

14

NEXT-GENERATION ENGAGEMENT SCHOLARS IN THE NEOLIBERAL UNIVERSITY

Cecilia M. Orphan and KerryAnn O'Meara

Higher education represents a central site for keeping alive the tension between market values and those values representative of civil society that cannot be measured in narrow commercial terms but are crucial to substantive democracy.

—Henry Giroux (2002, p. 433)

Introducing the Neoliberal University

U.S. higher education has historically occupied public and private roles, a twin engine built to serve both democracy and the economy (Hursh & Wall, 2008; Labaree, 1997; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). These dual aims, also conceptualized as the “capitalist knowledge” and “public knowledge” regimes by Slaughter and Rhoades (2009), were fairly well-balanced until the mid-1980s. Just as the capitalist knowledge regime was rising in prominence as a force shaping academic life, academic leaders began working to create or strengthen civic engagement commitments on college campuses (Berman, 2012; Bose, 2012; Hartley, 2011; Labaree, 1997; Thelin, 2004; Zemsky, Wegner, & Massy, 2005).

These efforts were born from the concerns of academics, nonprofit leaders, administrators, public officials, and students that higher education was losing its public purpose (Hartley, 2011; Kezar, Chambers, & Burkhardt, 2005). Stakeholders of universities and colleges all around the country became inspired by these efforts and took significant steps to institutionalize full participation and democratic engagement in public affairs for students,

faculty, staff, and community members on and off campus. At the heart of these efforts was an emphasis on leveraging the university's human capital in addressing the problems of surrounding communities.

In these early days of civic engagement, universities largely promoted technocratic approaches to community-university engagement. As the authors of this book argue, a new and different generation of academic leaders is pushing for the next evolution of these efforts that extends beyond technocratic engagement with local communities and a dualistic understanding of higher education's purpose. Next-generation engagement scholars are oriented toward the creation of an equitable and cocreated public engagement regime, as Saltmarsh and Hartley describe (see chapter 2). In order to support these scholars and achieve this vision of higher education, it is of paramount importance to attend to the preparation of the next generation of scholars in graduate school and the socialization of new faculty members, both on and off the tenure track.

Before attending to these socialization processes, it is first necessary to understand the conditions that have led to the ascendance of the capitalist academic regime in higher education. We argue that the current state of disequilibrium is due to the rise of neoliberalism as a dominant ideology shaping university life. Neoliberal ideology threatens the full participation ethos of civically engaged universities that have claimed and advanced the civic engagement movement. Neoliberalism is a political project and rationality that reduces the purpose of public institutions to their role within the market. This political project

entails submitting every action and policy to considerations of profitability; equally important is the production of all human and institutional action as rational entrepreneurial action, conducted according to a calculus of utility, benefit, or satisfaction against a micro-economic grid of scarcity, supply and demand, and moral-value neutrality. (Brown, 2003, p. 4)

Neoliberal public policies have led to the defunding of social welfare programs in order to leverage public resources and transform public institutions so that they advance the economic vitality of society (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2009). In higher education, those advancing a neoliberal ideology assume that higher education's sole purpose is to improve economic life and, as such, structure university and public policies to enhance the system's ability to serve as an engine for economic growth. As a result of the dominance of neoliberal ideology, universities and colleges have become increasingly privatized and commercialized, and there has been a chipping away at democratic shared governance. Students are viewed as customers who need to be

appeared instead of learners who need to be taught. Along with this understanding of higher education's purpose is the view of academia as a private good that exists primarily to ensure individual benefit and financial gain and to improve regional and national economic life.

As the narratives in part two of this volume reflect, graduate school preparation and faculty hiring and tenure processes often represent institutionalized forms of the capitalist regime within the neoliberal university. While next-generation engagement scholars are likely most affected by these neoliberal influences, they also represent our best hope for ushering in a new era of public engagement. In this chapter we describe the realities of the neoliberal university for faculty and student life, and then offer a set of recommendations for reshaping faculty and graduate student socialization processes to embody the values of public engagement. Our belief is that reestablishing the prior balance between the public knowledge and capitalist knowledge regimes within academia is not enough. Instead, we must use this time of disruption to advance a new vision for academic life.

