrow Wilson Foundation 2005). In seeking nonacademic positions, students of color may be motivated by institutional barriers and by financial hardship and family commitments. Students of color often pursue higher education, in part, as a way to gain skills and knowledge that will benefit their communities. Thus, institutional culture that emphasizes "basic" research and that stigmatizes applied and community-based work may diminish the perception of universities as welcoming work environments for students of color. At the same time, the accumulation of significant debt while in graduate school often forces students of color to look for jobs outside the academy, where prospects may be more numerous, salaries more competitive, and opportunities for advancement greater. Additionally, family commitments can place limits on the geographic parameters for academic employment for some students of color (Latina Feminist Group 2001; Meyer 2008).[2]

There is a growing consensus among leaders in higher education that the graduate curriculum should equip students with the knowledge, skills, and experiences for a broad range of careers, including those outside of academia (American Association of Universities 1998; Nyquist and Wulff 2006). In social sciences and the humanities, nonacademic careers include those in public history, technical writing, testing and assessment, training, market research, policy research, program evaluation, and nonprofit management, among others.

Skills Needed for Nonacademic Careers

Preparation for nonacademic careers is a lengthy process, akin to preparing for academic careers. A wide range of skills and experiences are required for success in nonacademic careers. These include the following:

Research/analytical skills

- Critical thinking skills
- Finding new information quickly

- Understanding complex contexts
- Thinking on one's feet
- Solving problems and identifying solutions
- Asking relevant research questions
- Conducting interdisciplinary research
- Using multiple research methods
- Interviewing skills
- Setting up databases
- Data analysis and interpretation skills and experience
- Designing research aimed at social change
- Experience in marketing research, program evaluation, assessment, Geographic Information Systems (GIS), survey research, etc.

Communication skills

- Conveying complex information to a non-expert audience
- Writing at all levels (websites, flyers, abstracts, reports, editorials, etc.)
- Speaking effectively before large groups and diverse audiences, including non-experts
- Basic skills in visual communications
- Editing

Entrepreneurial skills and experiences

- Writing effective grant proposals
- Computer and technical aptitude
- Imagination and creativity
- Track record of achievement
- Managing, motivating, evaluating others
- Experience in training, e-learning, curricular design and delivery
- Consulting, program development, venture/business planning, and project management
- Securing resources to support work
- Work experience in setting where seeking employment (nonprofit, government, etc.)

Effective personal skills

- Persuasion, social advocacy
- Leadership
- Listening skills
- Self-directed work habits (entrepreneurial spirit, ability to work independently)
- Flexibility, ability to change, willingness to learn

- Navigating complex bureaucratic environments, political savvy
- Performing under pressure and managing several projects simultaneously
- Delivering results quickly and keeping projects focused towards completion

Effective interpersonal skills

- Teamwork and collaboration
- Sharing power
- Negotiating competing agendas
- Social skills—ability to interact successfully with others
- Working effectively with diverse people
- Sense of ethics and responsiveness to community concerns, ability to empathize
- Capacity to develop trust, earn respect of communities[3]

Graduate students' success in the nonacademic job search is hindered by stereotypes about Ph.D.'s among potential employers. Stereotypically, Ph.D.'s are viewed as arrogant, lacking in common sense, and unable to communicate succinctly (Bryant 2005). Ph.D.'s are typecast as antisocial beings, unable to collaborate, uninterested in "real world" issues, and unable to function in office environments. Some employers fear that Ph.D.'s will leave nonacademic jobs when tempting faculty positions become available. A track record of involvement and of progressively increasing responsibility in engagement initiatives can provide evidence that counteracts these stereotypes and can allow doctoral students to develop desirable skills and traits.

Graduate Student Involvement in Community Engagement

Historically, community engagement has been largely tied to undergraduate education. Once students enter graduate programs, "far too often they shelve their civic interests, relegating them to the indulgences of a 'youthful past', to focus on the more 'serious' and mature challenge of professional training" (Stanton and Wagner 2006, 2). Barriers to engagement in graduate education, especially for doctoral students, are many. These barriers include mentors' limited knowledge about public scholarship, a lack of community engagement initiatives or conversations as part of graduate training, the requirement of a full-time commitment to academic studies, and emphasis on "basic" rather than "applied" research. Limited opportunities for financial support tied to engaged scholarship may also pose an obstacle.

