

## Facing Not So New Realities

*Todd C. Ream and John M. Braxton*

In *The Good of This Place: Values and Challenges in College Education* (Brodhead, 2004), Duke University President Richard H. Brodhead offers a collection of addresses communicating his undying belief in the extraordinary opportunities and contributions made by colleges and universities. For example, in an address titled “On Residential Education,” Brodhead extols the virtues of “living on” as “a chance to live as a member of a community; to have easy, daily contact with representatives of every part of the world; [and] the chance to learn how to live together, to enjoy together, and to work together to realize the best possibilities of associated life” (p. 100).

Brodhead’s argument is not unique. Even a casual review of the higher education literature confirms the host of developmental benefits afforded to students who “live on.” Brodhead’s collection is unique in the way it contrasts with a burgeoning body of literature announcing an apocalyptic era for higher education. Since the early-1970s, books on higher education for general audiences included terms in their titles such as end, last, crisis, collapse, death, and ruins. Such works have only grown in number since the 2008 recession. While some of these books eventually offer constructive suggestions, the bulk focus on the deplorable state in which the authors find America’s colleges and universities. Brodhead’s book, while not revolutionary in what it offers, is a refreshing departure from what is now a well-worn path of scathing criticism.

In many ways, colleges and universities brought these criticisms on themselves. A crisis of nerve initiated by the challenges these institutions faced during the late 1960s and early 1970s left even the current genera-

tion of institutional leaders with agendas long on questions and short on answers. For example, critics often decry that fragmentation abounds even in liberal arts colleges. Students are not only left with little opportunity to appreciate what their academic courses offer as a whole, but also what relationship their in-class and out-of-class experiences share. These problems only get worse as higher education institutions get larger, with research universities being charged as the most egregious offenders.

Thanks to his experience as chancellor of the State University of New York (SUNY), the United States commissioner of Education, and president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Ernest L. Boyer was perhaps more aware than any of his peers or successors of the challenges facing colleges and universities. For example, on becoming the SUNY Chancellor in 1970, Boyer inherited a host of concerns ranging from swelling bureaucracies to student unrest. The administrative decisions and the writings he left behind provided subsequent generations of administrators and faculty members with a wealth of wisdom. While Boyer's influence has found its way into a number of educational environments, to date no volume connects Boyer's wisdom to the current generation of crises besieging higher education. This volume seeks to fill that void. In what follows, we will set up the significance of the contributions that define this volume by first providing brief details concerning Boyer's life, his creative call for coherence, and the pervasive fragmentation he faced.

### The Life of Ernest L. Boyer

On September 13, 1928, Ernest Leroy Boyer was born to Clarence and Ethel Boyer of Dayton, Ohio. Ernest's older brother, William (Bill) served as dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Azusa Pacific University, and his younger brother, Paul, served on the faculty in the Department of History at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. Their father worked out of their basement running a mail order business providing books and office supplies. Their mother not only assisted their father, but also tended to the myriad of challenges that come with raising three boys.

The Boyer children grew up in a middle-class and ethnically diverse neighborhood in Dayton, and their family involvement in the Dayton Brethren in Christ Mission proved formative in many ways. The Brethren in Christ are a relatively small, Anabaptist group reflective of many of the theological commitments defining other comparable groups such

as the Amish, the Brethren, and the Mennonites. With pacifism, simple living, and acts of service being chief among these commitments, the headquarters for the Brethren in Christ is located just outside the main entrance to Messiah College in Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania. Like many of their fellow Anabaptists, the Brethren in Christ were often defined by an agrarian way of life.

Part of what makes the Dayton Brethren in Christ Mission (and Ernest Boyer's childhood) somewhat unique is that it represents a shift from this agrarian way of life to an engagement with the various groups populating a community such as Dayton. At the time, Dayton was home to a number of factories that came to define the industrialized North of the early twentieth century. Like many similar communities, Dayton became the recipient of a number of recent immigrants to the United States who came in search of work.

