

CT/d Dialogue I: Why the University Today?

February 7, 2023, GIDEST Lab, The New School

Cathy Davidson Senior advisor on Transformation to the Chancellor of the City University of New York and Distinguished Professor of English at the Graduate Center, CUNY; Founding Director of the Futures Initiative.

Wendy Brown UPS Foundation Chair in the School of Social Science at the Institute of Advanced Study, Princeton

Christoph Cox (moderator) Dean of Eugene Lang College, The New School

Cathy Davidson: Well, first, thanks everyone for being here. We were just talking about how hard it is to show up for anything these days, just physically it's hard. We're having to learn this all over again. I'm going to do a PowerPoint presentation. I'm going to go very quickly through some things. I just wanted people to be able to see all of the inheritance that have landed us into the world we're in right now in terms of higher education, so I'll talk about that briefly. But I really want to focus on the last five things, which are five things that I think we need to do and should do to change. Some of which have to do with changing ourselves. It's much easier to talk about institutions than to think about changing ourselves and our role in those institutions.

Since this is a slide presentation, please go to

<https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1UvI2fEVUzC8OBTWEgMIH8qgBtJHvJxu0WahjWKunjlw/edit?usp=sharing>.

This is my formal land acknowledgement [Slide 2]. Informally: I'll simply add that my late brother-in-law, Roy Cunningham, a Metis activist and professor, taught me how to read the land and one day I was walking down Broadway and I thought, "Darn! This must be the old Lenape Trail." And it is. One can always tell because the ancient Indigenous trails run according to the landscape and not according to grids. I love walking down Broadway and thinking that this was the most traveled byway in this part of the world. The three books, Indigenous books that I also want to acknowledge as formative to my thinking in this talk, and that have had a profound impact on how I try to teach, direct my center, and work towards institutional change are Sandy Grande's *Red Pedagogy*, Robin Wall Kimmerer's lovely book, *Braiding Sweetgrass*, and Max Liboiron's *Pollution is Colonialism*. It's a brilliant book especially for designers, social justice designers, as it looks at the details of how you create a lab using Indigenous principles. It's very interesting. And then I also want to recommend the work of the Native Governance Center. They're a wonderful organization and if you're looking at land acknowledgements or anything else, I highly recommend checking out the [Native Governance Center](#) and by all means contribute to them. It's run by Indigenous peoples and invaluable.

[Slide 4] Bell Hooks: "To be truly visionary, we have to root our imagination in our concrete reality while simultaneously imagining possibilities beyond that reality."

[Slide 5]: This is my own adage: We cannot change structural inequality with goodwill. We must design new structures with equality at the core. Right? Think about what the academy would look like if we had

believed our own critical race theory for the last 50 years and restructured higher ed accordingly. *We must design new structures with equality at the core.* And that's what I'm going to be talking about today—our legacy of an infrastructure of inequality.

[Slide 7]: The great project in the 19th century: how do you turn farmers into factory workers? Farmers make decisions all the time. Factory workers aren't allowed to make decisions. Mandatory public education. You don't have to read Marx very thoroughly to know about public education, its relationship to the workhouse. However, higher education has a different job, which is to train the people who do the assembly line work. How do you make shopkeepers into the professional managerial class?

[Slide 8]: Infrastructure of the Industrial-Educational Complex (1860-1925). The single most powerful person behind this movement is Charles Eliot, who, at age 40, becomes president of Harvard and stays president of Harvard for 40 years. He and his cohort create the modern American university. It's a little different in Europe, this is specifically about America. Some of the things that are happening in the world: eugenics, statistics, bell curves, standard deviation, assembly line, punch clocks, mass production, standardization, production, efficiency quotas. Eventually, Eliot is working with Frederick Winslow Taylor himself to make the infrastructure of the modern university.

We talk about the “Taylor-ized university.” That’s not a metaphor but a literal influence and even a partnership. Mandatory public secondary school and K-12, curriculum requirements, research universities, public universities, land grant universities. You can see how hierarchy and inequality play out in terms of the eugenic understanding of who deserves to be a manager, who deserves to go to university. Class status is intrinsically part of the legacy of how we're making our institutions. Historically black colleges and universities. Junior colleges. And then the whole new apparatus of standardization and outputs: majors, minors, electives, divisions, certification, graduate school, collegiate law school, nursing school, graduate school of education, collegiate business school, mandated contact hours, degree requirements, Carnegie credit hours, grades, IQ tests, giftedness, learning disabilities, multiple choice tests, college entrance exams, SATs fully established by 1925, tenure, sabbaticals, faculty pensions, peer review, school rankings, donor name shares, corporate sponsorship of research, and thesis defenses. These distinctions are being designed from around 1870 and are fully instantiated by 1925. 1925 and I don't have to explain a single one. Right?

This is our life. These are the divisions of our life, and they're created specifically in answer to the question that a friend posed to Eliot and that he answers in an influential 1869 essay called, “The New Education.” *How do I prepare my boy?* At that time, Harvard is preparing ministers. 10-15% of the students are actually becoming ministers. So Eliot’s friend wants to know how to prepare his son, who wants to be neither a minister nor a college professor. Harvard is transformed by Eliot and his cohort into a university for the industrial age. Morris Cooke, an industrialist from Pennsylvania who, with Frederick Winslow Taylor’s guidance, invents the Carnegie Credit Hour. Amazing. And all of these other features that now guide our institutions. These are frankly weird things—unless seen within the context of the Model T and the assembly line, standardization with a baseline of eugenics. Eliot even chairs the famous Committee of 10 that decides curriculum requirements for secondary schools. Charles Eliot also invents the first institution for accrediting higher education—and becomes its first president.

There are so many other legacies embedded in the infrastructure he and his colleagues devised. Consider the first Graduate School of Education. It's at Harvard. It will not admit future college professors. It's only for K-12 teachers. And explicitly so. Eliot is adamant that K-12 teachers need to improve their pedagogy but college professors should not be learning how to teach. They should be learning to carry their mentor's research forward.

[Slide 9]: These are the infrastructures of thought, of prestige, of structure that we've inherited, and all are reinforced by the professionalization of the professorate. Almost all of our professional associations are being formed at the same time as the modern American university is being designed. So we have a completely self-policing, self-referential iteration of those structures, Taylorist structures, not only in the structures that make our universities, but in the structures that make the reward systems and the pleasures and the joys and set the problems of what our lives are, as academics, today.

