1000 0001 1992

Dr. Ernest Boyer (Teaching, Scholarship and Undergraduate Education in Master's and Doctoral Institutions)

Well, thank you, Stanford, for that elegant and unusually generous introduction. I'm sorry my children are not here. I don't want to be quarrelsome, but you did forget to mention I was president of my eighth grade class, in fact for two consecutive years I was president. So the omission is particularly egregious.

I am delighted to be here with colleagues from the western college association. It was thirty-plus years ago when I spent several years employed by the western association, heading a commission on the education of teachers that sought to bring together the liberal arts and the teacher education departments at the time when the state education department in California required that all future teachers have an academic degree. Teacher education was abolished, and we were trying to build bridges between the academic programs in the liberal arts and those who were preparing to teach the nation's children. It's very good to be coming home.

I have, as you know, been asked to talk about the role of faculty in American higher education, especially at master's and doctorate-granting institutions, and I should like to begin by reflecting on how the view of the professoriate has changed throughout the years. When little Harvard College was founded in 1636, the focus was on the student; teaching was a central, even sacred, function; and the highest accolade a professor could receive in that day was the famous one that Chaucer extended to the clerk at Oxford when he said gladly would he learn and gladly teach. Educating the whole person was at the very heart of the Colonial college, and for a century and a half that's what scholarship in American higher education was all about. As late at 1869, in fact, when Charles Elliott assumed the president of Harvard, he declared in his inaugural address that the primary business of the American professor, and I quote, "must be regular and assiduous classroom teaching."

But change was in the wind, and early in the 19th century the focus of higher learning slowly began to shift from the shaping of young lives to the building of a nation. In 1824, Rensselaerville Polytechnic Institute was founded in Troy, NY, and according to historian Fred Rudolph, RPI was constantly reminding us that America needed railroad builders, bridge builders, builders of all kinds. The now famous Land Grant Act of 1862 linked higher learning to America's agricultural revolution, and when social critic Lincoln Stephens visited Madison in 1909, he declared that in Wisconsin the university is as close to the farmer as his pigpen or his toolhouse. And I assume the farmer could tell the difference. It was at the turn of the century, just a hundred years ago, the turn of the century, David Starr Jordan, the newly appointed, president of the newly established Stanford University, declared that, and I quote, "Entire university movement in this country is toward reality and practicality." And on the east coast, Charles Elliott, who was still hanging on, said that serviceability is the central mission of

American higher education. And so, just one hundred years ago, reality, practicality, serviceability were the inspired visions. And to put it as simply as I can, the scholarship of teaching had been joined by the scholarship of building.

Meanwhile, a third vision of scholarship was emerging. It began perhaps in 1861 when Yale University granted the first Ph.D. degree ever awarded here in the United States. And it was further strengthened as American academics who studied at the distinguished German universities of Gottingen, Heidelberg, and Humboldt were profoundly influenced by the emerging scholarship of science. I find it fascinating that Daniel Coy Gilman (and incidentally I'm intrigued that all of these great giants of presidents had middle names—Daniel Coy Gilman, William Rainey Harper, and on it goes. I really don't think Clark Kerr will be long remembered. Syllables do matter. To say nothing of Derrick Boch. I mean, who can recall that with fascination?) I find it fascinating that Daniel Coy Gilman, one of the most distinguished scholars of that era became president of the University of California in 1872 at the disturbingly young age of 41. But he left within three years, driven out by the faculty, accused by his critics of wanting to emphasize (hold your breath) wanting to emphasize at the University of California such courses as literature and language and history and diminish the influence of agriculture, which was heresy in that land grant institution in 1872. Gilman, however, recovered fast. He moved to the east coast with his tail between his legs to launch Johns Hopkins University in 1876. And it might be noted that in its first academic plan, undergraduates were omitted entirely from Johns Hopkins and it was in the end reluctantly decided to admit them presumably to help pay the bill, a tradition that lingers to this day. Upon Gilman's retirement two decades later, Woodrow Wilson gave the benedictory speech at the time that he left the leadership of Johns Hopkins and Woodrow Wilson praised Gilman as the first president, and I quote, "to create a true university here in the United States." Wilson also described Johns Hopkins as a university where, and I quote, "the discovery of new truth was judged superior to mere teaching." The battle lines had been joined.