The Rise of Neoliberalism and Creation of Disequilibrium

Prior to the 1980s, several indicators show a balance between the public and private purposes of higher education (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). One indicator is the results of opinion polls in which the public affirmed both higher education's economic function of professionalizing a skilled workforce and its public purpose of offering a liberal arts education that prepares students for lives as citizens (Berman, 2012; Teixeira & Dill, 2011; Thelin, 2004). We also see evidence of this balance in the provision of robust public funding in support of higher education, and federal and state legislation created to expand educational access to returning war veterans and historically disenfranchised groups (Gumport, Iannozzi, Shaman, & Zemsky, 1997; Labaree, 1997; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Zumeta, Breneman, Callan, & Finney, 2012). While universities have always brokered partnerships with the private sector, prior to the 1980s these partnerships were less susceptible to corporate influence. During this time, faculty members and administrators viewed themselves as creators and disseminators of knowledge that *could* be used by the corporate sector, a view that contrasts with the contemporary understanding of academics as originators of corporate innovation (Hursh & Wall, 2008; Newfield, 2008). These university partnerships with the private sector were also kept in check by state and federal policies that protected against undue corporate influence in university life (Subotzky, 1999).

A few key indicators are illustrative of the rise of neoliberalism. The first indicator was Congress's passage of the Bayh-Dole Act in 1980, which

granted higher education institutions the right to patent research findings (Berman, 2012; Giroux, 2002). After Congress passed the Bayh-Dole Act, colleges and universities exploded with faculty and administrator efforts to patent findings and broker private-sector partnerships to fund research (Newfield, 2008). University leaders founded university-industry research centers staffed by faculty and graduate students in order to coordinate and institutionalize these partnerships, making market logic a way of scholarly life.

The second indicator of neoliberalism's ascendancy was the perceptible shift in public opinion concerning higher education's role in society (Newfield, 2008). The public began to see higher education primarily as an engine for national economic growth and individual gain, obscuring the democratic and civic role of colleges and universities. As society became less supportive of higher education's civic role, skepticism grew about the "productivity" of colleges and universities and the return on the public's investment—productivity measured in purely economic terms (Berman, 2012; Brown, 2003; Giroux, 2002; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997).

A related indication of the rise of neoliberalism as a feature of college life is the decline in public funding for higher education as legislators began to view higher education as a private instead of public good (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Zumeta et al., 2012). Berman (2012) argues that even as public funding for higher education was declining, legislative demands that higher education produce technical innovation to compete with the Soviet Union and Japan amplified the sector's economic aims. Larger shares of federal and state funding were diverted from supporting university curricula and basic operations to instead support research and development (Thelin, 2004). These shifts "gave universities a new mission: to facilitate economic growth by making sure their research reached the marketplace" (Berman, 2012, p. 3).

Pressured by public skepticism and declines in enrollment, leaders of higher education institutions began emphasizing the sector's role in creating individual economic prosperity (Berman, 2012; Newfield, 2008; Thelin, 2004). Data about the earnings of college graduates have always supported the public's view of higher education being linked to individual economic prosperity, and higher education leaders cited these data to entice students to attend (Hursh & Wall, 2008; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Zumeta et al., 2012). As the discussion about higher education shifted to one emphasizing individual, private gain—and away from public benefit—public officials began reducing funding further, with the rationale that if colleges and universities were places for people to obtain economic prosperity, why should the public subsidize them?

The debate over who should pay for higher education is not new. Indeed, it began in the 1960s and 1970s as the theory of human capital, and the role of academia in its creation and development, gained broad acceptance

(Hursh & Wall, 2008; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Zumeta et al., 2012). In 1973 the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education published a widely cited report, *Higher Education: Who Pays? Who Benefits? Who Should Pay?: A Report and Recommendations*, advocating for higher education's private purpose. In this report, the foundation called for shifting more of the costs of higher education onto students and their families. What was different about the 1980s is that lawmakers and academic leaders began removing the checks and balances that existed in public policy prior to Bayh-Dole, and academic cultures that were once skeptical of undue corporate influence no longer guarded against the dominance of consumer values (Zemsky et al., 2005).

Neoliberalism's Creep and Civic Engagement's Push

This recent history has created the unique set of circumstances in which higher education finds itself today. These developments also inspired a rise in national civic engagement efforts (see chapter 2). Such efforts were aimed at restoring the balance between the public and private purposes of higher education while ensuring that undergraduate students acquire civic skills, and universities and colleges act as engines for democracy (Ehrlich, 2000; Hartley, 2011; Kezar, Chambers, & Burkhardt, 2005). Thus, the civic engagement movement was in part a response to the ascendancy of neoliberalism.