It's fascinating to me. At the same time, there's a whole apparatus of learning. I'm not going to go into grades, although I will note that Mount Holyoke is the first place that invents A, B, C, D, F grading. They decide not to have an "E" in their "scientific" new grading system because someone might be confused and think it means "excellent" instead of "failure." You suddenly have the only referential grade becoming F for failure. A, B, C, D don't mean anything. And then, within a year, you have psychologists (itself a relatively new and professionalizing field) engaged in studying "failure" and who is or is not prone to be a failure. (As an aside: the American Meat Packers Association becomes the second association after Mount Holyoke that adopts A, B, C, D grading. However, to this day, you can still find the metadata, including discursive comment, with any A, B, C, D grade awarded by the American Meat Packers who felt you should not reduce something as complex as sirloin and chuck to a single letter grade. This is not true in higher education.)

[Slide 11]: Next, higher ed today. So everyone's worrying right now about ChatGPT, I think it's hilarious! We should have been freaked out on April 22nd, 1993, when, for the first time in history, two profs at the University of Illinois, Dan Reed and Larry Smarr, from the National Center for Supercomputing Applications, come out and give to the world this amazing gift: the Mosaic 1.0 browser. So anyone who has an internet connection can connect to anyone else in the world without any of those credentials we saw two slides ago. No editor, no degree, no authority, no requirement for truth and with information suddenly abundant, right there, on our computer screen. That should have changed the infrastructure of industrial-age, output-oriented, assembly line-inspired higher education. That should have changed how we think about all the delivery systems of higher education—pedagogy, research, grades. It seemingly requires ChatGPT to make academics understand the mismatch between higher education and the world our students inhabit. Ironically, it's the potential for plagiarism that finally makes us pay attention to our outmoded and highly inequitable systems.

(Another aside: I'm sad I'm not teaching now. I'd love to have a class of students design a research project and then each independently offer ChatGPT a prompt and then compare the results to try to understand what words trigger which kinds of information gathering.)

[Slide 12]: My friend, Gail Mellow, who is the retired president of LaGuardia Community College, says: "How do we teach the top 100% in a system which is designed for the 0.4% at the Ivy Leagues?" Most books on education, most theories of education, apply to the Ivy League's 0.4%. This [see demographics

on Slide 12] is the world of our students today. How do we teach these students? Think even about the racial implications here. 45% of our college students in the US today are students of color, 16% of our faculty are. Who's mentoring all those students? Whose labor is helping all of those students navigate institutions structurally designed by professional champions of white supremacy? (Eliot, it should be noted, retired from his presidency at Harvard to become vice president of the First International Eugenics Congress.) How do we count the unequally distributed labor of “diversity and equity”?

[Slide 13]: The other issue that's facing all of us today is the so-called demographic cliff. I was just consulting for a week in Puerto Rico.. They've lost half their college student body, half in 10 years, because of the financial crisis, the earthquake, the hurricane, the pandemic... half their students. Plus colonialism. Right? So anything we're facing here is so much more graphic there. Worldwide, we have to be thinking what does it mean if the college age population shrinks? What does it mean if we want to expand who goes to college? What if we have to take seriously the charge to prepare students for their future—not for some future designed for the Harvard student of 1869?

Five ways. I want to end by highlighting five areas where I believe we, as academics, need to be focusing our attention and thinking very seriously if we want to redesign higher education with equality at the core, if we want to redesign higher education for our students' futures not for our past.

[Slide 15]: One, I don't think anything is going to change significantly in higher education until we change the faculty reward system. The current system that we have and the one we've inherited from the era of Charles Eliot is very clear about its values. Research is, in effect, all that really matters. Teaching not so much, service almost nonexistent in the value and reward system of higher education. I mean, how well does our society teach service workers? (Again, inequality is at the core of our inherited institutional structures.) What does it mean when institutional service is ignored, demeaned, and discredited? It almost always becomes, disproportionately, the work of women and people of color. We've got lots of stats and research on this. But it also means that those people who survive and thrive within the realm of institutional service and who become administrators are already in a different world of credit and recognition than the one that counts for tenure and promotion. I believe now only about 20% of the professorate is tenured. Is that correct? What does that mean in terms of equity and equality?

Wendy Brown: A 30% tenure track.

Cathy Davidson: I knew you'd know. Thank you.

Wendy Brown: But just to make your point, 70% of the teaching in the country happens outside of tenure.

Cathy Davidson: Outside. Yes. And yet the reward system still is so heavily based on that. Thank you. [Here's the recent AAUP study on tenure: <https://www.insightintodiversity.com/aaup-releases-first-study-on-tenure-since-2004-revealing-major-changes-in-faculty-career-tracks/>]

I would love it if we could have a different kind of reward system if we're going to teach the top 100%, not the 0.4%, but the top 100%. We also have to think about a different system of credit and reward for faculty because we're sadly all very smart people. That sometimes gets in our way: why should we do something for a system that's not going to reward us? Why should we do certain forms of labor in a

system that's going to hurt us? So I have been talking to several universities about what it would look like if we rewarded research, teaching, not service, but institutional leadership or institutional contribution. I mean, if you're on the hiring committee or the admissions committee or on the curriculum committee, that's leadership. That's hard.

I mean, in management terms, that is an extremely difficult thing to do. Even more so in those departments that are fully tenured, where no one can be fired, it's not easy to instigate institutional transformation. Right? It's a very real challenge. It's a real challenge to think about, we've all been in departments. How do you move a department?

And then I'd add a fourth component to our faculty rewards and recognition system: public impact. I think universities have to do more public outreach and public impact. And that has to be rewarded because that's not part of the peer review system that we're rewarded in. It's almost invisible in the peer review system that was structured by Charles Eliot as part of a different way of both creating a new kind of education and limiting who's going to be having access to that and who teaches in it and who thrives in it.

[Slide 16]: Two, eliminate the diversity tax and create equitable admission and support systems for students and faculty. You can't have 16% of the faculty in the role of mentoring the students who are now a majority minority in many institutions, but certainly not a majority in terms of credit and prestige. There has to be some recognition that faculty of color are doing too much of the unrecognized, unrewarded work. We've got the research on this too, that faculty of color are doing more than their share in terms of mentoring students and mentoring each other to get through the system. There has to be change, otherwise it's just exploitation.

If you have representation at the end of an inequitable system, but not systemically throughout that system, it's not "equity and inclusion" but further exploitation. In data world, the cliché is "garbage in, garbage out." Meaning you only achieve at the end of any data search the quality that you build into the data inputs. Inequality too. Unless it's equality at the beginning, it's not equality at the end. You can't do a reparation at the end simply by representation.

