**Teaching, Research, Community, and the Cost of Education**

Richard Kamber

The most remarkable features of American higher education are the diversity of colleges and universities and the autonomy enjoyed by those institutions. There is no national system of education, and the only national universities are the military academies and the National Defense University. States vary in the degree of control that they exercise over the policies and operations of state colleges and universities. In New Jersey, for example, state institutions are nearly as autonomous as private schools. Regional accrediting agencies today seldom exercise their primary responsibility, which is to deny accreditation to schools that do not deserve accreditation. Instead they pester schools, both good and bad, with self-study exercises aimed at encouraging greater emphasis on priorities that happen to have captured their interest.

Because of their diversity and autonomy, American colleges and universities approximate a free market. A would-be college student with the necessary qualifications and financial wherewithal has literally thousands of choices at his or her disposal. College and universities compete to attract students. For some this means competition for superior scholars, athletes, or artists. For many this means competition for enough students to pay the bills. Students compete for admission into the colleges and universities that they would prefer to attend. For most students the cost of an undergraduate education is partially subsidized. A tuition-free four-year education in the U.S. has become rarity. [[1]](#endnote-1) But the full cost of a four-year education is offset for most students, either directly by scholarships and financial aid grants, or indirectly by public funding of institutional budgets and tax breaks granted to colleges and universities. As operational costs have risen and state funding has declined, the traditional distinction between private and public has become increasingly blurred. In fiscal year 2012, state funding for the College of William and Mary, a public institution, represented just 12.8% of the college’s overall operating budget.

I believe that diversity and autonomy have had much to do with overall success of American higher education. Although the United States has fallen behind many other developed countries in the quality of K-12 education, the same is not true of American higher education. America’s top research universities may well be the best in the world, and elements of American liberal arts education are being considered for adoption by universities in Europe and China. I believe that competition for students has been good for American higher education. Colleges and universities have had to differentiate their missions, curricula and community characteristics in order to attract students. They have been induced to maintain quality by the freedom of their students to go elsewhere. Institutional autonomy and traditions of shared governance have allowed faculty to play a central role in designing and re‑designing the academic programs in which they teach and the communities of learners to which they belong. Most professors have a sense of ownership and take pride in what they do.

Among the major challenges facing American higher education today are how to balance teaching and research and how to the pay the bills. These challenges are not new but they have become more pressing because of the rise of research-based reward systems in institutions that are not research universities and the upward spiral of operational costs. Both bear directly on the future of liberal arts education.

One of the ways in which colleges and universities have sought to improve quality and attract students is by hiring faculty with doctoral degrees from well-respected research universities. As a result, faculty positions at liberal arts colleges, comprehensive institutions, four-year colleges, and even community colleges have been filled by individuals with an appreciation (and sometimes envy) of the careers of research faculty. Many of these institutions have also adopted systems of tenure and promotion that reward faculty who publish (or gain comparable recognition) and punish those who do not. There are real advantages to having teachers of undergraduates who are also engaged in research. A teacher who is also a scholar can model for students what it means to be a practicing professional: a historian as well as a teacher of history, a chemist as well as a teacher of chemistry. But there can be drawbacks as well. The most obvious is that teachers who are deeply engaged in her own research may be tempted to shortchange the time they spend working with students. A subtler drawback is that faculty who are immersed in their own specializations may be reluctant to talk to colleagues about topics and texts of mutual interest. This is a profound obstacle to interdisciplinary discourse, but I see it as well in my own department. There is an unfortunate presumption in the halls of academe that you cannot have a serious conversation about a text or topic if you are not conversant with the latest scholarly debates.

Paying the bills has always been a problem, but it has grown more acute over the years. When I began undergraduate education at Johns Hopkins in 1960, full tuition, room and board was $1,800. The buying power of a dollar in 1960 was greater than it is today, but buying power (based on the Consumer Price Index) accounts only for a fraction of the differences between then and now. If CPI inflation were the whole story, tuition, room and board at Hopkins would now be $14,140. In fact, it will be $59, 202 for the 2013-2014 academic year.[[2]](#endnote-2) It is no exaggeration to describe the price of an undergraduate as “soaring,” and it is no wonder that students and their parents worry about the practicality of so costly an investment.