Notably, leaders of these efforts have made significant headway in reestablishing public priorities and advancing the civic mission of higher education. We can point to some indicators of their success. The first is the explosion in the number of service-learning courses being offered (Campus Compact, 2012; Jacoby, 1996; National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012), as well as growth in the number of community-university partnerships (Maurrasse, 2001). Another indicator is the number of universities and colleges that participate in national civic engagement initiatives and consortia. Table 14.1 summarizes the campus membership of five major national networks that represent a large share of higher education institutions. Additionally, as of 2015, 361 campuses have received the Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement.

While these achievements are laudable, our argument is that higher education has yet to fully counter the creep of neoliberal ideology. Indeed, we believe that neoliberal ideology has been the dominant feature of contemporary waves of organizational change within the academy (Brown, 2003; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997).

Many of the institutionalized forms of civic engagement on college campuses too often fail to penetrate the heart of university governance and

TABLE 14.1
Campus Membership of Civic Engagement Consortia

Consortium	Number of Member Campuses
Campus Compact	1,100
American Democracy Project	250
Imagining America	88
Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities	83
The Democracy Commitment	70

culture. Because these activities remain surface-level boutique operations, they are able to coexist with neoliberal ideologies and efforts without much conflict. We see evidence of this coexistence in the presence of community-university partnership centers and civic engagement offices on the cutting edge of full participation and engaged public work within universities that have tenure and rewards incentives that privilege academic capitalism and private-sector partnerships (Orphan & Hartley, 2013; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). One reason for the isolation of civic engagement efforts could be the inability or unwillingness of academic departments to translate commitments to civic engagement into tenure and promotion guidelines. Ultimately, faculty will do work for which they are recognized and rewarded. Until tenure and promotion requirements reward public work, it will remain a secondary focus for many (O'Meara, 2011).

Furthermore, the framing for civic engagement that many campus leaders provide fails to inspire broad-based support that goes beyond awards and accolades to call on deeper values and convictions (Hartley & Orphan, 2014). Far too often, academic leaders declare success in institutionalizing civic engagement after the creation of campus awards or centers, and fail to identify the next set of strategic activities and goals that will deepen the campus's civic commitment. A lack of strategic planning and direction prevents these efforts from reshaping academic culture and being brought to scale on campuses. Whatever the reason for the continued isolation of civic engagement efforts, it is important to understand how neoliberal ideology expresses itself within public policy, academic administrations, and faculty and student life.

Neoliberal Public Policy

We see evidence of neoliberalism within public policy at the state and federal levels. Legislator demands for increased accountability in regard to learning outcomes (Giroux, 2002; Hursh & Wall, 2008), workforce readiness, and retention and completion can be viewed as neoliberal, as can declines

in public funding (Zumeta et al., 2012). Evidence of neoliberalism within public policy is also found in the use of performance-based funding, a funding model borrowed from the business sector. Performance-based funding encourages competition among higher education institutions and awards campuses for student retention and graduation as well as degree production within state-identified economic growth areas. Moreover, a number of state governors have advocated for the removal or denigration of liberal arts curricula in colleges and universities, favoring instead business and vocational education (Huckabee, 2013). Public officials also demonstrate neoliberal ideology in their demands that higher education participate in regional and statewide economic development, while simultaneously strengthening private-sector partnerships and relying on industry funding and sponsorships to address budget deficits (Berman, 2012; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997).

Neoliberal Campus Administrations

At the institutional level, we see neoliberalism at work in the growth of what has been termed the *administrative lattice*—college personnel who engage in private-sector-style management (Zemsky et al., 2005). University presidents, given funding cuts and the perceived need to brand their universities, have become chief executive officers of fund-raising and public relations (Brown, 2003; Giroux, 2002). Harried administrators, pressured to cut university budgets year after year, look to better funded and financially stable peers and see amplified research agendas as the way forward. In looking to these institutional peers, many administrators encourage increased grant and corporate-funded research as way out of institutional privation, further embedding academic capitalism into university life.

Neoliberal Faculty Life

The rise of neoliberalism also has coincided with a shift in the composition, preparation, and expectations of academic faculty and professionals (Giroux, 2002). The most blatant change in the makeup of higher education's teaching force is the expanding employment of non-tenure-track faculty (Bose, 2012; Kezar & Gehrke, 2014; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Currently, 56 percent of higher education's teaching force comprises non-tenure-track faculty, and the numbers are projected to increase as administrators use this form of inexpensive labor to balance university budgets (American Association of University Professors, 2011). This shift in the proportion of tenured versus non-tenured faculty has profound implications for shared governance, as administrators enjoy greater autonomy and influence in institutional decision-making (Kezar & Maxey, 2013; Newfield, 2008).