[Slide 17]: Three, reevaluate seat time as the metric for measuring competence. And I actually don't know if The New School does this. More schools are breaking free from the Carnegie Credit Hour as the measure of knowledge. Many are changing the credit hour as intellectual currency. However, it's hard because it means working against the rules and structures of accreditation that count those things—and certify our institutions as "worthy" for accreditation.

[Slide 18] Four, engage in serious faculty training in effective, equitable active pedagogy. I had the delight and honor to share the stage with Carl Wieman at one of the Nobel Prize Committee *Future of Learning* conferences. Wieman won the Nobel Prize in Physics in 2011. And he's a passionate advocate for changing the way we teach. He argues (in *Improving How Universities Teach Science*) that we're teaching American students how to hate science and how to be bad scientists. As he says, "It's not even empirical anymore." In the 2014 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* meta-study of 240 separate studies of learning the authors end by saying: If this had been a pharmaceutical study,

traditional learning would be taken off the market. Lecturing is an ineffective way to learn. Most discussion classes are little better—they are more or less “distributed lecture” and also build in inequality. The typical A+ student (those metaphorical three students who raise their hand in answer to all the questions) are statistically most likely to mirror the demographics of their professor. It’s a system of self-replication.

[Slide 19]: Five, do what we say we do in our mission statements. I love to do an exercise where I have professors take out their mission statements and their syllabi. Syllabi typically read like a terms of service agreement, which we know are designed so you never read them. And of course, what do faculty complain about most? "It's on the syllabus. How come students never read the syllabus?" But if you look at the standard syllabus, they look like they’re meant not to be read—pages of requirements, deadlines, rules, penalties, punishments. They are not designed to inspire learning or to help our students understand why a college education helps prepare them for their future.

One of the things I've just started doing is looking at the NACE (National Association of Colleges and Employers) “Career Readiness Competencies.” NACE researchers have interviewed 3,000 employers about what they look for in new employees: critical thinking, creative thinking, problem solving, written communication, communicating with people who have different backgrounds and different ideas than your own. *This is what we do in higher education.* Yet I've never seen these higher order thinking skills on a syllabus. I’ve only recently seen a syllabus that links course content to such crucial life skills.

So I've been doing something new recently. I'm going into classes where, instead of the tedious first day ritual of “going over the syllabus,” I have students look at the NACE competencies, look at the syllabus and translate the work they’ll be doing that term into the NACE competencies. Take a research paper. They might say “I’m taking an idea all the way through to implementation and it's due on a deadline. I've got a career skill here—a life skill here.”

What I like about this translational exercise is that it does not demand we change what we teach in our classes.. However, perhaps more importantly, it does change how we think about our own role in the classroom, in society, and in our students’ lives. We just have to think more profoundly and with heart about what we're doing.

In the United States, about 3.5% of college graduates go on to earn a PhD. Most of us teach as if a hundred percent of our students are going on to become tenure-track professors in our field. We've had studies of learning going back to the Hermann Ebbinghaus experiments on remembering and forgetting of the 1880s—not 1980s—1880s. We forget as much as 75% of what we learned for a major event (i.e., a final exam) within weeks afterwards.

At the same time, the life lessons of college, we don't forget. That’s important for us, as professors, to think about. We're often so worried about “covering everything” on the syllabus, that we forget why we're here, why our students are here. We need to go back and read our own mission statements, do what we say in our mission statements. Think about that. We need to take our role seriously and our students’ lives seriously. That may sound pretty basic but, if we are going to change our institutions, if we are going to work towards a more equitable institution and a more equitable society, that process

has to begin with our own examination of our own role and our practices. That sounds pretty basic, but it's not always so easy. Not always so easy at all, especially when then we go into a collective group and we say, "These are principles we should be believing in. How do we change for those principles?"

Wendy Brown: I'm going to speak about something really different. I have a million questions for Cathy. And with very few exceptions, I actually think this builds on some of what Cathy was saying and I'm in accord with what Cathy was saying. So maybe after I talk, we can discuss how to bundle us.

2022 was an amazing year for organized labor in the United States. Union organizing took place in an astonishing number of quarters and very surprising quarters and yielded over 374 strikes in total, which is 40% more than in 2021. Striking workers included, baristas, psychologists, steel workers, nurses, warehouse and grocery store workers, food service workers, dock workers, school teachers, techies, coal miners, academics, and more. Apple, Amazon, the *New York Times*, Starbucks, Chipotle, Trader Joe's, San Francisco Airport, Kaiser, the University of California, University of Illinois, NYU, The New School, Rutgers.

These are just a few of the giant employers that were forced to bargaining tables or threatened by being forced to bargaining tables. There was also the historic joining of the Association of the American University Professors and the American Federation of Teachers to quasi-*proto unions*, not quite unions, associations. The historic joining that united and represented over 316,000 academic employees.

Now this level of worker solidarity for me, I think for most people in this room, is nothing less than thrilling, especially after 40 years of neoliberal, ideological, political, and legal assault on worker solidarity, union organizing, and labor power. And for us here in this room, I think it's been amazing to see those who have long sustained our undergraduate curriculums while living at or below poverty levels, both adjuncts and graduate student workers, to see them stand up and refuse to take it anymore. All that said, I want to go under the excitement for a few minutes just to talk about where academic labor peels off from other kinds and what the special predicament is that this poses.

First, academic labor—despite the protest slogans at many strike solidarity rallies of profits over people—is not a source of surplus value or profit; with nefarious exceptions like the University of Phoenix and their cousins, academic labor transpires in non-profit, public, and private institutions.

Secondly, academic labor is, as Cathy already suggested, a really strange and stratified sector. The bottom where most organizing is happening is vastly underpaid in relation to both its educational and experiential levels. You will not find many workers in the world being able to grasp why somebody who had spent decades in school and often in debt, then ends up working at jobs for \$3,500 a course or \$5,000 a course or for \$27,000 a year.

Moreover, the range within academic labor, obviously, is also extraordinary. Where else does remuneration for the same work like teaching an Introduction to Chemistry or Introduction to Political Science... where else does remuneration for that work in the same institution span from \$3,500 to over \$35,000 depending on whether the instructor is a graduate student, an adjunct, or a senior distinguished named professor?

But the most unusual part of academic labor concerns how incredibly invested we all are in what we might crudely call our product. This investment doesn't differ from *all* other workers but it does differ from *most* other workers, and it's also an investment that many of our employers themselves don't share. Many of those at the very top of, especially, large universities, are much less invested in what we care about, what our students learn, what books we write, our ideas, et cetera, then we are.