A challenge for proponents of graduate engagement has been identifying the relevance of engagement for graduate education and professional development. KerryAnn O'Meara (2008) proposes that discussions of community engagement should be linked to early-career socialization processes for graduate students. She offers four assumptions for establishing community engagement in graduation education.

> One assumption is that there are concrete ways to connect graduate study to societal needs. A second is that doing so revitalizes graduate education while contributing significantly to society. A third assumption is that isolating doctoral programs from society limits the creativity, sense of responsibility, knowledge and skill development of future scholars. A fourth assumption is that the knowledge, skills, and values that graduate students acquire will also help them grow as professionals who find satisfaction in integrating different kinds of faculty work (40).

In this context, community engagement can be seen as a vehicle for disrupting conventional ideas about and practices in graduate education while renewing thinking about "learning, knowing, and doing within disciplines" (O'Meara 2008, 40). The idea of engagement as creating new ways of learning, knowing, and doing also applies to the preparation of graduate students for nonacademic careers.

Doctoral training provides students with diverse skill sets, including the ability to analyze important problems, conduct independent research, write and present findings and recommendations, and teach others (Clement and Crider 2006). Engagement initiatives allow graduate students to employ skills they may already have from public, nonprofit, or educational work prior to entering graduate school. Graduate students' skills are an important source of tangible expertise that universities can bring to the table as they seek to partner with local communities. Moreover, through participation in engagement activities graduate students gain additional skills that may not be exercised in their dissertation research and teaching duties, such as overseeing budgets, planning and evaluating programs, political involvement, and working with diverse populations.

Further, engagement initiatives allow students to enhance personal and interpersonal skills. Through community engagement, graduate students meet professionals from outside the academy and thus expand their networks to include additional mentors with potential job leads.

Community contacts challenge graduate students to learn (or relearn) how to communicate with individuals outside their disciplines and outside the university. Through engagement, graduate students demonstrate their commitment to public issues and their ability to work in teams and to function outside the academy. Engagement initiatives also offer graduate students concrete experiences in the kind of settings where they may seek future employment (e.g., nonprofits, local government). Such experiences are essential for future employability (Bryant 2005). In summary, community engagement enhances graduate students' career preparation by grounding their academic training, extending their experiences, and diversifying their personal and professional repertoire and approaches.

Incorporating community engagement into graduate education raises questions for universities and graduate departments, and requires new thinking about graduate training and development. The following case studies reveal some of the opportunities—and questions—tied to such involvement.

Case Studies of Graduate Engagement at the University of California, Irvine

The University of California, Irvine has been working to institutionalize civic and community engagement on its campus (see UCI Committee on Civic and Community Engagement 2009). As a research university, UCI has a special interest in engagement initiatives involving graduate programs and students. Two such initiatives include Humanities Out There (HOT) and the Community Scholars program. We present these cases as examples of how engagement programs can prepare graduate students for careers outside of academia. We also analyze these cases for the questions they raise about nonacademic career preparation.

Humanities Out There (HOT)

Humanities Out There is a flexible, creative partnership program between UC Irvine's School of Humanities and Orange County school districts that serves predominately low-income, Latino students. Although the HOT model can be applied to any humanities classroom, HOT allows UCI's School of Humanities to reaffirm its commitment to underrepresented local students. HOT brings together public middle- and high-school teachers, graduate students, and undergraduate tutors in a shared enterprise of transforming recent scholarship into age-appropriate curricula calibrated to state standards in the form of lesson plans emphasizing critical thinking and writing skills. Thematic modules are presented in a series of classroom workshops, taught by

teams of advanced graduate student leaders and undergraduate tutors working in collaboration with sponsoring teachers. The tutors themselves reflect the diversity of UCI's student body. During the course of the workshops, tutors become informal mentors who encourage aspirations to a college education (HOT 2009; UCI History Project 2009).