Tenured faculty are also subject to neoliberal pressures as administrators require that they fund parts (or all) of their salaries through grants and private-sector partnerships, while bringing resources into the university in surplus of their own salaries (Berman, 2012; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). In response, faculty have become more entrepreneurial and engaged in academic capitalism. Neoliberal ideology has caused administrators and faculty to view business and industry-oriented disciplines, such as marketing, engineering, and economics, more favorably in light of their ability to attract revenue to the university and has contributed to the perception of the liberal arts, humanities, and social sciences as "softer," secondary disciplines (Giroux, 2002; Zemsky et al., 2005). The unequal value placed on the liberal arts when compared with industry-oriented disciplines is reflected by inequitable funding for these disciplines, with industry-oriented disciplines claiming larger shares of university budgets, as well as preferential treatment given by administrators and students to these disciplines. Finally, faculty members from all disciplines are encouraged to focus more on research than on teaching and learning and to pursue grant-funded research (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997).

Neoliberal Graduate Education

The neoliberal influence on faculty life has translated into changes in doctoral student education, training, and socialization (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). When mid-career and senior faculty members were in graduate school, they were expected to do some teaching and complete their dissertations. If they had a publication (or two), this was viewed favorably once they entered the job market. During the 1970s and 1980s, despite national recessions, the availability of faculty positions was still growing, and recent graduates were able to find jobs fairly quickly (American Federation of Teachers, 2009; Slaughter, 1986).

This is no longer the case. Gone are the days when a dissertation and a few courses taught are enough to secure a faculty position. Doctoral students today, highly cognizant of the overproduction of doctorates and the vanishing nature of tenure-track jobs, are being encouraged—and in some cases, required—to not only complete their dissertations but also secure grants and publish research in highly ranked journals (Austin, 2002; Gilven, Roberts, & Martin, 2012; Giroux, 2002). This ratcheting up of doctoral labor has changed the way next-generation engagement scholars are treated by their advisers and institutions. Doctoral student labor also offsets losses in university budgets, as these students are often required to teach more classes and assist in more research projects (Giroux, 2002; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Due to these changes in academic life, doctoral students spend more time

on research assistantship duties and in some cases take longer to finish their degrees. As a result, doctoral students are beginning to unionize in an effort to resist the demands placed on them, although these efforts have yet to significantly change doctoral student life (Woodruff, 2014).

Doctoral students are rarely given instruction on how to be effective teachers or public scholars; rather their skills as researchers are of paramount value to the neoliberal university (Gardner & Barnes, 2007; Gilven et al., 2012). These students are socialized to esteem and pursue careers as pure researchers, sole authors of journal articles, and academics that have little, if any, engagement with public issues or societal problems (Austin, 2002; Austin, Sorcinelli, & McDaniels, 2007). Once such students graduate, they are encouraged to obtain tenure-track positions, often an unobtainable goal given the shrinking number of available jobs. The socialization of graduate students operates informally as well, with peers and faculty advisers sending subtle messages that it is better to wait until tenure before doing public work (Gilven et al., 2012; Schein, 2004). Despite these circumstances, many doctoral students report that their primary motivation for attending graduate school is a desire to improve society and leverage scholarship to address public problems (Eatman, 2012; Gardner & Barnes, 2007; Gilven et al., 2012).

Neoliberal Undergraduate Student Life

Neoliberalism also affects undergraduate student life. The first and most obvious change to student life is increasing tuition and student debt as students are required to fund larger and larger shares of their education (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Zumeta et al., 2012). This shift in financial responsibility has reinforced societal stratification, influencing who does and does not attend and finish college. Seventy percent of recent college graduates are, on average, \$29,400 in debt (Institute for College Access and Success, 2013). Because of this debt load, many people in their 20s and 30s delay major milestones such as marriage and home ownership, and a number of students attend college, accumulate debt, and do not graduate (Woodruff, 2013).

Neoliberal ideology promotes a view of individuals as being highly rational economic actors—*Homo economicus*—and consumers of education in a free market, instead of being public actors, learners, and citizens (Brown, 2003). The “customers” of universities and colleges are offered a flourishing set of lifestyle amenities on college campuses and are treated like individuals buying a product (Giroux, 2002). Further, Slaughter and Leslie (1997) argue that the federal shift to funnel aid to individual students in the form of individual student aid further cemented the view and position of students as clients of higher education institutions.