Most of us care deeply about the education we offer, what our students learn, how they might develop and transform, what hurdles they face, where they're going, just as we care really deeply about the books we read and sometimes write. Most of us also care very deeply about the academy itself, its future, the kind of future that Cathy is trying to bring about for it, the future of graduate and undergraduate programs within it. In other words, notwithstanding all the alienating and aggravating dimensions of academic life, I'm just trying to say the simple thing: We choose it because we imagine it's less alienating as work than most other things on offer, under what we still may plainly call capitalism. Despite the ever-growing precarity of those at the margins, we're drawn to the work because of this care, because we believe in it.

Now, there are obviously other workers who care about their clientele—health workers, teachers, therapists, have all organized in the last couple of years, not only for better wages and conditions, but often to protect what they provision. But there still remains the singular feature of higher educational labor, its commitment not just to students, but to ideas, to knowledge, to universities. It's never just a living nor is it quite service work or care work. Now, what's the implication of this for labor actions? We want the win. We always want the win. But we also care about how the institution metabolizes that win.

And the specific predicament—one that I suspect The New School is facing and that I know the university that I worked in for 30 years is facing, namely the University of California system—the specific predicament is that higher wages for graduate student and adjunct academic labor often results in the following: shrinking graduate programs or graduate programs that start admitting students every other year or have cohorts that are too small to really sustain the learning that graduate students need; reducing or eliminating TAs in large undergraduate classes; thinning curriculums or trying to figure out how to get more courses online; seeking to streamline degrees, that is, moving undergraduate requirements to a three-year rather than four-year package; and even, of course, melting down faculty positions or closing down entire programs. Yes, there's administrative bloat, but I want to suggest that the slogans we love, Chop From the Top, People not Profits, are inadequate models for institutions, public and private, that are funded through messy combinations of tuition, state support (whether direct state infusions or grants and contracts), philanthropy, and institutional debt—the size of which is another whole talk. In other words, institutions of higher ed are not funded through selling a product. They're funded through these complex, messy, funding streams; and higher academic labor costs, which is what our labor struggles have been about, require increasing one of these. And each comes with problems.

I don't need to tell New School folks that increasing tuition is off the table as is increasing institutional debt, which hangs institutions in another way. So it either requires increasing one of these or eliminating something. And this predicament, our deep care about the academy as such combined with its non-profit structure, makes the fit with the main unions that are helping with this academic labor organizing a little bit tricky. United Auto Workers, Teamsters, et cetera. Amazon, Starbucks, General

Motors with their billions in profits are rightly framed as struggles between workers and management or labor and capital or wages versus profit. And a union win in those places still may have some complicated consequences. It may result in a faster track to automation or relocation of a plant to other states or other parts of the world. It might cheapen the product, it might raise prices to consumers, but as long as there are other decent jobs, most workers don't care about this as much as we care about the deep degradation of education that is at stake in possible futures here.

Don't worry, I'm not saying don't organize—and we're getting to the other possibilities!

In other words, while there certainly are workers who care about the products that they make, whether it's building cars or other products, the effects of union wins don't cut as deeply into the very things they believe in as they do for academic workers. The way that the potential here is to cut deeply into decently sized graduate programs, futures for our graduate students in the forms of real jobs, decent undergraduate access and educational quality, the sort of thing Cathy just talked about, the future of an educated world beyond simply job training, the future of an actually educated world to deal with the massive and difficult problems that we have today without turning in an anti-education, anti-intellectual direction.

Now we care about all of these things and historically I'm going to suggest tenured faculty also had a vital part in shaping them in the academy. Faculty have never merely been employees, labor, but through that quaint term “shared governance,” we exercised power to set university priorities on standards and directions and changes. Today, of course, this power is severely eroded. 70% of instruction, as we were just saying, in higher ed, is now done by non-tenure track labor, and faculty who are tenured are increasingly sandwiched between managerial administrations on the one hand, and a neo-liberalized consumer strata on the other, a strata perfectly embodied in the plethora of lawsuits by New School parents for tuition refunds related to the strike question! Nevertheless, shared governance is not gone, and I want to suggest it may be an important part of resisting what I've just described as the problem of devastating downstream effects of successful academic labor actions.

Okay, so shared governance does sound really quaint today either because it's thought to be long gone in a neo-liberalized university or it just sounds like a site of co-opted drudge work for faculty who just want to get on with their teaching or writing or mentoring. So I want to suggest we have to remember what it is and what it upheld even in the context of the history of academic institutions that Cathy just shared with us.

Shared governance is the name for faculty's historic role in shaping departments, programs, majors, curriculums, graduate training, awarding degrees, making appointments and promotions based on our own judgments of teaching and research. It's not always radical, it's not always conservative, but it is different from being either management or labor. It's performed through everything from senate committees to departmental autonomy, peer review, to the very idea of administrators in institutions of higher ed that would be drawn from the faculty and then returned to the faculty.

Now, as I said, neoliberal management practices developing over the last 40 years have radically shrunk this role. Professional administrators take over more and more of university life. They come often out of

business training, not academic worlds, and research and learning are increasingly contoured to development fundraising. Students are increasingly cast as investors and consumers, and faculty have increasingly become absorbed with their own fiefdom, their own brands, their Google Scholar and citation index numbers, their titles, their salaries, their perks, rather than trying to make and shape a common academic world and future. That said, I don't think shared governance has died completely and I think it too complicates what we mean by academic labor. If academic labor isn't like other kinds of labor, shared governance isn't like other kinds of management. Its task is not to square the budget. It's not to attract investors. It's not to protect against litigation risk.

Its task is to uphold academic integrity and academic purpose and academic quality inside a particular institution. And I'm suggesting that I don't think this could be more important today when we can and should be challenging the management metrics and priorities that will treat academic labor wins as having to punch holes in parts of the university or college systems that we value the most. In other words—let me just put this succinctly and close—*we need to attend to the hinge between the singular nature of academic labor that cares about its place and cares about its product, and faculty governance that's designed to protect these things*. This hinge might be where we find a tactical response to the predicament I've described where academic labor wins often lead to devastating cuts.

To put things really obviously, the current economic model and metrics for higher ed both degrade it and are unsustainable. Skyrocketing tuition, public private partnerships, and debt finance capital projects, ever-growing dependency on philanthropy and desperation for it.... What do all these do? They skew curriculums and research and administration toward markets and marketability rather than worldly knowledge. And I'm suggesting that faculty need to really understand this. We need to stop complaining about those administrators and understand how our institutions are shaped and financed and governed and then exert our power as faculty to resist and redirect the policies, the directions to which we object the most. In other words, tenure track faculty's support for academic labor struggles requires more than solidarity with those struggles. It requires building and exerting our own powers of shared governance to contest what will otherwise inevitably be disastrous decisions about how to handle the costs of successful labor struggles.