During this period, however, the Johns Hopkins model remained the exception not the rule and well into the 20th century most colleges and universities in the United States continued to give top priority to teaching and now secondarily to service. One of my good friends, Vern Stadman, who worked years with Clark Kerr at the University of California and who was a colleague of mine at the Carnegie Foundation, wrote the definitive history of the University of California, and he says from the beginning of the 20th century right up to World War II, the primary commitment of the University was to classroom instruction.

But then, then following World War II, the culture of the American professoriate profoundly shifted. Following the GI Bill, we moved the country from elite to mass higher education, to choose Marty Trow's interesting formulation, and in the decade of the 1950s a veritable army of newly minted Ph.D.s fanned out to campuses from coast to coast determined to clone the research model they

themselves experienced and determined also to get a piece of the new federal research pie. In fact it was Vanderver Bush, former president of MIT, who was called to Washington during the war, and he persuaded Presidents Roosevelt and Truman that since the nation's universities had helped win the war, they could also win the peace, which gave birth to the National Science Foundation, to NIH, and to the research grants from the Department of Defense.

An absolute sea change was transforming the American professoriate within 20 years. In 1968, sociologist Halcourt Parsons captured the spirit of the times when he wrote that today the typical professor now resembles the scientist more than the gentleman scholar of an earlier generation. In the early 1960s I was at the University of California, Santa Barbara, and I watched a former teacher training and home economics institution being folded into the University of California system, and I can tell you it was a wrenching process to see faculty who had been hired to perform one mission almost overnight being held accountable for another. And then I joined the State University of New York where I struggled as Chancellor to protect the diversity in a 64-campus system at a time when everything was drifting upward and when research and publication became the single yardstick of success. Indeed, during this 20-year period we had two almost contrarian revolutions. We had the revolution of rising expectations in which we broadened access and presumably broadened the diversity of institutions, we also had what David Reisman called the academic revolution in which we didn't broaden, but we narrowed, the standards by which the professoriate could be held accountable. So we broadened the mission and narrowed the processes by which the functions could be performed and built into it a fundamental tension.

So, as I see it, after World War II, most campuses were caught in the crossfire of two great traditions. One of these, the land grant model, had all but faded from the scene. But two other traditions lingered on. On the one hand, there was the Colonial college tradition with its emphasis on the student, with its emphasis on general education, and with its loyalty to the campus. On the other hand, there was the European university tradition with its emphasis not on the student, but on the professoriate, not on general but on specialized education, not on loyalty to the campus but loyalty to the guild. And it's my own observation that almost all of the intense debates going on in higher education today, except those over priorities of parking, have to do with a struggle between these two traditions and the soul of the institution. Let me put it to you simply: are we a Colonial college or are we a European university or are we in some ways a blend of both?

Now the truth is that most campuses would like to have their cake and eat it too, especially when they're out recruiting students. When we're out attracting students and talking to the parents, we use Colonial college language to the core, we in fact ooze loving tender care. Read the view books. When we did our report on College: The Undergraduate Experience, I did in fact sit down one evening and did a content analysis of 30 view books selected randomly. These

are the marketing devices that we use to attract our students, bear in mind. Based on the content analysis, the word—I kept stumbling into the word community and colleageal and even family kept popping up time and time again. And alma mater somehow gives the inspiration that recalls Daniel Webster's image that she is small but there are those of us who love her. That strand of American higher learning keeps flowing on and on and the interesting thing is that the students and the parents actually believe that's what they're up to. They are sending their students off to college in a climate that they presume to be collegial, and that's why when things get screwed up and there's some kind of violence or breakdown on the campus we are profoundly judged harshly because somehow we have neglected what they thought to be both, not just our educational, but our ethical and moral obligations, and our language, to be blunt about it, reinforce the image of the collegiate model which somehow we wish to sustain in order to attract the students. And incidentally, back to my analysis of these view books, not only did I find the words interesting, but I was enormously intrigued by the pictures, too. They, after all, convey a thousand words, and based upon the analysis that I've made of the pictures, I concluded that about 60 percent of all college classes in America are held outside underneath a tree by a gently flowing stream. I mean, it's just amazing. It just oozes cuddleness to the core. And in fact, one recruiter said to a Carnegie researcher, "Water's very big this year." And I've been on campuses where I've actually seen these puddles that are pictured in the view book with a wide angle lens. I mean you can make a four foot pond look like a 30 foot lake if you get trick photography going for you. And I even read a view book where they said, you know you can have a pleasant day at the beach. Well, I know that campus. It's a hundred and fifty miles away and it would take all Saturday going 80 miles an hour. But somehow we create these images of a cuddly and supportive place. The only problem is, students occasionally do enroll, and frankly, to put it bluntly, they discover the truth of the fact that American higher education is organized around two very separate cultures—the collegiate culture that supports the students presumably, and the European university culture that supports the professoriate. And for freshmen and sophomores, the two are absolutely separate and divided worlds.