Student choices of academic majors is another telltale sign of neoliberalism; one out of five undergraduate students are business majors (Stockwell, 2014). In observing the trend of 25 percent of Yale graduates going into business consulting, Marina Keegan (2011), a recent graduate of Yale University who is now working at a consulting firm, wrote,

There's something sad about so many of us entering a line of work in which we're not (for the most part) producing something, or helping someone, or engaging in something that we're explicitly passionate about. Even if it's just for two or three years. That's a lot of years!

These students also feel pressure to pursue disciplines that are more likely to improve their job prospects so that they can support themselves and their families. The previous anecdote is a cautionary tale of sorts as we think about the next generation of students who are being socialized in undergraduate programs to forgo public work and instead pursue lucrative careers.

A final symptom of neoliberalism in the undergraduate context is the treatment of students and faculty of color. As universities seek to portray inclusive and diverse campuses, they fill brochures and websites with images of multiracial communities. A 2009 study of 40 higher education institutions showed that 78 percent of institutions overrepresented the number of minority students on campus in university websites (Wilson & Meyer, 2009). We agree that increasing diversity on campus is vital to inclusive excellence. However, elite institutions perpetuate inequalities of race and class when they use minority students and faculty members as marketing tools to recruit larger groups of diverse students without considering the structural and cultural changes needed to retain and support them once they arrive on campus (see chapter 2).

Against the Siren Song of Neoliberalism: Recommendations and Ways Forward

While the picture we have painted of the realities of the neoliberal university may seem bleak, we are hopeful that we can rebalance the public and private purposes of higher education. Indeed, we believe that these circumstances create a unique opportunity to move beyond a dualistic understanding of higher education's purpose into the advancement of the public engagement regime that the authors describe throughout this book. What follows are some of our recommendations for reconfiguring campus life so that undergraduate

students, graduate students, and early-career faculty are socialized to value higher education's place within a democratic society.

Although we argue that neoliberalism has become a central feature of university and college life, we reject its inevitability. We see growing awareness of and discomfort with the realities of the neoliberal university among faculty and administrators, and we believe that these people are potential change agents for advancing the public purpose of higher education (Brown, 2003; Giroux, 2002; Hursh & Wall, 2008). National civic engagement efforts have been an important check on the growing influence of neoliberalism; however, our work is not yet finished. As Henry Giroux (2002) wrote, higher education's public purpose demands a "profoundly committed sense of collective resistance" (p. 457), and we believe that next-generation engagement scholars are ideal allies for mounting this resistance.

In order to achieve this resistance, we see graduate education as a powerful lever for change. Doctoral programs are intense socializing experiences for those faculty members and students involved (Austin, 2002). Programs that reflect public values and advance visions of publicly engaged academic life could have a profound effect on aspiring academic leaders and faculty members. Even more promising are the students themselves, who often come to doctoral programs with public engagement experiences and a desire to promote social justice. As such, these students are ideally suited to claim and advance the goals of public engagement. In discussions about the privatization of higher education and its effects on graduate students, people often advocate for graduate student rights to collective bargaining on wages, benefits, and working conditions. We agree that greater graduate student voice in shared governance, learning, and working conditions, as supported through collective action, can protect graduate student rights and make universities more democratic. However, we also are concerned with how to create departmental, college, and university work environments and disciplinary fields that scaffold graduate student agency in community engagement.

Prior research on graduate student agency reveals at least three pathways for this to occur (O'Meara, 2013; O'Meara et al., 2014). First, agency means feeling like one has choices and is not limited to one institutional script of the way things have to be. Second, we enact agency to achieve goals that are important to us and that have personal meaning. Third, change occurs in universities and in individuals through relationships and "critical agency networks" (Rhoades, Kiyama, McCormick, & Quiroz, 2008).

Informed by this research, academic departments can positively influence graduate student agency by encouraging and legitimizing multiple career paths through structured opportunities for students to gain the knowledge, skills, and orientations of public scholars. We also believe that resources

(financial and ideological support and information) must be marshaled in support of engaged scholarship, and campuses should facilitate networking and mentoring for aspiring publicly engaged academics (O'Meara, 2013; O'Meara et al., 2014).

Graduate students need exposure to multiple ways they can contribute as public scholars in higher education and other organizations. One way to spread this awareness is for departments to host speakers, mentors, and role models who exist in multiple institutional types and organizations for doctoral students to consider. Departments also need to provide structured opportunities such as internships, core and elective course development, and teaching and research experiences that allow students to develop as public scholars (O'Meara, 2008).