So I want to return to where I began. It's been an amazing season for academic labor as it found its footing and voice and power. It defied those who said unions have no place in academia. And I'm suggesting it is time for secure faculty, tenured faculty, to match and back and join this power with our own.

Christoph Cox: Thank you so much, Cathy and Wendy. We have about 90 minutes for this discussion, but these two presentations could be the start of a multi-day retreat! I have a number of questions and follow-ups for you both. But let me say a few words to connect your remarks to the New School context. I've spent most of my academic career in "progressive" institutions, universities and colleges that, in various ways, can legitimately claim that description. I was an undergrad at Brown University and a grad student at UC Santa Cruz. I then spent more than two decades at Hampshire College. These institutions can lay claim to all sorts of innovations. And yet, in other respects, all of them are quite traditional when it comes to some basic questions: Why is an undergraduate education four years? Why is the ordinary school year just nine months? Why does the basic undergraduate population consist of 18 to 22 year olds? Why do students pursue majors? Why are there disciplines? Why are students evaluated through

grades? (To be fair, Hampshire rejected grades or majors from the beginning. But many other traditional structures remain.) It seems to me that we should ask these questions.

During office hours yesterday, I had a conversation with a student from One New School, the student movement that emerged from the strike last semester. The two of us spoke for about an hour; and I plan to have further conversations with her and her colleagues. One of the things I really appreciate about the One New School movement is that those students are engaged in a radical rethinking of education. They've asked basic questions such as: "Do we need a Board of Trustees?" "Do we need a president?" "Do we need administration?" "How much more do we need beyond students and faculty?" These questions may seem naïve, and in some ways they are. Nonetheless, the radical impulse is really refreshing and necessary if we're going to try to make good on the "progressive" label. They're really asking: If we were to rebuild college education from the ground up, what would we maintain of what currently exists and what would we dispense with?

Now to my first question, which is directed at Cathy, though I welcome Wendy's response as well. It has to do with the ways that standards of accreditation, which are beneficial in many ways, also thwart innovation and radical rethinking of education. Compare our "progressive" institutions with the alternative art schools that have arisen over the past 20 years or so. I'm thinking of the Black School, the Alternative Art School, Soma in Mexico City, and many others. They aren't constrained by standards of accreditation and thus enable all sorts of pedagogical and structural innovations. So anyway, maybe we could start with the accreditation question, which may seem boring and policy-oriented, but it largely determines the degrees of freedom available to an institution.

Cathy Davidson: So when I was on a book tour for *The New Education*, one of the first talks I gave was to the National Association of Accreditors. And I walked to the front of the stage. There were maybe 5,000 people there. And I said, "I'm so sorry. I know you're all going to hate me, and hate what I'm about to say." And this pall descended. And I looked at the organizer and I said, "I thought that was going to be funny. I can feel something major just happened here. What's going on?" He said, "We're desperate. We're desperate for input on how to change. We don't like the system. And it's a system that we've inherited, too. We're supposed to carry out these rules, and it's hard for us to change them." Well, my first response to that was kind of shock. I mean, it never occurred to me. And that's the kind of structural problem that you're talking about.

Why the fuck didn't it occur to me? I'm writing about the structures of higher education. Why didn't it occur to me to think about who are the people that are charged in their jobs with keeping these rules, and how are we complicit in that? That's part of the whole role. What is our role, and what role can we play? I've now talked to a number of accreditors about different things, and been on a number of committees and things. It's surprising, and kind of scary sometimes, how hard it is for institutions that enjoy a certain kind of institutional reputation. Well, it goes back to the financial structures you're talking about. If reputation is how you get philanthropy—it's how you get students who are willing to pay \$80,000 of your tuition, all of that—it's very hard to then say, "We need to change this accreditation system for a different kind of outcome." I mean, it's hard but it has to happen. And people have to be invested in that and make cases for it. I think it can only happen with consortiums of institutions. And maybe even just institutions that don't occur in the same places in the rankings.

Wendy Brown: I do just want to say, I think that a little eruption around the *US News* rankings is a very interesting sign. Because that tail has been wagging the dog for the last 25 years. It's not guaranteed because right now the reaction to the jumping off the train has been, "Oh god, we screwed up." But that does not mean that the critique of the ranking system, that is now pretty widespread, won't take hold.

Cathy Davidson: Exactly. And I think the AP system, the college boards, have been found out to be complete liars. As soon as I saw their justification, I was like, "That's a lie." I mean, in the text you could just tell they were lying. You knew they were complicit in that censorship. But I think too, that's a billion-dollar industry. It's supposed to be nonprofit. But I keep thinking, "Someone's making a lot of money off that."

Wendy Brown: That's also shattering because of the opting out of SAT and ACTs that started off eight years ago. So it's not frozen. I completely agree. But it is the in-between institutions that are most squeezed. It's not the ones at the top and it's not the ones at the bottom. The top doesn't need it, the bottom's losing anyway.

Cathy Davidson: Accreditation is important. And it's one of those other governance issues that we have to be involved in. And we have to be involved, again, cross-institutionally. It's interesting, even things like until Raj Chetty started doing social mobility studies, the rankings were based on the income you made leaving an institution, not the differential between family income coming in and family income after leaving. Or at an institution like this, maybe income isn't what you're after. I mean, you need enough income to survive, but maybe you have other things you're looking for. Why was income earned at the end, so much a motivator? Well, we know it's capitalization, it's philanthropy, it's all of those things together.

Wendy Brown: Return on investment. I mean, it was the idea that ROI should be the index for the level of financial aid supplements all higher education institutions in the country got from the federal government. And that the higher your return on investment, which meant the higher the outgoing income of the undergraduate products, the more money the feds were going to pump in. That came from Obama.

Cathy Davidson: And to make that more complicated, it's also Obama that undermines the for-profit education system, and pretty much makes that a bankrupt institution. So you've got both happening at the same time.

Christoph Cox: : I have many more questions, but we don't have much time. There are a lot of smart people in this room and I'd love to hear their comments and questions.