Realizing the need to reach out to this population, Ernest's paternal grandfather and grandmother, William and Susie Boyer, left the farmland of Ohio to serve in one of its emerging industrial centers. Located just outside the gates of the Platt Iron Works, the Dayton Mission was dedicated on April 7, 1912. William and Susie Boyer would lead this congregation for the next 35 years and remain active in it until their deaths some years later. Recalling his childhood in a speech he gave to members of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Ernest Boyer argued "the most important mentor in my life was my grandpa Boyer" (Boyer, 1997a, p. 111). In particular, what defined Boyer's memories of his grandfather was the fact that "Grandpa, at the age of 40, moved his little family into the slums of Dayton. He then spent the next 40 years running a city mission, working for the poor, teaching me more by deed than by word that to be truly human one must serve" (Boyer, 1997a, pp. 111–112).

As a young person growing up in a Brethren in Christ Church with aspirations for higher education, Ernest Boyer would then move to Grantham, Pennsylvania, where he attended Messiah College and met his future wife, Kathryn Garis Tyson. Given that Messiah was a two-year Bible college at the time, Boyer moved to Illinois to earn an undergraduate degree from Greenville College. Although Ernest would serve as a pastor of a Brethren in Christ congregation in Orlando for one year, he and Kay would move to California where Ernest would earn a doctoral degree in speech from the University of Southern California.

Part of the draw to move to California was also an opportunity Boyer had to serve as academic dean at a Brethren in Christ institution of higher learning, Upland College. Now closed, Upland gave Ernest Boyer

his first opportunity to serve as an academic administrator. Upland was a former Bible college struggling to find its way as a liberal arts college. Boyer arrived at Upland in the midst of this transition. In fact, Boyer was a member of a new class of administrators that President David Martin welcomed to help chart a path for Upland's future. Under Dean Boyer's guidance, Upland would receive provisional accreditation from the Western College Association in 1959. In *A Vision for Service: A History of Upland College*, E. Morris Sider argued, "It was without question the high point of the last period, perhaps of the entire history of the college" (Sider, 1976, p. 172).

While helping lead Upland toward accreditation, Boyer met a number of individuals in the larger higher education community. Perhaps one of the most influential of those individuals on Boyer's life proved to be Samuel B. Gould. As President of Antioch College, Gould developed a reputation for utilizing a variety of pedagogical means in an effort to increase access to higher education. After his appointment as the chancellor of the University of California–Santa Barbara, Gould invited Boyer to join his administrative team as director of the Center for Coordinated Education. When appointed the chancellor of the State University of New York, Gould once again invited Boyer to serve with him as his executive dean. Boyer held this post for five years and then succeeded Gould as chancellor.

One could argue Gould's interest in utilizing creative pedagogical means to increase access was one that resonated with Boyer given his upbringing in the Dayton Mission. When Boyer succeeded Gould as chancellor of the State University of New York, that influence became immediately apparent as Boyer quickly gained a reputation for innovation. Faced with leading the largest university system in the country, Boyer knew reform would prove difficult and perhaps not entirely necessary. As a result, "he chose to create a new SUNY college to offer alternatives to traditional education" (Bonnabeau, 1996, p. 16).

The crowning achievement in this effort came to be known as Empire State College. Although the seeds of this institution were planted during Gould's tenure as Chancellor, Empire State was established within the first year of Boyer's tenure on April 1, 1971. In addition to funding New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller provided, the Carnegie Foundation and the Ford Foundation each gave \$500,000 to help support this new initiative. James Hall would become president and Arthur Chickering was appointed academic vice president. Hall, then 33, had emerged as someone who appreciated the unique dimensions of the Empire State experience. Chickering had served at Goddard College and was part of

that institution's efforts to launch the nation's first program designed for working adults.

Boyer, Hall, and Chickering came together to offer a vision and a plan for an institution that would emphasize practical experience, learning outcomes, and personal mentoring as its definitive qualities. Instead of having a traditional campus with a specific geographical location, Empire State would be comprised of a host of regional learning centers spread across the state of New York. These centers were designed to reach out to students who otherwise did not have access to more geographically specific institutions. In his history of Empire State, Richard F. Bonnabeau indicates, "The number of inquiries from prospective students the first year of the college's existence was like a tidal wave. From September 1971 to June 1972, the Admissions Office received approximately seven thousand requests for information" (Bonnabeau, 1996, p. 44). While several other comparable experiments failed, Empire State has continued to expand and now seeks to offer each student a "unique, blended-learning experience, which, depending on the specific program, may include online courses, independent faculty-guided study, participation in small study groups or short-term residencies" (Empire State College, 2012).