In terms of earning power and quality of life, a liberal arts education is still a very good buy. For most young Americans today, its practicality is indisputable. Studies show that a liberal arts education helps to develop skills that corporate leaders say are indispensable for a 21st century workforce: skills in communication, critical thinking, and problem solving.[[3]](#endnote-3) In recent years higher education has been kept within reach by student loan programs, but crushing debt is making that option less attractive. Some educators are looking to MOOCS (Massive Open Online Courses) as a way of reducing costs. I welcome MOOCs as one of many online resources for enriching education, but I doubt they will play a significant role in reducing costs. Before there were MOOCS, there were “BOO—ks” or books as I prefer to say. It still takes a teacher to help students learn how to make the most of the resources at their disposal—whether those resources are online or on a shelf. Effective online education requires at least as many hours of teaching time as traditional classroom instruction, it is less costly primarily because the instructors are being paid less.

I have five suggestions for dealing with the problem of paying the bills: (1) Redress the imbalance between state funding of higher education and the burden borne by students and parents; (2) Curb the abuses of proprietary institutions that have been milking student loan programs; (3) Provide socially constructive opportunities for students to earn forgiveness from debt; (4) Cut back on non-educational amenities and services that have been added to campuses over the years to make them more appealing; (5) Offer full-time tenured faculty the opportunity to teach more courses in overload.

Every college and university worthy of the name is a community of learners, but the vectors of teaching, research, community, and budget vary from in a multitude of ways. In the pages that follow I offer two cases studies based on personal experience. The first is drawn from my experience as an undergraduate at the Johns Hopkins University. The second is drawn from my work as Dean of Arts and Science at Trenton State College (renamed The College of New Jersey in 1996).

**Becoming a Teacher**

The thought that I might become a teacher first occurred to me in 1959, during my senior year in high school. Prompted, by recent legislation aimed at helping students with special needs (the Beadleston Acts), Asbury Park High School had instituted streamed classes for gifted students in English and Mathematics. The teachers of these classes were women in their forties, who, a generation later would probably have been college professors. They were of dynamic instructors, whose knowledge and enthusiasm captivated students and triumphed over senioritis. My teachers in history and Latin were very nearly as good. As a child of Sputnik, science was still my first love, but I found it increasingly difficult to stay lashed to the Periodic Table when I heard around me the voices of Cicero, Shakespeare, Emily Dickinson, George Bernard Shaw, and Albert Camus.

Although I was accepted into a special program for aspiring physicists at Brown, I chose instead to attend Johns Hopkins. One reason for this decision was growing uncertainty about my dedication to science. Another was the influence of my cousin Gerald Kamber who had just earned a Ph.D. in Romance Languages at Hopkins. Gerald seemed to me the incarnation of dash and sophistication. He had fought on Iwo Jima and traveled in Europe. He was fluent in French and Italian, played the saxophone, and cooked food that tasted nothing like my mother’s Indiana recipes. A third reason was money. Hopkins had offered me a $200 scholarship, which made it about $300 cheaper than Brown. These sums seem piddling today, when a textbook can cost over $200[[4]](#endnote-4), but full tuition, room and board at Hopkins in 1960 was $1,800.

My scientific career at Hopkins did not last long. Although I was captivated by scientific theories, I lacked the patience and discipline required for scientific research. I found work at the bench tedious. I wanted drama not data, and I managed to find it. After causing a nasty explosion in the freshman chemistry laboratory, I was counseled to seek a major where I was likely to do less harm to myself and others. I chose philosophy. I had gotten a taste of philosophy during my senior year in high school. Cicero and Camus were not systematic thinkers or especially original, but they wrote eloquently about lofty questions of life and death and introduced me to philosophical worlds far removed from the pedestrian preoccupations of the Jersey Shore. During my first semester at Hopkins, I took Introduction to Philosophy with Maurice Mandelbaum, then Chair of the Philosophy Department. Mandelbaum’s lectures were polished, precise, and exquisitely organized. But what really impressed me were the answers he gave to the flurry of questions that students raised at the end of each lecture. My classmates and I did our bumptious best to stump the teacher. But no one succeeded. However audacious or arcane the question, Mandelbaum handled it with ease and specificity. I recall thinking that I would give my eyeteeth to have such magisterial command of a subject. What I did not realize at the time was that after teaching Introduction to Philosophy for decades, the questions raised by undergraduates become pretty predictable.

My freshman roommate was also taking Introduction to Philosophy that semester. We had been put together in part because we were both science majors. He had started the semester in Chemical Engineering, but his career in science was even briefer than mine. I remember walking with him across campus on a brilliant fall afternoon arguing about whether Kant or Hegel was the greater philosopher. The fact that neither of us knew much about Kant or Hegel and dimly perceived the magnitude of our ignorance didn’t discourage us in the least. We extrapolated from the meager details at our disposal to grand claims about the lasting significance of these heady thinkers. To call our conversation “sophomoric” would be too generous, and English doesn’t have an adjective for the starker naiveté of college freshmen. Yet despite the poverty of our fumbling debate, we were on to something important. We were excited by great books and the ideas they embodied. We were learning that earnest conversations about the best that has been thought and said was a way of advancing understanding, exposing youthful ignorance, and making our lives a little richer.