Speaker 4: I have a question. Thank you both for being here. This is amazing. I took so many notes. So to the point of faculty governance. I've been a member of the faculty senate for almost six years. I've been a chair of the faculty senate. And also right now, co-chairing the strategic planning of the university. So that's a big load. You guided us through understanding labor organizing and what it means for us. I agree 100%. But one thing I'm going to question is that faculty governance, the hinge of care/labor/faculty governance, is really where it's at. Isn't faculty governance labor in and of itself?

I think about how many hours I spent on this the last six years. I could have written a few more books basically, and taught more classes with more care for my students in all this time. It's really a lot of time. And you cannot make decisions or try to orient policy and changes in meetings once a month, as we do. So the question is, how do we do that? Because you need funding, you need this to be recognized as leadership, as you also said. But it's not part of the current infrastructure. I don't know about other universities, but for sure that's the case of ours. So how to account for this varying labor that is faculty governance? Because it's a lot. And it takes a lot of your time, and you don't do something else.

Wendy Brown: I suspect Cathy and I might have slightly different answers to this. But I share your pain. I gave a huge number of years to the institution. Once I gave up on our UC Senate at Berkeley, because it just basically did the bidding of the administration. The least autonomous, least shared governance senate of the entire UC system, was at Berkeley interestingly. So we organized separately through the Berkeley Faculty Association, which is a proto-union that basically kept pushing for different priorities, different values. So we were able to do something, but it was a huge amount of work, just as you say. And I think about not just the books I could have written, but the students I could have mentored. It takes away from something.

I think the only good answer I have, to refer back to what Cathy said, this kind of work is done mostly by women. It's done mostly by people who, as it were, feel like they must take care of the house and not just their own little square of territory. If we build a culture in which we understand that we are fighting for the future of the academy, of higher education, through these practices, not just doing committee service, I think we might be able to drag more of our colleagues into it. And therefore, do less of it ourselves. Because my sense is that somebody like you is giving it all, whereas most of your colleagues are giving almost nothing. And that's not shared governance. That's exploitative service.

And I admire you for doing it. But that's not shared governance. It's not us together shaping the future of our institutions. It's something else. And so I'm saying recognition, yes, remuneration, yes. But also, altering the culture in which most of us even tell our junior faculty, "Don't let them drag you into committees, don't let them drag you into this. Just write your books, teach your classes, go home, have your kid if that's what you want to do, whatever. Don't do that stuff." It's actually become, I think, part of progressive mentoring to argue that everybody ought to stay away from it.

Cathy Davidson: I totally agree. Again, I just returned from Puerto Rico. And anybody who knows this system better than somebody who spent one week there, should contradict me. But the institutions I was dealing with, they were surprised that we don't require all faculty to go to every faculty meeting, and be involved in shared governance. They're facing a huge crisis. They've lost half their student body. They're 11 campuses. The first day, I met with all the presidents and vice presidents, and senior administrators from all 11 campuses. Next one was all the faculty governance from all the 11 campuses, and the head of student governments from all the campuses. And then the Board of Trustees, and then a meeting of everyone together.

And they were shocked when I said that there were often people like yourselves who spent enormous amounts of time doing this. Whereas the majority of people at US institutions, mainland institutions,

aren't there at all. They're like, "Well, we all take turns. And we must, that's required." It's not even apparently written, it's just that's what you do. It's your institution, that's what you do. So I don't know how you change that culture. I think we have to begin by actually changing the official reward structure. And I am working with a number of institutions around the country in what we call the two-out-of-three system, where you can actually do a contract, like contract grading, and where you say, "For the next five years, I'm going to do faculty governance. And it's going to count as research."

And one of the institutions I'm working with has started a blog, where people who are doing that and on that contract, blog about it. And that counts Or they're writing articles about it, but it actually counts officially as part of their productivity. Now, that's kind of a backward system. I mean, for all the things about how you're accepting a system of productivity and then making a workaround within it. I don't know if that's better or worse, but it's what they're doing. I've got a little group of people, totally informal—and everybody signs NDAs, so I'm not going to say any names—but a little group that are trying to work out a different and more equitable system than the current pyramid. It must feel sometimes like that pyramid is just piercing your heart. It's an enormous amount of work that you're doing. And more power to you.

Wendy Brown: Cathy, I just want to take up one thing that you said during your presentation, which is that you want the idea of service converted to the idea of leadership. And the only thing I worry about there is that we have different capacities and tasks. And I had colleagues, you probably have colleagues, who are just the most amazing mentors. And that is their service. They're mentoring...

Cathy Davidson: Oh, yeah, no question.

Wendy Brown: ... and it's so different from leadership. So I'm just wrestling with, could we start thinking about the category of institutional work that does not hierarchize the difference between the extraordinary work that you are doing in strategic planning, and the extraordinary work that one of my shy and more brilliant colleagues is doing to just make sure every at-risk student in her classes does not fall through and out of the system? And I'm not that good at that. I don't do it very much. I have always felt guilty about it. I have so much admiration for her doing it. Can't they all count as service?

Cathy Davidson: I think all of that goes in leadership.

Wendy Brown: Without ending up in a British system of ticking boxes each time you dedicate an hour to service.

Cathy Davidson: Oh, God. Horrible, horrible, horrible. I mean, that's like a dystopia. That's a dystopia.

Christoph Cox: On the other hand, I hear from many faculty of color that that's actually the only way to account for informal labor.

Wendy Brown: That's what I hear, too.

Christoph Cox: At Hampshire, faculty were really calling for the college to account for and credit all the unofficial labor done by faculty of color, women, and queer faculty. It was difficult to do because it turned out to involve time-consuming surveys and other accounting mechanisms. Yet these were ways

of trying to address what I'd hear from faculty, for example, that Black faculty would spend hours each week advising, mentoring, and caring for Black students who were not their official advisees. As Dean of the Faculty, I really felt we needed to credit this work in a way that could relieve these faculty from some of their more official committee work. I don't think our solution was adequate. But I'm still committed to developing some mechanism for this.

Cathy Davidson: So almost all the leadership programs I run, and I run several, are peer mentorship leadership programs. Including one we just had wonderful feedback from for the City of New York where recent CUNY graduates are mentoring high school students from a level of poverty that's almost unimaginable, people who typically earn family income less than \$10,000 a year in New York. So I don't make a distinction between leadership and peer leadership and peer mentoring. But I do understand what you're talking about there. I had a colleague at Duke, he became the provost, who when he was head of the political science department, was very worried about two Black faculty members who seemed to be mentoring everyone, and went to a system of checklists. They disbanded it very quickly, but no one forgot the lessons. Because the number of hours that were spent was shocking. Shocking. But it is annoying, where basically everyone had a little clicker and was saying how many office hours they were spending and stuff. But it was shocking how different it was.