Boyer's success with initiatives such as Empire State College and his growing reputation in Washington, DC, through the service he provided to commissions appointed during the Nixon and Ford administrations, led President Jimmy Carter to appoint Boyer as the United States Commissioner of Education in 1977. While Boyer appreciated the challenges he faced while serving in that role, his innovative spirit clashed with the expansive bureaucracies and politicized personalities he encountered in Washington.

If the time Boyer spent in Washington, DC was arguably the low point of his career, the time he spent in Princeton, New Jersey as president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching was arguably the high point. Assuming that position in 1979 and holding it until he succumbed to a three-year battle with cancer in 1995, Boyer worked to cultivate an understanding of the traditional role of the Foundation by exploring the challenges and opportunities facing institutions of higher learning. Over time and due to his commitment to viewing education as a lifelong process, the Carnegie Foundation also expanded its focus to include both kindergarten through senior-high education and preschool education. While this book will focus on Boyer's contributions to higher education, a review of the reports produced by the Carnegie Foundation during his time as president quickly reveals an underlying focus

on utilizing innovative pedagogical means to bring otherwise disparate dimensions of society together.

### A Creative Call for Coherence

While Boyer's commitment to utilizing innovative means to bring together otherwise disparate elements of society reflects Sam Gould's imprint on his life, it also reflects the imprint of his paternal grandfather, William Boyer. Without the early influence of his grandfather in his life, Boyer may not have fully appreciated how Gould was trying to shape higher education. He may not have recognized how an institution, such as a college or university, could serve as an agent for coherence in a manner comparable to the way his grandfather led the mission church. In the end, this creative call for coherence is what arguably defines Boyer's legacy and the nature of the hope he envisioned for higher education.

Returning to his days as a boy in the Dayton Mission, Boyer experienced a setting where otherwise disparate segments of society came together. In his grandparents, Boyer witnessed two people who gave up the comfort and familiarity of their previous lives to follow their calling to serve people who were otherwise ignored. Instead of establishing a traditional church unit, his grandparents initially established the mission church in a rental home "on the corner of Herman Avenue and Taylor Street, in the midst of a working class neighborhood of modest frame or brick houses crowded onto small lots" (Boyer, 1987, p. 56). Previously, the Brethren in Christ had predominantly reflected the ethnic ties of their German parents. In Dayton, the Boyers encountered a diverse array of recent immigrant groups now populating the industrial core of the city.

In his history of the Dayton mission, Paul Boyer notes that his grandfather's accounts of the life he shared with his congregants included "many sympathetic and moving accounts of individual victims of poverty, epidemic disease, alcoholism, industrial accidents, child neglect, and family disruption" (Boyer, 1987, p. 75). As previously noted, young Ernest's experiences with his grandfather in these contexts would leave a lasting impact on him that he often publically referenced.

While the focus of this book is limited to Boyer's hopeful vision for higher education, Boyer did not limit this vision to postsecondary institutions. He wove this innovative call for coherence into his work on preschool-age education, elementary schools, and senior high schools. While an important part of his call for coherence involved attempts to

provide access to higher education to groups otherwise neglected, that commitment proved to be part of a larger understanding that included aspirations for both curricular and structural coherence. In relation to that first commitment, Boyer went so far as to argue in *Ready to Learn: A Mandate for the Nation* that preschool education centers should be integrated into care centers for senior citizens. Concerned about how the fragmented nature of our society limits the interaction of its members to individuals within particular age groups, Boyer was convinced that all citizens, regardless of age, suffer. When talking about a society's youngest and oldest citizens, Boyer argued, "Without children and old people mixing in daily life, a community has no future and no past, only a continuous present" (1991b, p. 110). In order to rectify this problem, Boyer envisioned a host of initiatives, including intergenerational care centers where preschool-aged children and senior citizens could benefit in a number of ways from sharing in a common community.

Not only does Boyer want to see more senior citizens incorporated into the structure of schools, he also wants to see greater coherence in terms of how educational organizations are structured. For example, part of his underlying concern is that in many elementary schools, the structure only allows for horizontal interaction with colleagues at each grade level. While third-grade teachers may talk with third-grade teachers, they rarely talk with fourth-grade teachers. As a result, Boyer proposed in *The Basic School: A Community for Learning* that teachers also be organized into what one elementary school referred to as learning families or units "made up of teachers from kindergarten through grade five" (1995, p. 39). The result of these groups was that "Grade levels became blurred; lessons units were planned for coherence through all grades" (1995, p. 39).