Founded in 1997, HOT has provided graduate students with opportunities to create lesson plans, shadow veteran teachers, mentor and manage undergraduate tutors, and implement assessment measures. Since 2001, 70 graduate student leaders, primarily from UCI's Departments of History and English, have worked with over 2,200 undergraduates in delivering curriculum to over 5,100 Santa Ana middle- and high-school students. Furthermore, 30 booklets in history and literature are in print, each containing multiple lesson plans.[4] Designed by the graduate leaders, the World and U.S. History units have had wide distribution through the California History–Social Science Project, a network of professional development seminars for teachers (Winters 2009). Humanities Out There does not have stable institutional funding, but cobbles together monies on a year-to-year basis to support graduate students with a 50% teaching assistantship, a level mandated by their union local in light of the work involved (this is discussed in more detail below).

For several HOT history workshop leaders, community engagement becomes a career path outside the academy. Three former HOT leaders are employed full time in UCI's California History–Social Science Project (CHSSP) and in the UCI Center for Educational Partnerships (CFEP), with one serving as CFEP's executive director. Five others, currently assistant professors at other campuses, apply the skills they learned in HOT in their new roles as historians involved in teacher education. HOT graduate students learn about pre- and post-test assessment and are involved in designing and implementing the tools for measuring learning outcomes for their Santa Ana pupils. Given the increased emphasis on accountability, as evidenced by the accreditation standards of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges' new assessment protocol (Western Association of Schools and Colleges 2008), the familiarity of HOT leaders with creating and evaluating assessment measures will no doubt prove valuable to their future academic departments.

The most engaged HOT graduate leaders make a difference and measure it, too. Their ability to translate scholarship into accessible lesson plans, to work in partnership with others, to supervise a team of undergraduate tutors, and to create a classroom environment where learning is fun can be transferred to a variety of career settings outside the academy, including teacher education programs, private

foundations, museums, and nonprofit community-based organizations (Winters 2009). As an innovative humanities partnership program, HOT reinforces the relevance of the humanities to building capacity and the public good. In the elegant words of founding UCI faculty member and celebrated poet James McMichael, "Capacity is both how much a thing holds and how much it can do" (McMichael 2006, 19). HOT demonstrates to UCI university faculty and administrators and to local school officials and teachers, how the humanities builds capacity in students at all levels.

COPC Community Scholars

UCI's Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC) connects graduate students and faculty with community organizations to address local problems and concerns. Two COPC programs are particularly relevant in preparing graduate students for nonacademic careers: the Community Scholars program and a related set of COPC-sponsored, skill-based courses taught by professionals in urban planning and other fields.

The Community Scholars program connects masters and doctoral students in social science disciplines with community organizations to conduct applied research projects tied to pressing local needs. Each year, COPC issues a call for projects to advocacy and nonprofit organizations in the region. Submitting organizations describe their needs for specific research and/or technical assistance, and discuss how their proposed projects advance public impact, community building, and/or policy reform. Organizations also agree to serve as "clients" for projects they propose. All project proposals are reviewed by COPC staff before the list is disseminated to graduate students across campus.

Aiming to fulfill appropriate degree requirements, graduate students may elect to conduct a research or planning project from the list. (Most students use the Community Scholars program to complete the Professional Report requirement of the master's degree in Urban and Regional Planning or to conduct second-year Ph.D. research projects.) These students submit applications to become Community Scholars. Accepted students receive a modest stipend and a small budget to cover project expenses. In return, Community Scholars are expected to consult regularly with their "client" organizations, conduct the requested research projects, and provide clients with professional-quality reports addressing the relevant community issues. In addition, Community Scholars attend a year-long training workshop that explores community-based research methods and ethics, and emphasizes the communication of research findings to diverse

audiences (UCI Community Outreach Partnership Center 2009).

Many of the same "client" partner organizations participate every year. Clients include Orange County Communities Organized for Responsible Development (OCCORD), the United Way of Orange County, the Orange County Congregation Community Organization (OCCCO), and the Neighborhood Housing Services of Orange County (NHSOC), among others. In 2008–09, the program included nine Community Scholars and nine partner organizations. Past Community Scholars are now employed in settings that include private planning consulting firms, city agencies, and nonprofit organizations such as the Orange County Family and Children's Commission and the Service Employees' International Union.