Christoph Cox: And we probably never estimate those things accurately.

Speaker 4: Amazing conversation. Thank you so much, Wendy and Cathy. I wanted to bring the question of qualifications in faculty searches into the mix. It seems to me that the faculty search and hiring process is a wonderful place to practice shared governance. And yet we continue to still default to qualifications of faculty—who are then focused on, I think you said, 3.5% of students who go into PhDs—instead of focusing on content. And at Parsons we've been able, in some of our searches, to eliminate the requirement for a terminal degree. And I'm really struck when you talk about the labor that we need towards shared governance—and, Cathy, when you talk about the other 97% of students—are we in fact looking for the wrong set of qualifications in full-time faculty if we are committed to a radical rethinking of our institutions? And might that be a place where we can, without even asking for permission, but with groups of colleagues focused in their work and search committees, to really think about what are the qualifications of somebody who's going to want to participate in shared governance and really transform the institution?

Cathy Davidson: I think first of all, I mean, departments in institutions, I think it is a form of shared governance. And it's often a form of the Hunger Games version of shared government. I do not understand how, when you start with 600 applicants, you somehow have this committee that's happy and gets down to four, and then, with those bottom four, it's like, "You are an idiot. How could you possibly want number three?" I mean, it's the worst version of the meritocracy, and the tyranny of meritocracy. I do think every institution has to decide in some collective fashion, and this is going to sound a little la-la, but some collective fashion, what its values are and what it's looking for. And then in a design department in Parsons, maybe a terminal degree is not the most important thing. Maybe being wild and crazy and the most inventive, inspiring person ever is what you need in a department that's a little sleepy. But how you make those collective decisions isn't easy, because we've inherited a structure that rewards a certain kind of behavior. So you're asking people to step out of culture. How do you do that? How do you step out of capitalism? How do you step out of culture?

But Wendy, I'm so moved by the thought of what it would mean to really take that hinge between shared governance and some kind of efficacious transformation of a system. And to think of that in

terms of a kind of collectivism. And then I'm such a practical person who wants to know how you fix it and that's not exactly a how-you-fix-it kind of statement! But it does feel like there has to be some collective saying: "What are our standards, before we actually do a hiring? What are we looking for? What do we need? What do our students need? What does our institution need?" Rather than starting with the standard issue job description.

Christoph Cox: Just one quick comment on that. We need to think about how our actual politics line up with our professed politics. It seems to me that a lot of academics are closet libertarians. At all the progressive institutions I've been a part of, I'd often hear faculty say, "I just want to be left alone to do my teaching and do my research." And yet, at the same time, they'd rightly insist on shared governance, on the importance of playing an active role in how the institution is run. It often seems that everyone wants shared governance until they get it and realize that it's a ton of work!

Speaker 5: The question I had is maybe both practical and idealistic at the same time. What kind of skill sets are necessary for shared governance to work, in the way that we can challenge management metrics? So what kind of education do we need to make faculty function better in faculty governance? It's a hard question and I'm very well aware that the university is part of an ideological state apparatus. So we reproduce the same social relations over and over again. So it'll take not much short of maybe a revolution to change that! I'm also aware that I've had the enviable position of ever since starting the junior faculty search, I've been chairing my own program.

So I've developed this extraordinary skill set, that I didn't even think I needed, to be able to design and implement a curriculum for teaching and research. So a lot of what I've done is learn a whole new language of management. But I'm constantly translating my faculty's achievements, accomplishments, capacities, and tasks into management language, which has made me a very good manager. Now, I can do dual speak. And that means that I've become very, very good at translating. And we know that translating has its own politics.

I just have one more thing to add. I'm very well aware that when I look at faculty who do serve, who serve out of care, it often reproduces the need for a certain kind of identity politics. It's often class, it's often gendered. So I got into this because I believe in education. And I do have fantasies for cultural revolution so I do believe in it. So I'm curious what kind of pedagogy can we start implementing now to make faculty better as participants in governance so that we do challenge management and we don't keep on reproducing.

Wendy Brown: Fantastic question, I'll just give you my very quick answer. My experience at a large university was that the more conservative faculty knew a lot about how the university ran in its nuts and bolts and the more left faculty knew a lot about what was wrong with it, but not how it ran.

I actually think we need to not simply, I mean you, you're doing God's work, no doubt about it, absolutely, but I just think that translating is what you have to do now. But what you really want is a block of faculty that will say, this is what it takes to teach a decent class. We need the conditions for being able to do that. This is what it takes to have conditions for training graduate students and not just doing it in either a complaining, we-don't-care-what-your-budgets-and-funding-streams-are way, and so forth. But, on the other hand, not getting in there how my more conservative colleagues did with being so taken up by those categories that there was no critique of them.

And I just think shared governance of a progressive sort actually requires understanding how contemporary institutions of higher learning work and not getting absorbed by the languages and the metrics from DEI to development offices that tame and neutralize the kinds of concerns that you have.

And that requires more than one person. I mean, both of you are describing basically solo work. It's not shared governance. So concretely, practically, it means getting more faculty who care about the place to be more willing—as we did in the Berkeley Faculty Association—to learn how the damn place works. Budgetary transparency, organizational transparency. What is this new office of strategic planning development, blah, blah blah? Not yours, but the one that's really useless that just has feathered 16 more 401ks without actually delivering anything to the university.

I mean, these are the things that I think we do have to learn. Not everybody wants to do it. A lot of people do just want to go write their books and teach their students and go home. And yet those folks often also complain. So all I'm saying is to mobilize those complaints into a willingness to learn. And there are people too who really are not administrators.

Cathy Davidson: And I think it begins, I really do think it begins with pedagogy. So I try to structure my classes as communities of caring and mutually responsible collective bodies. So my students create part of the syllabus, they create the grading system. They work in groups, but they aren't static groups and each person is a different leader each term. And if you haven't done anything, your partner, your team is not going to be supporting you. I use a badging system: you never give anyone a bad grade. Just if somebody's done something. You come up with a criteria at the beginning for what's going to make your group valuable. And then you give somebody a badge that week if they did a great job. And believe me, when you come in and you see that nobody in your group gave you a badge that week, it's more important than giving somebody an F. And when you now come in and you see everybody in your group appreciated what you did, it's an amazing thing.

We also, with the program, I run the Futures Initiative. We have collaborative agendas. I haven't set an agenda in 15 years. That's how I ran it when I was a Vice Provost for Interdisciplinary Studies too. Whoever came to me set the agenda. And that requires a different level of thinking about how institutions work and much less scapegoating. But I do that, I've done it with second-graders too, and I do it with graduate students, with programs, with the programs we're setting up.