To Boyer, fragmentation was not simply a phenomenon plaguing the way educational organizations are structured but also the way those organizations present ideas. In *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America*, Boyer challenged the distinctions often perceived to be separating the elements of a core curriculum. In particular, Boyer argued, "we must bring a new interdisciplinary vision into the classroom and the total program of the school. The content of the core curriculum must extend beyond the specialties to touch larger, more transcendent issues" (p. 115).

While Boyer's hopeful call for coherence defined his efforts in higher education, this commitment runs deeper. It defined not only how he saw college life but also education across the life span. While Sam Gould introduced Boyer to various innovative ways to bring together the otherwise disparate threads defining academe, Boyer's compulsion to see the good

of such efforts stems from his days as a young boy growing up in the Dayton mission. His grandfather's willingness to bring together the poor, the oppressed, and otherwise socially marginalized arguably inspired Ernest to combat the educational community's propensity for fragmentation.

### The Pervasiveness of Fragmentation

To be perfectly clear, few if any administrators, faculty members, or even policy makers would argue this propensity for fragmentation served the educational community well. When pressed, most individuals would argue against fragmentation but most of these individuals also lacked the hope needed to see beyond its relative pervasiveness. Within higher education alone, the 1950s and 1960s represented a period of considerable growth. Facing both the changing needs of a domestic labor market and the emergence of the so-called baby boomer generation, colleges and universities were bursting at the seams. In order to respond, both federal and state levels of government needed to be involved. For the federal government, much of this investment came in the form of financial aid for students. For state governments, a considerable part came in the development of completely new college campuses particularly in places with exploding populations such as Florida and California. The result of these efforts quickly became evident when, for the first time in the history of American higher education, more students were served by public institutions than private institutions—a ratio that has only grown larger with time's passing.

One of the downfalls of the effort to keep pace with this explosive growth was the emergence of multiple forms of fragmentation. For example, California, as previously mentioned, was one of the sites of this explosive growth. As a result, the opportunities provided at places such as the University of California—Berkeley and —Los Angeles proved insufficient. The University of California system then added full-scale campuses in San Diego, Irvine, Riverside, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, and Davis. In addition, the Cal State system was formally established, bringing together some publically supported institutions with longer histories such as Fresno and San Diego and newly established campuses such as Fullerton and Northridge.

The renowned architect of the University of California system was its chancellor, Clark Kerr. In *Portraits of Leadership: Six Extraordinary University Presidents*, Arthur Padilla referred to Kerr as being responsible for California's Master Plan for Education—an effort which also landed Kerr on the October 17, 1960, cover of *Time* (Padilla, 2005). However, while



delivering the Godkin Lectures at Harvard University in April 1963, Kerr referred to the modern university as an entity more aptly named a multiversity. Kerr did not necessarily see this transition as a constructive one, simply the reality of a new era. When coming to terms with this transition, Kerr explained, “The university is so many different things to so many different people that it must, of necessity, be partially at war with itself” (1995, p. 7). When reflecting on the origins of the multiversity, Kerr contended, “No man created it; in fact, no man visualized it. It has been a long time coming about and it has a long way to go” (1995, p. 7).

To read the Godkin Lectures is to come into contact with someone with mixed feelings about the fragmentation definitive of the multiversity. On one level, Kerr seems enamored with the organizational realities of a university system such as the University of California. Adding some historical context in *A Brief History of the University of California*, Patricia Pelfrey offered “The fragmentation of the university into the many-purposed multiversity served the needs of a postwar society in which knowledge was growing exponentially and becoming a vital economic commodity” (2004, p. 40).

On another level, the stark manner in which he describes this reality echoes some remorse. For example, he describes the undergraduate experience as one where, at best, only the strongest will thrive and perhaps, at worst, survive. The average student now has to navigate a massive bureaucracy with a host of challenges and with little to no safety net. He would go so far as to even offer that “The casualty rate is high. The walking wounded are many” (Kerr, 1995, p. 14). In volume one of his memoir *The Blue and the Gold*, Kerr acknowledges these mixed feelings in claiming “that just as I was describing the rise of the multiversity in my Godkin Lectures at Harvard (1963), and, to a degree, celebrating it, I was plotting . . . a counterrevolution at Santa Cruz [a University of California campus defined by a host of unique educational experiences and perhaps most notably a series of residential colleges]” (2001, p. 262).