Along these lines, graduate programs must offer research methods courses that embody practitioner- and social justice-oriented methodologies (O'Meara & Jaeger, 2007). Dissertation committees should also encourage doctoral students to conduct nontraditional dissertations (Hoyt, 2013; O'Meara, 2008; O'Meara & Jaeger, 2007). Finally, doctoral programs should offer students instruction on the science of teaching so that graduates are well-equipped to teach as well as to do research, should they choose to pursue teaching positions.

One way to achieve these changes to the graduate and undergraduate student experience is to continue to convince faculty of the merits of public work and engaged scholarship and teaching so that they support the public purpose of higher education. To achieve wider faculty support and collaboration within campus civic commitments, the socialization systems for faculty should be reshaped, as socialization is the primary way in which cultural norms and values are transmitted (Kanter, 1972; Pratt, 2000). In order to do this, next-generation scholars and change leaders must demonstrate to faculty how public scholarship makes a valuable contribution to the institution's academic life (Hartley, Harkavy, & Benson, 2005). Additionally, change leaders must prove the utility of public scholarship and engaged pedagogies so that faculty members see these strategies as an effective way to fulfill their responsibilities as teachers and scholars (Hartley & Orphan, 2014). Those faculty members already convinced can champion their practices to broader university audiences, enabling others to see public scholarship in action. Likewise, campuses should highlight the work of engaged faculty and students, making it more visible as an institutional priority to campus stakeholders.

Tenure and promotion guidelines should reflect these values through incentivizing scholarship produced with community partners and research published in public venues. This scholarship should be free of jargon and made accessible to a variety of audiences. Campus leaders must also provide

professional development to faculty that embodies the vision of engaged teaching and encourages students to participate in research. For teaching to reflect the values of public engagement, campus civic engagement efforts should be collaborative and cocreated with students, while resisting formulaic or prescriptive sets of activities. In this way, faculty, students, staff, and community members might be brought in as full participants in designing the university's civic commitment. These changes to faculty life and culture can also affect opportunities within graduate student programs.

Non-tenure-track faculty members are also a vital part of the academy's response to neoliberalism. They are of particular concern when considering early-career scholars and graduate students because so many now fill non-tenure-track positions. The Association of American University Professors (1993) recommends a variety of institutional policies that would enhance the agency of non-tenure-track faculty. First is improving job security and working conditions for these faculty members. Second is increasing the number of paid opportunities for non-tenure-track faculty to participate in shared governance. These two steps alone would help address the inequalities inherent in the role of non-tenure-track faculty. They would also ensure that more next-generation engaged scholars have a voice and place within university culture and decision-making.

National networks such as Imagining America's Publicly Active Graduate Education (PAGE) Fellows should be leveraged to build the solidarity of rising academics as they enter the academic workforce. PAGE in particular is a powerful network because it links next-generation engagement scholars with one another so that best practices are shared. PAGE is also useful because it helps remind its members that they are not alone, even if it may feel that way at times. Regional PAGE collectives could be leveraged to focus on the particular issues facing various sectors of higher education.

PAGE scholars often pursue research agendas with public ramifications and are committed to finding jobs after graduation that will allow them to live out their public aspirations. The annual Imagining America Conference is already a space in which next-generation engagement scholars meet to organize and share their work. PAGE students are involved with programming and planning these conferences. Other practitioner conferences could follow Imagining America's lead and ask that graduate students have a larger role in planning annual gatherings while also facilitating networking among these students.

Disciplinary societies and associations also have an important role, as many faculty members and graduate students receive significant socialization in these venues. Two such organizations have notably taken up the issues facing graduate students and early-career faculty members. The first organization

is the Public Philosophy Network, a collection of affinity groups and caucuses focused on issues related to faculty and graduate student life in philosophy. The PhD in Philosophy affinity group provides a space for members to share stories and resources related to finding nonacademic jobs. This group aims to be a resource for faculty members who are mentoring and advising current PhD students so that they can guide them through their academic and nonacademic job searches. Another goal of the group is to create a national conversation about the need to expand the acceptable and canonized career paths for recent doctoral awardees. The second organization is the American Studies Association, which also has a standing committee that examines and discusses the state of graduate education around the country, providing space for debates about the fit between graduate programs and the realities of the job market.

These two networks are notable, but they lack a strong public engagement orientation. Our recommendation is for publicly active academics to develop more networks of this kind within disciplinary societies while paying special attention to the role of public work and engagement within graduate education and the lives of early-career faculty members. Our hope is that if more of these types of networks exist, they will serve to elevate the conversation about the role of graduate education and next-generation engagement scholars in protecting higher education's public purpose.