Now what we've done, of course, is to create a student services support system to try to fan the embers of the collegiate model, to be engaged in the loving tender care of students. But the connectedness between the student services and the academic is as large, the gap is as great, as it can be. Now when students stay with us and continue up the academic ladder or, if you like, go down the academic chute, by the time they elect their major, you begin to see somewhat of a convergence between the collegiate and the university models. And then by the time they get to graduate school, they start to come together in still more intimate relationship; and by the time you're a Ph.D. candidate and have a senior advisor, there is an incestuous interlocking of the faculty and the student cultures. But these do not come together until finally the upper division and the graduate programs, and the students have made the enrollment. In fact, it's for that reason that Robert Maynard Hutchins (there's another example; that middle

name will keep you in remembrance every time!)—but, as you know, he quite seriously proposed that the freshmen and sophomore years be abolished at the University of Chicago, acknowledging that they should go off and finish this whatever it is, general collegiate effort, and then enroll in the upper division and start their serious specialization—the European university tradition—ironically, spinning off the community college movement, which now takes 40 percent of the students and has become, I think, one of America's most remarkable social revolutions. The irony is that neither students nor faculty, at least based upon our information, have been particularly happy with this cultural bifurcation.

At the Carnegie Foundation, we survey faculty and students every three to five years, and according to our data about half the undergraduates in this country say they feel like a number in a book, sort of circa Berkeley 1964—don't fold, spindle, or mutilate. About 60 percent of the faculty say they'd rather teach than do research. And last year I decided to ask one other question. I asked the faculty in our survey "Do we need methods other than research and publication to evaluate the role of the faculty?" And I guess I was unprepared for the fact that 70 percent of the responders said yes. And incidentally, that 70 percent held constant at all of the Carnegie types of institutions, from research one to the liberal arts, a sense that somehow there need to be multiple measures of faculty performance that match the multiple missions that we in our hyperbole claim that we perform. Further, in this process of unitary model in a diversified mission, I think we've distorted campus functions, too. While the nation's campuses talk about diversity among the more than 3,000 institutions, the harsh truth is that higher education in this country has, in my opinion, become a hugely imitative system with most campuses measuring themselves against the Berkeley or the Amherst models.

Well, what are we to do about all of this? I mean, we're in America and every solution has a problem, right? So in a recent Carnegie report, as some of you may know, entitled Scholarship Reconsidered, we concluded that the time has come to move beyond the tired old teaching vs. research debate, which I think has lost all of its juices—we've already chosen up sides years and years ago—and begin to ask what I think is the more compelling question, "What does it mean to be a scholar?" And let me just say parenthetically that the word "scholarship" has been around at least for 500 years. It's had an honorable and interesting tradition. It in fact refers historically to the insights and the erudition of the mind. It has to do with careful thought and almost consistently with teaching, and historically it is also applied not only to teachers but to students, too. It wasn't very long ago when we referred to our most gifted students as scholars in the classroom, where the life of the mind begin to join. And because of the quality of the university work, the scholarship between the faculty and the students becomes blurred. It did not have to do with the degree you held; it had to do with sophistication and the carefulness of your thought. It seemed to me since all faculty are or should be scholars, we could start with the query, "What, in fact, is the role of scholarship today?" And in response to that intriguing

question we propose a new paragon of scholarship with four interlocking responses. Let me touch on them very briefly.

First, we say in the Carnegie report that research is at the very heart of academic life. Nothing that we've written should in any way be seen as diminishing or degrading that essential function. We celebrate what we call the scholarship of discovery, which incidentally was the formulation that Woodrow Wilson used when he defined Johns Hopkins more than a century ago. Fifty years ago, Vanderver Bush put it this way: "Universities are the wellspring of human understanding, and as long as scholars are free to pursue the truth wherever it may lead, there will surely continue to be a flow of new scientific knowledge." And specialized research, in my opinion, is more urgently required now than ever before because of the problems that are increasingly complex. I'm suggesting that we urgently need great universities that excel in the scholarship of research, and frankly I worry about federal cutbacks. I worry about policies that would direct government funds away from basic research, and I worry also about the increasing corporate control of research that might predetermine and restrict the free flow of ideas. So to put it simply, the goal of our report is to strengthen research, not restrict it, but I'd also like to keep the bad from driving out the good.