Perhaps Kerr’s sentiments are reflective of the larger culture of leadership in American higher education at that time. The multiversity and its perpetual fragmentation are not realities to celebrate wholeheartedly, but neither are systemic responses immediately accessible. Kerr is to be commended for doing more than a number of his contemporaries through the establishment of a University of California campus such as Santa Cruz. However, the absence of a pervasive form of hope held him back from fully challenging forces he perceived inevitable. At this juncture,

the hopeful nature of Ernest L. Boyer, as expressed through his relentless desire for coherence, proves to be a radical departure.

### Significance of this Volume

Most of Boyer's publically accessible works are in the previously mentioned reports published by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching during his time as President. For example, in *Creating Campus Community: In Search of Ernest Boyer's Legacy* (2002) William M. McDonald and associates review the impact Boyer's reports had on how educators now design both curricular and cocurricular learning communities. In a comparable sense, John M. Braxton, William Luckey, and Patricia Helland's *Institutionalizing a Broader View of Scholarship Through Boyer's Four Domains* (2002) considers the impact of the ideas Boyer offered in *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (1990c).

However, until recently a considerable number of Boyer's ideas remained inaccessible to the general public. Initially, Boyer's unpublished papers were housed in Princeton, NJ, under the care of the Carnegie Foundation. In the late 1990s, those materials (primarily comprised of a large number of speeches and letters) were transferred to Messiah College. Over the course of the last couple of years, officials at Messiah labored to make those items available to the public via a digitized archive system.

The completion of this process will prove to be of considerable benefit to a number of groups. As previously mentioned, Boyer's publically accessible ideas are generally found in reports published during his years at Carnegie. In many ways, individuals familiar with those reports will notice that the seeds of what came to fruition in those works are present in many of the selections found in this book. In addition, beyond the previously mentioned secondary sources by William M. McDonald and his associates along with John M. Braxton, William Luckey, and Patricia Helland, only a few other similar books exist. The most prominent examples are Kerry Ann O'Meara and R. Eugene Rice's *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered: Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship* (2005) and Charles E. Glassick, Mary Taylor Huber, and Gene I. Maeroff's *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate* (1997). Surprisingly, no full-length biography considers Boyer's legacy. As a result, this book is designed to provide answers to questions perceived to be plaguing the academe while reintroducing the thought of one of the most prominent leaders in the history of American higher education.

## Limitations of this Volume

Unfortunately, no singular volume can capture the breadth of Boyer's influence, the times in which he lived, and a full portrayal of the challenges currently facing higher education. In order to try and make sure this edited volume has a specific focus and delivers on that focus, it also harbors at least two limitations. First, this volume does not pretend to offer an evaluation of Boyer's ideas. In contrast, the contributors simply try to limit the scope of their efforts to the best of their abilities to matching to the current challenges to reflections offered by Boyer. Part of our hope is that further work will begin to offer more detailed evaluations of Boyer's ideas, how they impacted higher education, and ways they might still be impacting it.

Second, when making the selections from Boyer's writings, the contributors each needed to make some modest and charitable judgment calls related to what they found in the online archives. Boyer was notorious for rewriting speeches up to the last minute. As a result, what you will see in this volume in terms of a clean manuscript does not immediately reflect what he left for us to consider. For example, the original draft of his speech was often typed but then he would often spend a considerable amount of time making revisions. Many of his speeches are thus replete with insertions, deletions, and other notations. The contributors had to thus draw on their expertise to decipher what Boyer actually uttered on that occasion. Each contributor also includes details in his or her introduction pertaining to that process and footnotes when pertaining to changes they made from the version found in the online archives. As a result, what you will find in these pages is the product of those efforts.

## Audience

Four particular audiences will hopefully find this work to be of considerable interest. First, this book is designed to meet the needs of scholars considering the history of the state of New York. In addition to his national and international reputation, Boyer is arguably the most well-known chancellor of the SUNY system. Part of his legacy is defined by the fact that he faced an onslaught of problems during the early 1970s—problems that are arguably similar to the ones facing colleges and universities today. Unfortunately, many of the challenges he faced have gone undocumented as a result of the absence of such a volume as well as the absence of a biography that considers his life. This volume thus gives

students of New York history a deeper appreciation for Boyer's legacy, the challenges the SUNY system faced during his time as chancellor, and the similarities shared by those challenges and the ones facing higher education today.