COPC also sponsors graduate classes taught by local professionals and leaders of community organizations. These courses focus on professional skill development, including labor organizing, neighborhood planning, and grant writing for nonprofit organizations. Most COPC-sponsored courses involve a public impact project. The courses are designed to enhance graduate students' skills and to tie UCI knowledge-production activities to pressing community concerns. COPC covers the cost of hiring adjunct faculty instructors and also supports course activities (e.g., guest speakers, site visits, presentations to project clients). COPC-sponsored courses are popular with graduate students from urban planning, sociology, anthropology, and criminology. Course instructors also benefit by focusing engaged projects on activities tied to the instructors' own professional responsibilities and interests. Course instructors further gain from the relationships they establish with the university and with COPC staff, which have led to collaborative grant writing and other joint projects. Funding for the Community Scholars and for COPC-sponsored courses derives from extramural grants and institutional support.

Through these programs, graduate students engage with complex social issues in local settings, where their work must be informed by the tacit knowledge of community members and where results are expected to improve the lives of local people. More generally, COPC programs demonstrate to graduate students the pressing need for applied research that assists in real-world problem solving. These programs fulfill degree requirements and, at the same time, give graduate students a broader view of the applicability of their knowledge and skills in nonacademic settings.

Issues to Consider in Graduate Student Engagement to Support Nonacademic Careers

These case studies uncover critical issues that universities and

graduate programs must consider in expanding graduate student involvement in community engagement and in preparing graduate students for nonacademic careers.

Need to Reconcile Graduate Curricula with Enhanced Graduate Student Engagement

The demands of engagement activities must be reconciled with graduate program curricula and objectives. If we seek to promote graduate student engagement, we must think carefully about how this can occur, not as an "add-on," but rather as an integral part of student development. For example, the Community Scholars program has succeeded, in part, because it builds on the existing structure for the Professional Report requirement in UCI's master's program in Urban and Regional Planning. It has been more challenging to adapt the Community Scholars program to engage doctoral students in urban planning and elsewhere on campus. O'Meara (2008) suggests that engagement should be incorporated throughout the graduate student career with experiences that progress from, for example, learning about community-based research methods and serving as a teaching assistant in a service-learning course, to conducting applied research and overseeing other students in engaged projects.

Increasing engagement raises questions about the appropriate focus of activities for graduate students in the social sciences and humanities, and especially for doctoral students. Should doctoral students' time, for example, be spent writing community-oriented reports and developing K–12 curricula, or should energy be concentrated solely on producing scholarly publications? Should students confine their employment while in school to research and teaching assistantships, or would internships in business, government, or cultural institutions also be appropriate (Johnson 2009; Nyquist and Wulff 2006)? Is community-based research an acceptable methodology for dissertation projects? Recognizing that many doctoral students will seek nonacademic careers may help faculty and graduate programs to broaden their thinking about appropriate work for students.

Rather than lengthening the graduate program by adding new expectations, increasing graduate engagement may help to address the "time-to-degree" problem. Indeed, the fields with the poorest prospects for tenure-track academic jobs (history, English) have the longest time-to-degree (Woodrow Wilson Foundation 2005). Students often are reluctant to leave the university without a position in hand. By equipping students with relevant skills and experiences to succeed in nonacademic pursuits, we may help to smooth students' progress through the degree program and into meaningful employment.

This issue is part of a larger conversation on the status and value of the humanities in higher education and in public life. Civic engagement initiatives are one way for humanities programs to demonstrate that value to their students and to others. For example, history doctoral candidates at Drew University participate in public humanities internships as part of their graduate training. In the words of Drew historian Jonathan Rose, "We recognize that we must train … students for something more than careers as college-level teachers. And we have to move those students briskly to graduation without exploiting them as cheap academic labor" (2009, 37). Diversifying career options is not a new response to the current economic crisis. In 1999, the Townsend Center for the Humanities at the University of California, Berkeley sponsored a benchmark conference on the future of doctoral education in the humanities (Sommer 1999). The debate on the size, scope, and nature of graduate education has intensified in recent years, however, as searches for tenure-track positions have been routinely cancelled, postponed, or suspended. As the dean of Arts and Sciences at New York University, Catherine Simpson, colorfully explains: "'This is the year of no jobs'…. Ph.D.s are stacked up … like planes hovering over La Guardia" (Cohen 2009a).