Undergraduate education at Hopkins was a stepchild of the doctoral programs and medical school. Frederick Rudolph notes in *The American College and University* that “the voluminous correspondence” between Daniel Coit Gilman, Hopkins’ first President and Charles W. Eliot, President of Harvard makes no mention of “such questions as the methodology of teaching on the college level.”[[5]](#endnote-5) “Not once,” he remarks, “did they concern themselves with ‘the management of student affairs, including educational or personal guidance.’ ” This lack of interest in the learning needs and personal lives of undergraduates was still very much in evidence when I arrived on campus in 1960. Most of the courses designed for freshmen were large lecture classes taught by faculty who had no special gift for lecturing (Mandelbaum was a happy exception) and supplemented with discussion sections lead by graduate students with no special gift for leading discussions. Academic advising was a casual affair, and course requirements seemed to be negotiable. Student life consisted of a campus YMCA that was run by the college chaplain, a genial man, who needed crutches because of a bout with polio, and an early Civil Rights activist.

It was not until the middle of spring semester that I discovered the secret of securing a first-rate undergraduate education at Hopkins. The secret was to act like a graduate student. Would-be graduate students typically apply to a institution because they want to study with particular faculty members who are teaching at that institution, undergraduates typically apply to an institution because they what to attend that institution. Hopkins valued students who had the confidence and self-direction to participate in designing their own education. If you were waiting for the helping hand of institutional policy to show you the way, you were going to wait for a very long time. But if you sought out faculty with whom you wanted to study and took an interest in their work, you were welcomed into the fold. To the best of my knowledge, Hopkins had no official policy on coaxing undergraduates to act like graduate students in training. But the practice had taken shape over the years as part of the culture of the campus community. One manifestation of this culture was comic. The stacks of Gilman Library were open to graduate students but closed to undergraduates. If you wanted a book from the stacks, you had to submit a request to the librarian’s desk and wait until the book was retrieved. Graduate students at that time—especially those in the humanities—usually wore sport coats. All that an undergraduate needed to do in order to get into the stacks was to put on a sport coat and stride confidently through the open door.

My friends in the sciences are amused by what humanists call research. They cannot quite fathom why explaining one book in terms of other books counts as research. Be that as it may, I found humanistic research more congenial than laboratory research. The history of ideas had been nurtured at Hopkins by Arthur O. Lovejoy, whose groundbreaking study *The Great Chain of Being* (1936) and new journal *The Journal of the History of Ideas* (founded in 1940) defined this branch of intellectual history. I was enthralled by the art of tracing the journeys of ideas through works of major cultural significance. My favorite practitioners of this art at Hopkins were two young faculty members: Richard Macksey and Lionel Gossman. Macksey’s personal library at that time had tens of thousands of volumes (eventually it reached 70,000), and he seemed to have read all of them. Gossman taught interdisciplinary courses in literature with sparkling wit and seductive intelligence. Both treated undergraduates with unusual generosity.

I also began to appreciate historical research of a different kind. Mandelbaum, who was then my advisor, urged me to take Don Cameron Allen’s course on Milton and Earl Wasserman’s courses on 18th Century British Literature. Neither of this subjects appealed to me, but I took his advice and was richly rewarded. Both Allen and Wasserman were brilliant storytellers. They made the works they taught come alive in the classroom. One sometimes had the impression that they had written *Paradise Lost* or *Tom Jones*. Wasserman’s classes could have been put on stage. Since I knew very little about the particulars of British history in the 17th and 18th centuries, I was compelled to do some reading of my own on political and social history. I was surprised to discover how much this modest historical background illuminated my understanding of literary texts. I encountered another level of historical research when I reluctantly took a course in the political history of the Middle Ages as a prerequisite for a course in the intellectual history of the Middle Ages. For the first time I was confronted with the importance of records and documents that were not literary, philosophical, religious, or scientific. One of the books we read was Bryce Lyon’s recently published (1960) *A Constitutional and Legal History of Medieval England*. It was over 600 pages of very dry reading, but it was also something of a revelation. I came to appreciate how documents that were not intended to advance a theory or tell or a story could provide indispensable data for the construction of historical narratives.