Second, this book is designed to help expand the base of scholarship in higher education. Boyer's thought was highly influential, yet there is still a shortage of primary and secondary sources, as previously noted. Higher education scholars are quick to cite Boyer as a leading authority but no effort has been made to review his work systematically, much less his unpublished work. This book seeks to provide higher education scholars with a systematic introduction to Boyer's work in a manner that connects it with many of the challenges they are currently exploring.

Third, college and university administrators will also benefit from the resources found in this book. One can argue that Boyer's influence is greater on higher education administrators than on higher education scholars. The sheer number of residence life programs and plans for faculty promotion (naming only two) that reflect Boyer's ideals evidence this fact. This volume will not only provide administrators with a systematic reference guide to the crises plaguing their schools but also introduce them to Boyer's previously unpublished writings.

Finally, policy makers are arguably weighing in more on the fate of higher education than ever before. Cries for greater accountability were raining down from governor's mansions, state legislatures, and Congress even prior to the economic recession, which began in the fall of 2008. Constrained budgets have only added to the pitch and frequency of those cries. At times, such concerns reflect challenges that require attention. At other times, they reflect an ill-informed and reactionary impulse posed by the tyranny of the urgent. As a result, this book seeks to provide policy makers with a systematic introduction to these crises while also giving them an introduction to Boyer's hopeful, yet practically grounded ideas.

### *Chapters*

This edited volume systematically matches selections from Boyer's writings found in the archive housed at Messiah College to the literature concerning the current set of crises besieging higher education. As a result, each chapter opens with an introduction to the state of a particular crisis by a noted higher education scholar with research interests in that area. Beyond the literature in the subfield of higher education, these scholars consider the arguments made in recent books (written in the last five

years) designed for lay audiences. Such books include: Frank Donoghue's *The Last Professors: The Corporate University and the Fate of the Humanities* (2008); Andrew Delbanco's *College: What It Was, Is, and Should Be* (2012); Richard A. DeMillo's *Abelard to Apple: The Fate of American Colleges and Universities* (2011); Stanley Fish's *Save the World on Your Own Time* (2008); Benjamin Ginsberg's *The Fall of the Faculty: The Rise of the All-Administrative University and Why It Matters* (2011); Anthony T. Kronman's *Education's End: Why Our Colleges and Universities Have Given Up on the Meaning of Life* (2007); Harry R. Lewis's *Excellence Without a Soul* (2006); and Mark C. Taylor's *Crisis on Campus: A Bold Plan for Reforming Our Colleges and Universities* (2010).

Following the introduction offered in relation to that particular crisis, the same scholar then provides a battery of Boyer's unpublished writings that best respond to the crisis in question. Those selections were made in relation to three criteria: (1) In what way do they best respond to the crisis in question? (2) In what way do they best represent the development of Boyer's thought? and (3) In what way do the selections best transition from one to the next?



A summary of what each chapter explores follows. Chapter 1, "The Financial Crisis" by John S. Cheslock: Prior to the 2008 recession, the costs associated with higher education were a major concern to almost all stakeholders. For example, legislators were concerned about whether the investment they were making in their respective public universities was worth the costs to their states. Students and parents were concerned about whether they could continue to afford an education at the rate costs such as tuition, room, and board were increasing. The recession has only compounded these concerns as the endowments that often helped support institutions of higher learning dropped in assessed value. These kinds of questions, however, are not unique to the current era. As Chancellor of the SUNY system and then as commissioner of Education, Boyer oversaw budgets buffeted by the competing interests of declining dollars and increasing demands. In the end, his answers not only included making serious determinations about the value of higher education but also creative ways to reallocate available resources.

Chapter 2, "General Education and the Quest for Purpose" by Cynthia A. Wells: The emergence of the "multiversity" brought with it a level of specialization previously unseen in higher education. Professors were

now trained and hired to teach subdisciplines and rewarded for publications that reflected a focused yet narrow understanding of knowledge. At the same time, the late 1960s and early 1970s witnessed challenges to perceived canons of knowledge previously thought to deserve necessary appreciation by all educated students. As a result, Boyer lived in an era when general education became a battleground between competing forms of specialization and identity. In the face of these pressures, he sought to find ways to bring scholars and their students together around common areas worthy of exploration.