We focus most of our recommendations on graduate education and early-career faculty life. However, heeding the supplication of Marina Keegan (2011), who advocated for students to consider alternative career paths, we believe that undergraduate students should also have exposure to public careers. Career center staff should be trained in how to translate various majors, including those within the liberal arts, and civic engagement experiences into résumé bullet points and public careers. University publications should profile school alumni who have pursued public careers, and these alumni should be invited to campus to share their experiences. Finally, college and university leaders need to present public careers as valuable, recognized, and supported (O'Meara et al., 2014).

While neoliberalism's creep into university life is worrisome, we believe that attendant with these challenging times is an opportunity to revisit core commitments to diversity, public engagement, and democratic life. As academic leaders react to the conditions created by the neoliberal university, with strategic organizing we might move past a simple recalibration of the public and private purposes of higher education into the creation of public and democratic opportunities. Ultimately, we believe that next-generation scholars and practitioners are indispensable to advancing these goals. Therefore, we must adequately prepare and support these scholars so that they are able to fulfill their public and scholarly aspirations. In

turn, these new scholars will educate and encourage younger cohorts of academics to consider the public dimensions of their careers and academic trajectories.

We remain hopeful that a new vision for academic life can be achieved and are encouraged by promising practices we see nationwide that hint at what might come. Until we address this aspect of the academic pipeline—graduate school and early-career faculty life—we will not be able to shift the balance of university life away from neoliberal tendencies. Indeed, next-generation engagement scholars are our best hope in preserving higher education's status as a "central site for keeping alive the tension between market values and those values representative of civil society that cannot be measured in narrow commercial terms but are crucial to substantive democracy" (Giroux, 2002, p. 433). Simply put, if we want to foster a public engagement regime, we must grow and nurture it within our own ranks.

References

- American Association of University Professors. (1993). *The status of non-tenure-track faculty*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Association of University Professors. (2011). *It's not over yet: The annual report of the economic status of the profession*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/file/2010-11-Economic-Status-Report.pdf>
- American Federation of Teachers. (2009). *American academics: The state of the workforce, 1997–2007*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *Journal of Higher Education*, 71(1), 94–122.
- Austin, A. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., & McDaniels, D. (2007). Understanding new faculty: Background, aspirations, challenges, and growth. In R. P. Perry & J. C. Smart (Eds.), *The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education: An evidence based perspective* (pp. 39–89). Netherlands: Springer.
- Berman, E. (2012). *Creating the market university: How academic science became an economic engine*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bose, P. (2012). Faculty activism and the corporatization of the university. *American Quarterly*, 64(4), 815–818.
- Brown, W. (2003). Neo-liberalism and the end of liberal democracy. *Theory and Event*, 7(1), 1–25.
- Campus Compact. (2012). *Creating a culture of assessment: 2012 annual member survey*. Boston, MA: Author.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (1973). *Higher education: Who pays? Who benefits? Who should pay?: A report and recommendations*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