This leads me then to priority number two. We say in the Carnegie report that in addition to the scholarship of discovery, we also need what we call the scholarship of integration. We need professors who go beyond the isolated facts and who make connections across the discipline and who shape a more coherent view of knowledge and a more integrated, more authentic view of life. And as I look around, I do believe that while I feel an urgency about discovery, I also feel an increased urgency about integration—the capacity to move from the isolated fact, to gain information and to move on to knowledge and ultimately to wisdom. That is, to put new knowledge in context, and without that pedantry results. Barbara McClintock, the Nobel Laureate, said on one occasion that everything is one. There is, she said, no way to draw a line between things. I wonder whether Professor McClintock has looked at a college catalog in recent days. Frank Press, as you know the president of the National Academy of Sciences, sent me a copy of a speech he gave not long ago in which he suggested that the scientist is in some respects an artist, a fascinating thought. And to illustrate his point, he observed that the magnificent double helix, which broke the genetic code, was not only rational, he said, it was beautiful as well.

When I read Frank's speech, I thought of the days when I used to watch the liftoffs at Cape Kennedy when in the final countdown, they'd zero in on the faces of the engineers who were staring intently and with great anxiousness to the monitors above. And then when they'd get to three-two-one-contact and would be successful liftoff into space, suddenly there would be a great burst of satisfaction and a smile and, if I read the lips correctly, the engineers didn't say well, our formulas worked again. They'd say almost in unison the word

"beautiful." It always intrigued me that they chose an aesthetic term to describe a technological achievement, which raises the interesting question that perhaps the scientists and artists are in fact engaged in common cause. That below the differences of our language, there is in fact an aesthetic as well as an intellectual process that binds us all together. Several years ago, when the world-renowned physicist, Victor Weiskoft, was asked, "What gives you hope in troubled times?", he replied, "Mozart and quantum mechanics." But where in our fragmented academic world can students make connections such as this? I think it doesn't overstate the case to say that we've created academic departments that still serve political and administrative functions, but in large measure have lost their intellectual juices. And yet very often there is something about the tyranny of that restriction that makes it impossible to step beyond that boundary because somehow you have threatened the territorial arrangements that the academic tribalism has reinforced.

I think there's a positive side to all of this. I think increasingly the most exciting work going on in the academy is in what I'll call the hyphenated disciplines, in psycho-linguistics and bio-engineering and the like. In what Michael Polonny calls the overlapping academic neighborhoods. Professor Clifford Gertz at the Institute for Advanced Study had an interesting monograph several years ago intitled Blurred Genres. He said the old categories of knowledge are beginning to break down. Something is happening, he said, to the way we think about the way we think, and new disciplines are emerging in response to compelling intellectual questions. In fact, I think frankly, integrative studies are imperative and inevitable in the century ahead, in part because of the imperatives within the academy itself, as the questions drive us to realign the disciplines, and I think because of external imperatives. The human survival questions that have to do with ecology and health and population—that inevitably will cause the integrative studies to flower to to flourish. Over 50 years ago, Mark VanDoren wrote that the connectedness of things is what the educator contemplates to the limit of his capacity. VanDoren concludes by saying that those who can begin early in life to see things as connected have begun the life of learning. And this, it seems to me, is what good scholarship is all about.

This brings me to category number three. We say in the Carnegie report that beyond the scholarship of discovery and beyond the scholarhip of integration, we also need what we call the scholarship of application to relate the theory of research to the reality of life. I've already suggested that this uniquely American view of scholarship, the usefulness of knowledge is rooted in the land grant colleges, it's rooted in the polytechnic institutes such as RPI, it's rooted in the normal schools, it's rooted in the conservatories, institutions that were in the 19th centruy in the nation's service, as Woodrow Wilson put it. Well, we're not in the 19th century, in case you want an insight to take home, we're really standing on the threshold of the 21st. I occasionally like to say the threshold of a new millenium since I do not expect to have the opportunity to put it that way ever again. I mention that because our shore lines are polluted, the ozone layer may

be threatened, our schools are dangerously deficient, our cities are imperiled, and I really do believe that the university urgently needs to respond to the crises of this century just as they responded to the needs of agriculture and industry a century ago. In fact, I really do wonder if it's unfair to ask how we can justify a university that's surrounded by pressing human problems and essentially ignores them. It seems to me it's a failure not just educationally but ethically as well.