Chapter 3, “Leading Academe” by David S. Guthrie: The advent of the “multiversity” also witnessed an era of specialization both for its faculty and administrators. Previously, administrators were faculty members perceived to have a certain set of diplomatic abilities and an imperial intellect that could appreciate the complexities of the emerging disciplines. However, the pressures for specialization eventually yielded a new class of professional administrators who often had little to no experience as teachers and scholars. In the SUNY system, Boyer faced these pressures in acute ways as he led what, at the time, was the country’s largest system of institutions of higher learning. He responded by finding creative ways to draw both administrators and faculty members together around common areas of concern deemed critical to the mission of the institutions they were collectively charged with leading.

Chapter 4, “(Re)Defining Scholarship” by Claire Howell Major: The defining elements of the academic vocation in recent years typically include activities such as teaching, scholarship, and service. As the research university continued to grow in the influence it exerted over other types of institutions such as comprehensive universities and liberal arts colleges, scholarship became more vested in terms of original research—the reporting of facts otherwise previously unrecognized by fellow experts. As this inclination progressed, elements of the academic vocation such as teaching and service came to be perceived (however correctly or incorrectly) to be of decreasing value. In addition, the pressure to generate original research results pushed scholars deeper into relatively isolated subspecialties. Critics of the university have subsequently charged that what is now often deemed scholarship is of little use or even interest to the larger academic community much less the wider public. Boyer recognized these growing pressures during his time at Carnegie and proposed that scholarship was not simply vested in what he labeled as the scholarship of discovery but also in the scholarship of integration, application, and teaching.

Chapter 5, “Crisis in Student Community” by Robert D. Reason, Ezekiel W. Kimball, and Jessica Bennett: The advent of the “multiversity” was not simply embodied by a seemingly ever-expansive array of disciplines and subdisciplines. In addition, the sense of community defining institutions of higher learning was also beginning to fray. By virtue of their growing size and increasingly diverse constituents, campuses were no longer singular communities, but umbrella organizations with a growing array of subcommunities. Students who failed to find their way into one of these subcommunities were beginning to fall “between the cracks.” Facing these challenges head on, Boyer proposed an array of curricular and cocurricular responses with perhaps one of his greatest contributions being his ideas concerning how these two arenas of the student experience could be integrated with one another.

Chapter 6, “Access to College Is About Equality of Opportunity” by Vasti Torres: For generations, higher education in the United States was perceived to be accessible only to the social and financial elites in American society. These perceptions began to change following World War II as the federal government sought ways to help veterans earn an education deemed necessary for a growing nation. The late 1960s and early 1970s saw an increasing wave of demands for access to higher education by members of historically underrepresented groups such as women and ethnic minorities. As a result, a variety of issues needed to be reconsidered ranging from the costs associated with a college degree to the nature of learning environments. Boyer was at the forefront of making college accessible to all students desiring to receive an education. As witnessed by his efforts with initiatives such as Empire State College, he challenged his contemporaries to rethink how higher education was delivered. This legacy of creativity is one that continues to bear results today.

Chapter 7, “Which Public to Serve” by Kelly Ward: Originally, most colleges and universities in the United States were established to meet the needs of the church by educating future generations of clergy and laypersons. Toward the end of the 1800s, this commitment shifted to the education of persons trained to serve the interests of the nation-state. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, that commitment began to change again, as students were left with the impression that institutions of higher education existed to help them prepare for their own professional futures. While Boyer saw value in helping prepare students for their own careers, he also believed these efforts were to be ones made in relation to the service of a larger public. Institutions of higher learning (and the students

they were called to educate) were to contribute, each in their own way, to the well-being of a global society.

*A Final Introductory Thought*

While no single volume can capture the optimistic spirit of Ernest Boyer and his vision for greater coherence in higher education, this volume seeks to begin, at least, what will hopefully prove to be a successive wave of important conversations. The digitization of the Boyer Archives at Messiah College make Boyer's work immediately accessible to any number of individuals around the world at any time. In many ways, the manner in which this material is now accessible is reflective of much of Boyer's spirit. Our hope is that what we offer in the following pages gives you a taste of what may come if you choose to access the archives on your own. No doubt, the contemporary challenges facing higher education are large in number. In Ernest L. Boyer and the legacy he left behind, resides a blueprint for hopeful responses available for anyone to take up and implement in his or her own unique way.