Need to Increase Faculty Support for Nonacademic Career Options and for Graduate Student Engagement

Graduate students express a deep desire to connect their disciplines with public problems, and to use their knowledge to assist their communities (Bloomfield 2005). Social responsibility emerged as a top agenda item for doctoral students at the 2003 National Conference on Graduate Student Leadership (Woodrow Wilson Foundation 2005). More than half of all doctoral students reported that they would like to be involved in some form of community service, but less than one in five reported having the opportunity to do so. Graduate students further note that they feel unprepared for work that connects their scholarship with the needs of society (O'Meara 2008).

More faculty support is needed to accommodate graduate student engagement. Proponents of graduate student engagement must work with faculty to challenge the idea that students should emulate their mentors' careers (Woodrow Wilson Foundation 2005). We also need to continue to educate faculty about engagement and to reassure them that engagement is not just "service," but rather is central to the scholarship of the university.

Faculty attitudes can be shaped by the efforts of major disciplinary organizations, which can do more to encourage engaged professional behavior (Bloomfield 2005). This could include support for presenting

engaged work at conferences and publishing engaged scholarship in disciplinary journals. Many disciplines already incorporate a focus on engagement in their work; for instance, anthropology, sociology, and history boast public scholarship programs (O'Meara 2007). Recognition of public scholarship by the disciplines will help to socialize and support engaged graduate students.

At UCI, recent activities evidence a growing support for engaged research and teaching/learning on campus. The university recently established a campus-wide committee to institutionalize engaged research, teaching/learning, and outreach. UCI created a new administrative position, the director of engagement, and approved a new minor in civic and community engagement. In 2010, UCI initiated a new award for engaged teaching. In addition, UCI has for two years hosted an annual, regional conference on campus–community engagement (organized by COPC). This growing support for engagement may encourage UCI graduate students to become involved in these activities.

Need to Involve Additional People in Graduate Education

More and different people must be involved in preparing graduate students for success in nonacademic careers. What is needed is an active partnership between professors and leaders in business, government, cultural institutions, schools, and community and nonprofit organizations (Nyquist and Wulff 2006; Woodrow Wilson Foundation 2005). Graduate schools and programs may also partner with their career centers and alumni offices to build a more complete picture of career options for their graduates.

Graduate education is typically regarded as the province of tenured or tenure-track faculty, especially those at research universities. If graduate students are to participate meaningfully in engagement, however, students will also need sustained opportunities to learn from other kinds of people. This is especially critical when faculty do not have experience or understanding of principles or practices of engagement. In UCI's Community Scholars program, for example, the program director struggled to secure faculty to offer graduate courses that develop professional skills relevant to community-based projects—the kind of skills and experiences, that is, sought by community partners and nonacademic employers. COPC eventually found success by hiring adjunct faculty who are professionals in other areas (neighborhood planning, grant writing, etc.) to teach these courses. These adjunct faculty—who teach courses after their day jobs as nonprofit and public sector leaders—offer students alternative models for creating social change.[5] Some regular faculty continue to see such

courses as more relevant for master's rather than for doctoral students. Also, institutional barriers may restrict the use of non-tenure-stream faculty to teach graduate courses. With regard to HOT, colleagues in the history department acknowledge the valuable skill sets acquired through participation in the program and actively promote graduate student involvement. As HOT director Lynn Mally observed in personal communication, "the program makes graduate students consider how the highly specialized material that they are learning can be conveyed to a broader audience. It is an incredible training ground for graduate students going into teaching at any level, since they are in charge of the content and the methods to convey that content."