Although I had difficulty deciding which branch of the humanities I wanted most to study, I knew with certainty that I wanted to become a college professor. The excitement with learning that I first felt in high school had grown into a passion. Hopkins sent a relatively high percentage of its baccalaureate graduates into Ph.D. programs and many others into medicine or law. I doubt that this was by design, though perhaps it became design at some point. Hopkins had been modeled on the German research university, and its faculty modeled for students a life steeped in learning and professionalism. Comparatively few planned to enter the world of business. One of my classmates who did was a lackluster student named Mike Bloomberg.

**The Work of a Dean**

Although I received my undergraduate education from a research university, my career as a teacher and administrator has been spent at private liberal arts colleges and a comprehensive public institution. From 1989 to 1998, I served as Dean of Arts and Sciences at Trenton State College (renamed The College of New Jersey in 1996). Trenton State College had been a state teachers college for most of its history, but it became a comprehensive institution in the 1960s. By the time I arrived it consisted of a School of Arts and Sciences with 17 departments, a School of Education, a School of Nursing, a School of Business, and a School of Engineering Technology that was accredited a few years later as a School of Engineering.

Trenton State College had recently outdistanced the other state colleges in New Jersey in the recruitment of academically superior students. Judged by SAT exams and high school rank, its student body resembled that of Rutgers University. This notable success had been achieved in large measure by a clever stratagem adopted by the college’s Board of Trustees. During one of New Jersey’s periodic budget crises, the board had agreed to reduce the number of students admitted to the college, if the state would freeze the college’s budget for a specified number of years. This was attractive to the state because funding to the state colleges was based on the total number of student attending each institution, and most of the state colleges were increasing the size of their student populations. As Trenton State College reduced the number of students admitted each year, it became harder to gain admission to the college, and the reputation of the college as a selective institution began to rise. The number of students applying for admission began to increase, but the reduced number seats for incoming freshmen made admission more competitive than ever. The selectivity of the college spiraled upward, and superior high school students in New Jersey began to think of Trenton State College as an inexpensive alternative to the private colleges in Pennsylvania that had become popular choices for many middle and upper-middle class New Jersey families. The college could not compete with Swarthmore and Haverford, but it could complete with Franklin and Marshall and Bucknell. It was a highly selective college with small classes (typically 28 or fewer students) on a handsome 250-acre campus. And it was half the price of a comparable private school. Trenton State College became “a best buy.”

In addition to the usual responsibilities of a dean, I began my job with two special assignments. One was to raise the quality of the faculty of arts and sciences. The other was to lead the campus in the development of a new general education program.

I was aided in the first of these tasks by the fact that many of the least accomplished faculty members were approaching retirement age. Although retirement was not mandatory, the state had a generous pension plan, and faculty with 25 or more years of service received full medical coverage for life. I offered members of this cohort whose teaching was competent the opportunity of teaching part-time after retirement at the highest level of adjunct pay. I pointed out that their pensions plus two or three courses a year would equal their current pay. So even if they loved to teach, they would gain flexibility in their teaching schedule and a significant reduction in load without losing annual income. During my tenure as dean the School of Arts and Sciences hired over a hundred full-time faculty members, and I worked closely with departments to make sure that each person hired had a record of success as a teacher and scholar. Since the college was a “teaching institution,” it was essential that new faculty be caring and gifted teachers. But I also insisted that they be practicing professionals who could model for students what it meant to be a biologist or historian, a sculptor or cellist. Initially there was resistance from many quarters to this “teacher-scholar” paradigm, but gradually it became the standard for the institution.

I reinforced the “teacher-scholar” paradigm by insisting that it govern the standards for tenure and promotion. Until quite recently, tenure had been nearly automatic for all but the most conspicuously incompetent hires and those who had the misfortune to come up for tenure during the downsizing of the student body. I refused to approve for tenure anyone who could not demonstrate success in teaching, scholarship, and service. Promotion had for years been a function of seniority rather than performance. The likelihood of being promoted depended on one’s place in the queue. I insisted that promotion be based on merit and that no one be promoted to full professor without a significant record of publication or comparable accomplishment in the arts.

The reform of the general education program required a subtler approach, since it involved the campus as a whole. Earlier attempts to transform the general education program had been rejected by the faculty, even though there was widespread discontent with the 15-year old requirements then in place. Luckily, I found a talented partner in Robert Anderson, a member of the Sociology Department with a keen interest in general education and interdisciplinary studies. (Bob later became director of general education.) I formed a general education task force made up of faculty appointed by the deans of all five schools and two students elected by the Student Government Association. I chaired the committee. We met every week, and I asked that the first few weeks be spent on discussing what in our own undergraduate educations had been most effective and why. When we got to the point of discussing subject requirements, I asked that none of faculty on the task force advocate for requirements in their own academic areas. Thus, a mathematician could advocate for a language requirement but not a mathematics requirement.