I'm lucky enough to have been this person who can make a structure that allows other people to flourish in that structure. So it's hugely gratifying to see people flourish, but I also realize that part of what they have to learn—and this is usually the last lesson—is, okay, this was great, but we're about to go out into the friggin' real world. So what have we learned here that carries, and what have we learned here that has to be an armor that not going to carry at all. So that's always a very interesting last event.

Speaker 6: We're talking about a very hard and complex system to fix. Well, healthcare is definitely more complex and we don't deal with life and death situations! But what I mean is that we can spend a whole day pointing to broken parts in our system such as admissions, hiring, committees, service etc. And there's this proposition that you can maybe eliminate this, eliminate that. Start from here or start

from there. You mentioned that we might start changing things from pedagogy and within the classroom. In that timeframe of two hours, you can create a new world. But again when the class ends and you find yourself again surrounded by processes that force you to do this and that, you're back facing these barriers that in the end become insurmountable.

So where does the actual change come from? I believe that maybe it's through the curriculum itself that it is where you can force things to open up and maybe one thing will change after the other until other parts of the system will follow. So where do we start? Is it like acupuncture in that we have to put needles everywhere and energize the whole body at the same time? And it's not only our own body that must be energized, because our body is connected to a larger ecology, for example, other institutions that regulate us. Because the mission is clear, the desire is clear, but at the same time we can no longer solve our problems with the same tools that created them. And we know it's just not destroying everything that will generate something new. So my question is, where do we start?

Cathy Davidson: I'm not religious, but if I were religious, I would say my religion is the Colored Conventions. It's a digital humanities project where Gabrielle Foreman and a number of people have found hundreds of thousands—it started as tens, and then thousands, and now they've found hundreds of thousands—of people during the era of slavery who were meeting secretly. And it continued. There's probably not an African American leader in America today that somehow doesn't have ancestry back to the Colored Conventions. These were secret groups that met and gave each other solidarity and advice and companionship completely in a situation that was illegal and then continued after slavery, during reconstruction.

I like to look at that because we know that those kinds of societies exist everywhere. That in even the most oppressive society, there are people that fight and that figure out how to organize and fight and be both stealthful and successful. So I don't mean that as a glib answer. I mean, that's my little thing. I love to look in and see what they found because they're finding secret records in people's bibles and things. They find meeting notes. And so there's hundreds now. And the way that project is organized, there's not one person but thousands of people that are looking in communities for records of something that nobody knew existed.

That's a metaphor-ish, but I don't think it is only a metaphor because I think you work with, you find the people, who give you strength and who share your values, and then you find more people and you really do work on that collective level. But it has to start with some kind of commitment, not just to have one person doing that. And maybe it starts with food. If you put pretzels out or a pizza out or something out, that helps. But something that is both not just extractive as so much of our labor does feel extractive, but also that's something about community building that builds from there. And I know that sounds very loose. But actually, I think it kind of works.

Speaker 7: I think something that's going to come up a lot here in the next few months is how assessment can be a topos for faculty governance to embrace and shape and lead rather than a kind of quantification culture or a kind of budgetary Excel sheet, through things like closing of programs, maybe on the horizon or even building new ones and looking at streams. Assessment is something that we see a lot of at The New School and we've lived through different non-implemented models of it. And I think that's created some disjunctures and lack of unity, or lack of a building of a culture that would

incentivize creativity. But in your experience, how is assessment a kind of space that can be taken back from the worst version of the industry?

Cathy Davidson: Well, I just think community based assessment works and collaborative management and collaborative budgeting.

Wendy Brown: And interesting. Of course, the people who are here are the ones who are already flat-out working their tails off in the Senate, in their classrooms, at home, probably in the city, et cetera. For me, assessment, which is so important at the basic level, asks where are we? What do we do? How well are we doing it? It needs to happen in faculty conversations that are outside the existing metrics and reporting schemes. And that means gathering together and asking ourselves those questions rather than just, how do I get out of here really fast so I can not have anything to do with the institution? And it's not easy to insist on that. I think it might be easier at The New School where everyone at least professes some care about these things. I think that's New School culture. You draw on the ongoing precarity of the place, the danger that that precarity will either take the institution off a cliff or take it in a direction that everybody hates and you say, What do we as a faculty think we need to do? And what do we need to educate ourselves in?

And I took that to be your question. It's like, what is it that faculty need to know? And faculty do need to understand basically where funding comes from and where it goes. They don't need all the down and dirty details. And I'm always shocked by how many faculty really have no idea, just no idea how their institutions are funded and organized and starting there and as you say, with pretzels and beer, and finding somebody who can help demystify that and then say, what's our situation? What are our risks and what are our possibilities? And what does really need to be cut? And some questions should be asked about things that many people will think are holy.

And I think taking seriously the desire to diversify and figuring out how faculty and graduate students and willing administrators could do that without these overgrown offices with ridiculous budgets that aren't helping us, that's going to be scandalous to have that discussion, but we'd better start having it. And that's just one, I mean, that's not the biggest budget sucker. The biggest one is called development!

Speaker 8: Faculty governance at The New School is a complex thing, and it varies by division. All the conditions within faculty governance, the structure of the debates, the forms of discussion, even the seating arrangements! It's been a long struggle to just open that up with a younger, more diverse cohort of faculty and that involves training people, mentoring, supporting.... Well first of all, bringing in new faculty and creating conditions to bring them in so that you don't, in hiring debates, have to deal with all the things which you have to deal with when you're trying to hire faculty who just aren't the same as the faculty already in the school. So faculty governance in itself requires so much work to democratize it internally just as a form. And that's partly why it ends up distributed so unequally.

Wendy Brown: I could just say to give you a little hope there. That is why at Berkeley we built a parallel structure. It's not all the faculty, but it was the Berkeley Faculty Association, which was part of the UC Council of Faculty Associations. It probably has about 15 to 20% of the faculty involved rather than officially 100%. But it's an activist left. And that parallel structure could make more noise and engage in more serious challenges and also go directly in our case to Sacramento to lobby, which we can't do

through our Senate. So the parallel structure may or may not be a useful model here, but something other than the official Senate thing, which can also be a terrible energy suck.

Cathy Davidson: Although if it's fun, I think a parallel structure's great. I actually think that in some ways it goes back to your question and having the right kind of parallel structure can be effective and can be a joyous thing.