To succeed in nonacademic careers, graduate students also must network with others outside the university. Involvement in engagement can provide graduate students with valuable career connections. By participating in campus engagement workshops, lectures, and events, graduate students can meet other engaged faculty, professional staff, and graduate students on their campuses. These individuals can be mentors and may provide internships, employment opportunities, and future job references. For example, through his involvement in organizing the COPC regional engagement conference described earlier, Michael Powe, the graduate student co-author of this chapter, built relationships with faculty members outside of his home department. This led to summer employment as a research assistant for a faculty member in Asian American Studies, and also to participation in a campus committee to design a new service-learning, study-abroad course. By attending regional and national conferences on engaged scholarship (and especially by participating on panels or moderating sessions), graduate students can also connect to the broader community of engaged scholars in their disciplines and beyond.[6]

Need to Reconsider How Graduate Students Are Funded

We must visit the question of funding for graduate students to promote engagement and to prepare students for nonacademic careers. Graduate students are typically supported through research or teaching assistantships or through fellowships while they conduct their dissertation research. To be viable, engagement must satisfy course requirements and/or provide adequate financial support for graduate students, including the cost of tuition and health insurance as well as salaries. Supporting graduate students is prohibitively expensive for many of the sources that fund engaged work, such as foundations, local governments, or nonprofit organizations. Further, universities are not competitive in applying to conduct community-based projects (evaluations, assessments, technical assistance, etc.) if the full cost of

employing graduate students is included as part of the budget.

As one example, HOT graduate student leaders receive compensation equal to that of a half-time teaching assistant—approximately $25,000 in stipends and fees per academic year, including health insurance. The School of Humanities and the Graduate Division each fund two graduate students and UCI's Center for Educational Partnerships (CFEP) has matched with support for an additional four. While the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Woodrow Wilson Foundation once provided significant awards that underwrote the creation and publication of lessons plans as well as contributed to the funding of several cohorts of HOT graduate leaders, these grants expired several years ago. With a few notable exceptions, such as Dr. Fariborz Maseeh, private local philanthropists show little interest in graduate education in the humanities, or they lack resources to endow a full graduate fellowship. Furthermore, school districts are not in a financial position to contribute monetarily to the program at this scale. The lack of sustained financial support for graduate students in the project impedes long-range planning and is a source of persistent anxiety for the dean of the School of Humanities, the HOT faculty director, and graduate students themselves. Of course, this predicament reflects the larger issue of where the humanities fit in contemporary public education. Some humanists emphasize the relevance of a liberal arts education—the instrumental abilities to think critically, write clearly, and to weigh interpretations—while others decry what they consider a "service" model as they underscore the intrinsic value in contemplating the human condition. The place of humanities in a large research university remains contested. Through engagement, graduate students and their mentors can contribute to the larger project of justifying the humanities (Cohen 2009b).[7]

Universities must identify new ways to support graduate student engagement, such as through fellowships for public scholarship, assistantships for engagement activities, and tuition remissions for students who are employed in internships and related projects off campus. For example, UCI recently created a new, campus-wide "Public Impact Fellowship Award" to recognize graduate students who are involved in engaged research. Proponents of public scholarship must also investigate ways to facilitate graduate student involvement through channels other than paid employment, such as by accommodating internships for course credit and by building engagement into other aspects of the curriculum.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Increased community engagement by graduate students will have

many other benefits, in addition to preparing students for nonacademic careers. Engagement will help recruit and retain graduate students and faculty of color. Many students and faculty of color have a desire to engage with communities outside their campus and to use their scholarship to address critical issues in the local context (Woodrow Wilson Foundation 2005). This commitment begins with students' lived experiences, which instill in many a sense of community obligation. In addition, taking courses in ethnic studies and related areas enriches students' understanding of the historical roots of contemporary struggles within their communities. This combination of lived experience and educational expertise contributes to innovative approaches to community partnerships. According to historian George Sánchez,

> American Studies and Ethnic Studies programs and departments … house scholars who focus on race and ethnicity across a wide range of minority groups in the United States and abroad. Collectively, these strengths give [them] a certain intellectual power to engage with diversified communities facing a host of difficult and complex social and cultural issues now and in the future. (2008, 6).