Lest I be misunderstood, I'm not talking about doing good; I'm talking about doing scholarship. Donald Shone of MIT writes about what he calls the reflective practitioner. He proposes a new epistemology of practice in which scholars not only move from theory to practice but move from practice back to theory. And I think all of us have seen the delicious interaction between the theory and the practice, and it shows up everywhere in the academy today. Certainly those preparing teachers understand the "ahas" that come when students are in the classroom and start to realign and give definitive understanding to the theories that they've heard and go back to the classroom redefining the nature of their intellectual insights. The New Horizons, the new pathways program at the medical school at Harvard, begins with students in the first year going into the clinics, observing, listening to the patients, and then going into the classroom and formulating theory both in diagnosis and the application of health care based upon practice. The same applies to lawyers or to architects, or surely to artists, or even to business schools. I'm suggesting that in the end, theory simply cannot be divorced from practice, and that in developing new priorities for the professoriate we simply must give new dignity and new status to what we call the scholarship of application.

Well, this brings me then to category number four, in case you're counting. We say in the Carnegie report that scholarship means not only the ability to discover and integrate and to apply knowledge, it also means inspiring future teachers in the classroom, a process that might be called the scholarship of teaching. Several years ago I couldn't sleep and instead of counting sheep, I counted all the teachers I've had. There were a few nightmares in the bunch, but I also remembered three or four who consequentially changed my life. You've already heard about my first grade teacher. I thought about Mr. Whitlinger who, in a high school history class, asked if he could see me. Well, I had cardiac arrest and sweaty palms. Teachers don't just want to pass the time of day. But in just a few fleeting moments, Mr. Whitlinger said, "Ernest, you're doing pretty well in history; you keep this up, you just might be a student." That was the highest academic accolade I'd had. And I ran home that night—you mean I'm not a cowboy, I'm not a fireman, I'm something Mr. Whitlinger calls a student. He redefined my sense of understanding at a time when I was very confused about who I was or what I might become. I had a literature professor in the university that taught Shakespeare and oddly enough used to read King Lear and Macbeth aloud in class. I discovered in that seminar that literature is not a recollection of the past; it's an inquiry into the deepest yearnings of the human spirit, and that

words really to reach deeply, not only into the intellect but into the soul as well. And while being somewhat reflective on this point of teaching, I just recalled an occasion when I was commissioner of education and walked into a classroom in New Haven, a sixth grade class where there were 30 little kids from the inner-city, and they had all gathered around the desk and I was genuinely alarmed. I thought they were attacking the teacher and denying oxygen, and I nearly did what almost everyone does in a crisis—run to the central office. But then I paused and looked still further and discovered that I'd read it entirely wrong; they were gathered there out of enthusiasm, not anger or confrontation, and as I listened just to the side I discovered that they had all read Charles Dickens' Oliver Twist and were engaged in a heated debate over whether Oliver could survive in New Haven. They had concluded that he made it in London, but they knew he couldn't make it in New Haven. And I thought, "I've found what teaching's all about." He not only taught the subject, he taught the setting. He knew the students. He wasn't teaching 19th century London, he was teaching 20th century New Haven.

I mention this to say that these wonderful mentors, at least in my life, live on forever and I suspect that almost everyone in the audience in the room is here because of an inspired teacher. And the problem is that in the academy—and that scholarship is somewhat interconnected through continuity of the transmission of ideas and the inspiration that keeps it alive. It's almost a relay in an Olympic sense, and great teachers keep the flame passing from generation to generation. But the problem is that in the academy today, I don't think I overstate it, good teaching is not adequately rewarded. The truth is it's far better for a professor to deliver a paper at the Hyatt in Chicago, which incidentally is a miserable hotel, than it is to teach undergraduates back home. And I think conveying new knowledge to one's colleagues is important and it makes sense. But that too, is teaching; to fly off to a conference in Chicago, it's transmitting your feelings and ideas. That's a teaching act. And to celebrate that as being worthwhile and to diminish the same function to undergraduates who could be future scholars, speaking in the most hopeful and hope-filled way, it seems to me is a caricature and distortion of what the importance of teaching is all about. As far as that goes, a published article is an act of teaching, too; it's only in print and not verbally presented. I'm suggesting, then, that excellence in my judgment cannot be divided. And if colleges enroll students, they have both an educational and an ethical obligation to give them quality instruction. And those assigned those courses, who are given what we like to call teaching loads, should be rewarded significantly for their work. So we need classrooms where there is active, not passive, learning. We need classrooms where students learn to cooperate rather than compete. And we also need to view classrooms as a laboratory where even research on teaching can be thoughtfully pursued.