I won’t go into all of the details of the program and the ways in which some of its components were piloted, but four of its features were especially noteworthy. First, it replaced one course in composition and two in public speaking with two integrated courses in rhetoric (writing, speaking, and reasoning). Second, it instituted college-wide requirements in foreign languages, mathematics, and laboratory science. Third, it required every student to take a course that involved gender studies. Fourth, it created a three-course core program for every student who entered the college as a freshman.

The core program consisted of a sequence of three courses taken by all students in each entering class. The courses were Humanities Ideas and Ideals, Society, Ethics, and Technology, and a world history course called Change in Societies. This program aimed at providing a common core of learning for all of our students. I asked department chairs to recommend members of their departments who were particularly effective lecturers and willing teach in the core program. I organized these individuals into course‑specific groups and asked them to develop a syllabus and anthology. (A descendant of the anthology that was developed for Society, Ethics, and Technology is now used nationwide.) I joined the group that developed Humanities: Ideas Ideals and taught in that course as a lecturer and discussion leader, so I could appreciate the challenges of faculty who were teaching in the program. Few of the participating faculty had ever collaborated with faculty from other departments on the creation of interdisciplinary coursework. Most found the experience exhilarating. After a little experimentation (and some weeding out), the lectures were dynamic, well-structured, and highly accessible.

By the middle of the second year of operation, we had at least one set of student evaluations for each of the three courses. The results were disappointing. Although some students gave high marks to the lectures, others did not. The means across the board were lower than those that participating faculty were accustomed to. The problem seemed to be one of form or venue rather than content. As one student explained the problem by saying that he was interested in what the lecturers had say, but that he tended to fall asleep when he listened to a lecture in an auditorium. The evaluation of discussion sections broke along different lines. Some discussion leaders received relatively high marks from nearly all their students, while others (especially those who were not lecturers) received mediocre marks from most of their students.

These evaluations made it more difficult to recruit full-time faculty and forced greater reliance on adjuncts. I met with the President of the college to discuss this staffing problem and suggested that we hire a small number of full-time faculty members whose sole responsibilities would be within the core program. Their teaching and research would be devoted to the strengthening of the three core courses and the development of strategies for building student and faculty support. I had already set a precedent by hiring an exuberant specialist with a Ph.D. in rhetoric from Berkeley to head the rhetoric program. The President was not interested. He suggested that I compel senior faculty in Arts and Sciences to relinquish upper-level courses in their disciplines and teach in the core program instead. I pointed out that those upper-level courses were indispensable to major programs and could not be staffed by adjuncts. He replied that Nobel Prize winners would be happy to come to the college and teach those courses without compensation. I thought he was joking and tried to move the conversation forward. But he was serious.

I could not in good conscience ask my senior faculty to relinquish the upper-level courses on which their majors depended. But Bob Anderson and I came up with a strategy for consolidating the history and humanities portion of the core program into a single course that could be taught without lectures sessions. We pulled together twenty faculty volunteers who were interested in developing a new core course. After twenty days of animated discussion we created Athens to New York. This course blended texts and topics chosen by individual instructors with five features that would be common to every section. The common features of each section were these. (1) It dealt with particular times and places; (2) It included a unit on ancient Athens and a unit on 20th century New York; (3) It included in its readings Plato’s *Apology* and Sophocles’ *Antigone*; (4) It included a unit on a Non‑Western or indigenous culture; (4) It dealt with issues of race, class, and gender; (5) It addressed the following the following questions: What does it mean to be human? What does it mean to be a member of a community? What does it mean to moral, ethical or just? How do individuals and communities respond to differences of race, class, gender and ethnicity?

Athens to New York was a compromise that some participating faculty found very congenial. It was a core course with plenty of room for individualization. Student responses to the course depended in large measure on who was teaching the section. Faculty members who were successful in their own areas of expertise tended to be successful in this interdisciplinary course. It also encouraged faculty from different departments to talk to one another about what they were doing in their respective sections. Nevertheless, there was grumbling from some faculty who found the required common elements too restrictive. Several of these professors argued for replacing Athens to New York with a first-year seminar on any topic of a faculty member’s choosing. By this time I was embroiled in arguments with the Vice President for Finance over space for faculty research laboratories in plans for the new science buildings and with the President over the appointment of a new Academic Vice President. I was on my way out as dean.
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