Through engagement, graduate students may form new ideas about what constitutes scholarship and about how knowledge is produced. They may ask new questions and seek different types of answers.

Those students who do pursue faculty careers will benefit from engagement in terms of their future teaching and research. Even if graduate students do not remain engaged in later years, this experience may enhance their ability to evaluate their colleagues' engaged scholarship—for example, during reviews for promotion, in peer review of articles submitted for publication, and in assessing grant applications (O'Meara 2008). Finally, graduate students represent an important resource and a source of expertise that universities can bring to the table as they seek to partner with local communities.

At this critical juncture in graduate education, we are better served to think of graduate students not as the next generation of teacher-scholars but, more broadly, as the next generation of intellectual leaders (Woodrow Wilson Foundation 2005). Community engagement represents a critical tool in preparing students for these roles.

Notes

1. The authors would like to thank Christine Kelly for her helpful

comments and Peggie Winters, Rosie Humphreys, and Lynn Mally for their research support.

2. A recent edited volume by Mary Howard-Hamilton and colleagues (2009) sheds light on these and other issues faced by graduate students of color.

3. Sources include Bryant 2005; Johnson 2009; O′Meara 2007; O′Meara 2008; University of San Diego Career Services Center 2009; Woodrow Wilson Foundation 2005.

4. These booklets are available by request from Peggie Winters, Humanities Out There, School of Humanities, UC Irvine, Irvine, CA 92697.

5. The employment of adjunct faculty to teach professional skills courses also raises questions, since these adjunct faculty face some of the issues raised earlier, such as low salaries for teaching. At the same time, since these adjunct faculty are typically full-time professionals in other fields, some concerns regarding adjunct employment do not apply (e.g., lack of benefits). Also, as noted earlier, adjunct faculty who teach professional skills courses benefit from opportunities to build relationships with university faculty and staff, and from opportunities to develop student projects related to their own professional responsibilities.

6. Such conferences include the Continuum of Service Conference organized by Western Campus Compact offices, the annual meeting of the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities (CUMU), and the International Conference on Service Learning and Community Engagement Research, among others.

7. For an insightful overview on the relevance of humanities education, see Laurence (2009).

References

American Association of Universities. 1998. *AAU Committee on Graduate Education report and recommendations*. October. http://www.aau.edu/publications/reports.aspx?id=6900.

American Association of Universities. 2001. *AAU non-tenure-track faculty report.* April 10. http://www.aau.edu/publications/reports.aspx?id=6900.

Bloomfield, V. 2005. Civic engagement and graduate education. *Communicator* 38 (3), 1–2, 6.

Bryant, R. A. 2005. “But I have no skills.” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 18. http://chronicle.com/jobs/news/2005/08/2005081801c.htm.

Civic Engagement Benchmarking Task Force. 2005. Resource guide and recommendations for defining and benchmarking engagement. Accessed January 16, 2011. http://*www.scholarshipofengagement.org/benchmarking/FINAL.doc.*

Clement, T., and D. Crider. 2006. *Summary report on the National Conference on Graduate Student Leadership*. St. Louis, MO: Washington University.

Cohen, P. 2009a. Doctoral candidates anticipate hard times. *New York Times,* March 6. http://www.nytimes.com/2009/03/07/arts/07grad.html?scp=9&sq=Humanities&st=cse

Cohen, P. 2009b. In tough times, the humanities must justify their worth. *New York Times*, February 24. http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/25/books/

25human.html?_r=1&scp=2&sq=Humanities&st=cse

Golde, C. M., and T. M. Dore. 2001. *At cross purposes: What the experiences of doctoral students reveal about doctoral education.* Philadelphia, PA: A report prepared for The Pew Charitable Trusts. Accessed January 16, 2011. *www.phd-survey.org/report%20final.pdf.*

HOT. 2009. Humanities Out There. Accessed February 22, 2009. http://www.humanities.uci.edu/hot/.