- Eatman, T. K. (2012). The arc of the academic career bends toward publicly engaged scholarship. In A. Gilven, G. Roberts, & C. Martin (Eds.), *Collaborative futures: Critical reflections on publicly active graduate education* (pp. 25–48). Syracuse, NY: Graduate School of Syracuse University.
- Ehrlich, T. (2000). *Civic responsibility and higher education*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Gardner, S., & Barnes, B. (2007). Graduate student involvement: Socialization for the professional role. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(4), 1–19.
- Gilven, A., Roberts, G., & Martin, C. (Eds.). (2012). *Collaborative futures: Critical reflections on publicly active graduate education*. Syracuse, NY: Graduate School of Syracuse University.
- Giroux, H. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(4), 425–463.
- Gumport, P., Iannozzi, M., Shaman, S., & Zemsky, R. (1997). *Trends in higher education from massification to post massification*. Stanford, CA: National Center for Postsecondary Improvement.
- Hartley, J. M. (2011). Idealism and compromise and the civic engagement movement. In J. Saltmarsh & M. Hartley (Eds.), *To serve a larger purpose* (pp. 26–48). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Hartley, M., Harkavy, I., & Benson, L. (2005). *Service learning in higher education: Critical issues and directions*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hartley, J. M., & Orphan, C. (2014, March). *The ties that bind: The role of faculty socialization and organizational change*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Philadelphia, PA.
- Hoyt, L. (2013). *Transforming cities and minds through the scholarship of engagement: Economy, equity and the environment*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Huckabee, C. (2013, January 29). N.C. governor wants to tie university support to jobs, not liberal arts. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/blogs/ticker/north-carolina-governor-wants-to-tie-university-support-to-jobs-not-liberal-arts/54787>
- Hursh, D., & Wall, A. (2008, January/February). *Re-politicizing higher education and research within neoliberal globalization*. Paper presented at the World University Forum, Davos, Switzerland.
- Institute for College Access and Success. (2013). *Student debt and the class of 2012*. Oakland, CA: Author.
- Jacoby, B. (1996). *Service learning in higher education: Concepts and practices*. New York, NY: Wiley Publishers.
- Kanter, R. M. (1972). *Commitment and community*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Keegan, M. (2011, September 30). Even artichokes have doubts. *Yale News*. Retrieved from <http://yaledailynews.com/weekend/2011/09/30/even-artichokes-have-doubts/>
- Kezar, A., Chambers, T., & Burkhardt, J. (2005). *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Kezar, A., & Gehrke, S. (2014). Why are we hiring so many non-tenure-track faculty? *Liberal Education*, 100(1). Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/liberal-education/2014/winter/kezar>
- Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2013). The changing academic workforce. *Trusteeship*, 3(21). Retrieved from <http://agb.org/trusteeship/2013/5/changing-academic-workforce>
- Labaree, D. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34(1), 39–81.
- Maurrasse, D. (2001). *Beyond the campus: How colleges and universities form partnerships with their communities*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. (2012). *A crucible moment: College learning and democracy's future*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Newfield, C. (2008). *Unmaking the public university: The forty-year assault on the middle class*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- O'Meara, K. (2008). Motivation for faculty community engagement: Learning from exemplars. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(1), 7–29.
- O'Meara, K. (2011). Inside the panopticon: Studying academic reward systems. In J. C. Smart and M. B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*, 26 (pp. 161–220). New York, NY: Springer.
- O'Meara, K. (2013). Advancing graduate student agency. *Higher Education in Review*, 10, 1–10.
- O'Meara, K., & Jaeger, A. (2007). Preparing future faculty for community engagement: History, barriers, facilitators, models and recommendations. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 11(4), 3–26.
- O'Meara, K., Jaeger, A., Eliason, J., Grantham, A., Cowdery, K., Mitchall, A., & Zhang, K. (2014). By design: How departments influence graduate student agency in career advancement. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 9, 155–179.
- Orphan, C., & Hartley, M. (2013, November). *Nothing gold can stay: How change processes come unraveled*. Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education Conference, St. Louis, MO.
- Pratt, M. G. (2000). The good, the bad, and the ambivalent: Managing identification among Amway distributors. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45, 456–493.
- Rhoades, G., Kiyama, J. M., McCormick, R., & Quiroz, M. (2008). Local cosmopolitans and cosmopolitan locals: New models of professionals in the academy. *Review of Higher Education*, 31(2), 209–235.
- Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Slaughter, S. (1986). From serving students to serving the economy: Changing expectations of faculty role performance. *Higher Education*, 14(1), 41–56.
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2009). *Academic capitalism and the new economy*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Stockwell, C. (2014, October 26). Same as it ever was! Top 10 most popular college majors. *USA Today*. Retrieved from <http://college.usatoday.com/2014/10/26/same-as-it-ever-was-top-10-most-popular-college-majors/>
- Subotzky, G. (1999). Alternatives to the entrepreneurial university: New models of knowledge production in the community service programs. *Higher Education*, 38(4), 401–440.
- Teixeira, P., & Dill, D. (2011). *Public vices, private virtues? Assessing the effects of marketization in higher education*. The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Thelin, J. (2004). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Wilson, J. L., & Meyer, K. A. (2009). Higher education websites: The “virtual face” of diversity. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 2(2), 91–102.
- Woodruff, M. (2013, March 26). The generational gap has never been more clear than it is now. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from <http://www.businessinsider.com/the-generational-debt-gap-in-america-gen-x-gen-y-boomers-2013-3>
- Wooldridge, E. (2014, January 28). Unionization discussion reemerges at grad schools. *Brown Daily Herald*. Retrieved from <http://www.browndailyherald.com/2014/01/28/graduate-students-consider-unionization/>
- Zemsky, R., Wegner, G., & Massy, W. (2005). *Remaking the American university: Market-smart and mission-centered*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Zumeta, W., Breneman, D., Callan, P., & Finney, J. (2012). *Financing American education in the era of globalization*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.