Now I recognize the big trick is adequately to evaluate the teaching process. As far as I know, there are only three sources from which information can be drawn: self-evaluation, peer evaluation, and student evaluation. And I think all of these

should be used. In the days ahead I'd like to see campuses work together to develop more uniform criteria of teacher evaluation, standards of assessment that could give us a currency that could be used from one institution to another. Robert Oppenheimer at the two hundredth anniversary of Columbia University put it to us this way. He said it's the proper role of the scientist that he not merely find a new truth and communicate it to his fellows. Oppenheimer said it's also the role of the scientist that he teach. That he try to bring the most honest and most intelligent account of new knowledge to all who will try to learn, and surely this means inspiring future scholars in the classroom.

Well, here then is a summary of our position. We say in the Carnegie report that scholarship surely means the discovery of knowledge as in research. But to avoid pedantry, it means the integration of knowledge. To avoid irrelevance, it means the application of knowledge. And to avoid discontinuity, it means inspiring future teachers in the classroom.

And, finally, in conclusion, I should like to return to the topic I've been assigned. What's the relevance of this new paradigm to master's and doctorate-granting institutions? First, while all professors should demonstrate their capacity to do research and stay intellectually abreast, I'm also convinced the time has come to celebrate the rich mosaic of faculty talent on the campus and to recognize that scholarly performance surely differs from person to person and from field to field. We also recommend in our Carnegie report something called creativity contracts, an arrangement by which professors could avoid burnout by moving from one scholarly endeavor to another across a lifetime. During one three to five year contract period, for example, a professor might focus primarily on research. Later, he or she might work on integrative studies, or spend time on field work. Or during another contract period, the professor might work full time on the scholarship of teaching. What we propose, in short, is a broken field approach to scholarship, one that encourages creativity across a lifetime and engages the faculty more actively in shaping their careers.

Second, it seems to me that the new paradigm of scholarship relates to campus missions. While it's quite possible for colleges and universities to promote the full range of scholarship on campus, I'm also convinced that master's and doctorate institutions have a special obligation to establish priorities and become less imitative and more distinctive. Let's have campuses with a small cluster of high quality research centers. Let's also have campuses where teaching and learning is a central focus. Further, why not have institutions that concentrate on integrative and interdisciplinary studies, including global education. And above all, let's have campuses that give top priority to service, establishing partnerships with health clinics, with city governments, with legal aid centers, with public schools much as the land grant colleges worked with farmers. And let me say I think there is increased urgency for this reaffirmation and rediscovery of the scholarship of application, service in the old fashioned sense. For one thing, I sense in this country a loss of confidence in the university's capacity to be

relevant. There is a feeling that universities have a private benefit but not a public good. And the more that mentality grows, it seems to me, the more our support inevitably will erode. But more than that, it's not just sustaining support. There are huge and urgent problems beyond the campus that are social and civic. I'm absolutely appalled at the neglect of little children in this society, at the decline of schools, at the health care system. And I don't understand how we can have a hundred million dollars to bail out the S&L's and don't seem to have sufficient money for our children. The squandering of our money instead of investing in the future of the coming generation. Universities, in my judgment, are clearly the most effective institutions in society, and I think it's urgently important that they be viewed as part of the solution and not part of the problem. But for that to happen, we have to, I think, reaffirm the essentialness of service.

Finally, this new paradigm of scholarship, oddly enough, might even have implications for our students, especially those pursuing the M.A. and the Ph.D. degrees. Consider, for example, a graduate degree program in which all four dimensions of scholarship would be seriously addressed. In such a program, a student would be asked first to do research; second to put the thesis in historical, social, and ethical perspective—to integrate; third to complete a field project; and fourth to present ideas to fellow students in teaching, a process that would be carefully assessed. I suspect that with such an integrated training, a new generation of professionals would come to campus better prepared to fulfill the full range of scholarship the modern university now requires. John Gardner wrote on one occasion that a nation is never finished. You can't build it and leave it standing as the pharoahs did the pyramids; it has to be rebuilt with each new generation. And this is true for colleges and universities as well. The challenge as I see it for today's generation is to broaden the definition of scholarship, not just for the professoriate, but for our students, too.