Howard-Hamilton, M., C. L. Morelon-Quainoo, S. D. Johnson, R. Winkle-Wagner, and L. Santiague. 2009. Standing *on the outside looking in.* Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Institute of Educational Sciences [IES], National Center for Education Statistics. 2008. *Digest of education statistics, 2007*. http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2008022.

Johnson, M. 2009. Career FAQ's: Frequent questions about working beyond academe. Accessed February 2, 2009. http://www.ironstring.com/sellout/sellout_faqs/sellout_faqs.shtml.

Latina Feminist Group. 2001. *Telling to live: Latina feminist* testimonios. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Laurence, D. 2009. In progress: The idea of a humanities workforce. Accessed January 16, 2011. http://www.humanitiesindicators.org/essays/laurence.pdf.

Martin, S. 2007. The new academic job market: A reordering of the academic world has shifted opportunities for psychologists. gradPSYCH 5 (1). http://www.apa.org/gradpsych/2007/01/cover-market.aspx

McMichael, J. 2006. *Capacity*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Meyer, L. D. 2008. 'Ongoing missionary labor': Building, maintaining, and

expanding Chicana Studies/history; An interview with Vicki L. Ruiz. *Feminist Studies* 34(1–2):23–46.

Nerad, M., E. Rudd, E. Morrison, and J. Picciano. 2007. *Social Science PhDs—Five+ years out: A national survey of PhDs in six fields—Highlights report.* CIRGE Report 2007-01. Seattle, WA: Center for Research and Innovation in Graduate Education.

Nyquist, J., and D. H. Wulff. 2006. Re-envisioning the Ph.D.: Recommendations from National Studies on Doctoral Education. Accessed January 16, 2011. http://www.grad.washington.edu/envision/project_resources/

O'Meara, K. 2007. *Graduate education and civic engagement*. NERCHE Brief. Accessed January 16, 2011. http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED500538.

O'Meara, K. 2008. Graduate education and community engagement. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, no. 113: 27–42. doi:10.1002/tl.306.

Rose, J. 2009. Rethinking graduate education in history. *Perspectives on History* 47 (February). http://www.historians.org/Perspectives/issues/2009/0902/0902gra1.cfm

Sánchez, G. J. 2008. Challenging the borders of civic engagement: Ethnic Studies and the meaning of community democracy. Keynote address at the University of California, Irvine, February 7. Accessed January 16, 2011. http://www.ucicopc.org.

Sommer, J. 1999. Whither the humanities PhD? *Berkeleyan*, April 7. http://www.berkeley.edu/news/berkeleyan/1999/0407/phd.html

Stanton, T. K., and J. Wagner (2006). *Educating for democratic citizenship: Renewing the civic mission of graduate and professional education at research universities*. San Francisco: California Campus Compact.

Survey of Earned Doctorates. 2009. *Doctorate recipients from United States universities: Summary report 2006* (updated). Chicago: NORC at the University of Chicago.http://www.norc.org/projects/Survey+of+Earned+Doctorates.htm.

UCI Committee on Civic and Community Engagement. 2009. *Institutionalizing community engagement at UCI.* Unpublished report. Available from the Division of Undergraduate Education; University of California, Irvine; Irvine, CA 92697.

UCI Community Outreach Partnership Center. 2009. Accessed February 28, 2009. http://ucicopc.org/CA_COPC_Scholars.asp.

UCI History Project. 2009. The History Project. Accessed February 22, 2009. http://www.humanities.uci.edu/history/ucihp/.

University of San Diego Career Services Center. 2009. Prepare for the non-academic job market. Accessed February 22, 2009. http://careerucsd.edu/sa/GPrepareforNonAcademicJobMarket.sh.

Western Association of Schools and Colleges. 2008. *Handbook of accreditation*. Accessed March 7, 2009. http://www.wascsenior.org/findit/files/forms/Handbook_of_Accreditation___July_2008.pdf.

Winters, P. 2009. *2009 Humanities Out There Report*. Unpublished report. Available from the School of Humanities; University of California, Irvine; Irvine, CA 92697.

Woodrow Wilson Foundation. 2005. *The responsive Ph.D.: Innovations in U.S. doctoral education*. Princeton, NJ: Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation.