ELLEN BOESENBERG

# SURVIVAL IN THE NEW CORPORATIZED ACADEMY: RESISTING THE PRIVATIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Rapid and profound changes are occurring in higher education that we ignore at our peril. Struggling against shifts toward privatization, Dr. Robert Price, a professor at City College of San Francisco, described the changes proposed for his campus as a tsunami (Nichol, 2013) and Jack Hassard cautioned lest the "slow creep of privatization does not turn into an avalanche" (Hassard, 2012). These are apt descriptions for the formidable changes that are poised to sweep away everything in their path, with immediate and devastating consequences for educators, students, and the institutions they attend. The curriculum is also affected and this in turn determines what knowledge is most valued. These transformations have a tremendous influence on how we as a society understand, value, and put education to use, as well as how we as educators practice our profession, generate, and use knowledge. These disastrous changes have not come without warning however. They are reflective of the neoliberal project and have the potential for far-reaching, negative social, political, and economic outcomes. Integral to neoliberalism is a belief that the market has the best answer for a range of social concerns and that it is most capable of delivering results for a variety of social functions, among them education. Acknowledging and understanding these changes can aid in the struggle to resist the effects of the privatization of higher education.

The privatization and commercialization of the nation's K-12 public schools have already been evident for some time; and higher education has created partnerships with for-profit K-12 enterprises and followed some of the same privatizing patterns (Kolowich, 2014). For example, Colorado adopted a voucher program for higher education, and Virginia's legislature created three levels of charter status for its public universities (Lyall & Sell, 2006). For-profit corporations such as Phoenix University are quite similar to K-12 for-profit corporations such as Edison Schools Inc. The major difference between K-12 and higher education, however, is that the tertiary level is also a site for the production of knowledge. This presents even more opportunities for the proponents of privatization to exploit. Corporations find not only a marketplace on the college campus and a customer base in the student body, but a center for production of what has become an increasingly valuable commodity— knowledge. Beyond partnering with and acquiring the results of research generated at the university, they have found opportunities in the development and sale of curricula and instructional methods. Knowledge production in the form of research findings, course development, and even teaching itself has gained currency in the so-called "knowledge society" (Valimaa & Hoffman, 2008).

Technology and changes in the global economy have played a major role in this transformation, including changes in the conception of knowledge especially as it pertains to its economic utility. The recent discourse promotes knowledge in service to economic growth, expansion of the corporate bottom line, and individual marketability in the economy, all of which influence educational practice. Technological

advances have reshaped pedagogy and have opened up valuable opportunities for profit-making in the form of e-learning. As Suzanne Guerlac explains,

> E-learning is itself a recent marketable innovation enabled by the rapid development of a whole range of technological innovations, vaguely identified as "web2"; these include social networking, multimedia, visualization, and sharing capabilities and, more recently, the promise of "the cloud." (p. 102)

At the same time that technological innovation has been advancing, the willingness to support public education at the university level has been faltering.

Decreases in funding and the vicissitudes of discourses about education have led many universities down the path of privatization, leading to a variety of outcomes such as: the outsourcing of academic labor, the restructuring of academic departments, the redesign of curricula, the shift to a corporatist-managerial approach to institutional governance, the commercialization of the campus, the exploitation of students and non-tenure track instructors, and the commodification of knowledge. Institutions of higher learning have been outsourcing such functions as food service, maintenance, payroll, campus bookstore, and campus e-mail for many years. More recently, tenured faculty are being outsourced through the use of distance learning programs, digital courseware, and an increased reliance on contingent labor. In a political climate that challenges free speech in the classroom and online (see Mattson, 2005), university professors are also being affected by the commodification of knowledge that usurps their intellectual property rights. All these circumstances jeopardize academic freedom.

Impending catastrophe notwithstanding, it might still be possible to halt the complete undermining of public institutions, their teaching missions, and the valued principles of academic freedom. This can be accomplished through resistance to the destructive practices that are being implemented, by challenging the detrimental discourses that support these moves, and by promoting alternate practices and discourses. It is crucial to first identify the discourses that support these neoliberal transformations and the hegemonic forces that have produced this looming crisis. We can understand the two faces of the discourse coin by looking at what is said- the words and phrases that predominate, and what is done- the actions that result. For example, the essential neoliberal discourse is revealed in a statement that appears as part of the information about Florida Gulf Coast University— a newly founded (1991) state university. Perhaps heralding the philosophies of future universities (or revamped existing institutions), its website proclaims, "The vision for the university was one that would address emerging higher education needs for the 21st century, including the use of technology in the learning/teaching process and multi-year contracts as an alternative to faculty tenure" (*Historical Perspective*, 2013). Couched in seemingly neutral terms, it is in fact, the manner in which technology is employed in the teaching process and the nature of the so-called "alternatives" to tenure that are examples of devices that are instrumental to the gutting of higher education.

Privatization's threat to higher education is palpable and profound. The American Council on Education and EDUCAUSE (a nonprofit association committed to promoting the use of information technology in higher education) published a monograph (Katz, Ferrara, & Napier, 2002) entitled, *Distributed Education: Challenges, Choices, and a New Environment,* in which they contrast the discourses that sustain the corporate code and the academic ethos.

> Perhaps most important, the behaviors of for-profit organizations are governed by competitive urgency. The corporate drivers of choice, activity, accountability, and behavior can set the stage for difficulties when juxtaposed with higher education's culture of consensus seeking, skepticism, collegiality, incentives, and long-term perspective. (p. 3)

It remains to be seen whether the clash of these disparate drives can be resolved in the contemporary educational practice in higher education.

**Reconnecting to the Purpose of Education**

Concomitant to uncovering and interrogating the discourse, it is important to identify the aims and motivations of the many "stakeholders" and participants in higher education. This can be accomplished by asking fundamental questions about the purpose of education. By connecting the changes in higher education to our understanding of the goals of education, we can begin to understand the institution itself from various perspectives and consider alternatives to the discourses driven by neoliberal objectives. History teaches us that the goals of education are not fixed for once and all time, nor is academic freedom to be taken for granted as an enduring privilege. These ideals require constant attention and struggle to maintain.

David Labaree (1997) examines the historical struggle over the goals of education in America and posits that the differing views on these goals are essentially political in orientation. His discussion includes three goals of education: *democratic equality, social efficiency,* and *social mobility,* each with its own discourse. The *democratic equality* goal of education seeks to provide equal access to education for all students in order to produce an educated citizenry capable of taking part in a democratic society. Perceived as a public good, education is undertaken primarily for the benefit of society. The aims of this goal are exemplified in the discourse of the Civil Rights Era. The *social efficiency* goal of education seeks to prepare each student for his or her future role in the economy. The role of the school, according to the social efficiency creed, is to achieve a suitable match between the student and a job. It asserts that when carried out efficiently, education is a public good that provides benefits to the whole of society. This ideology predominated during the Progressive Era at the turn of the twentieth century.

The third goal of education that Labaree (1997) considers is *social mobility* which holds "-that education is a commodity, the only purpose of which is to provide individual students with a competitive advantage in the struggle for desirable social positions" (p. 42). The student is both a consumer of and a competitor in a system that sees education as a private good and a process to be undertaken only for the benefit of the individual. This describes the philosophy that prevails today— an approach consonant with the logic of neoliberal economic thought. In the context of higher education it is enacted through the privatization of the institution as commissioned by the neoliberals. I would add to Labaree's description that educators are now inserted into this system as well— both as individual competitors in the system and as producers of knowledge.

Using Labaree's framework, we can detect the underlying purpose of education and uncover some of the motives of the various stakeholder as well. Of the three goals of education that Labaree describes, both the *democratic equality* and *social efficiency* perspectives perceive education as a public good undertaken for public benefit while the *social mobility* perspective perceives education as a private good undertaken for individual benefit. The privatization of higher education can be understood through the lens of these goals, because this process has more to do with privatizing the *purpose* of education than it does with delineating the differences between public and private institutions and their funding sources. Public institutions are already mostly funded by non-public sources, with only about thirty percent of their funding on average coming from public support (Lyall & Sell, 2006). So the public-private distinction in some ways is more a matter of degree than a matter of kind.

Nevertheless, discussions of privatization often start with funding issues. Lyall and Sell (2006) attribute the decline in public support to a change in political philosophy that heralds a long-term trend. They explain it as follows:

> The manifestations of this shift, tax cuts and spending caps, have converged with outdated fiscal structures and budget practices to create long-term state deficits, which then lead states to shift more responsibility for funding higher education from state resources to individuals. (p. 9)

Looking at *State Higher Education Executive Officers* data one finds that the average percentage change in educational appropriations per FTE (full-time equivalent) for the U.S. from 2007 to 2012 indicates a decrease of 23 percent, at the same time that FTE enrollments increased by more than 15 percent. New Hampshire had the greatest funding decrease of just over 50 percent. Only two states— Illinois and North

Dakota had increases (just below 10 percent and just over 30 percent respectively). Every state had enrollment increases from 2007 to 2012— from a low of 4.2 percent in California to a high of 36.2 percent in Oregon. Colleges and public universities felt the pinch when decreases in funding and increases in enrollment occurred simultaneously (*State Higher Education Finance FY 2012,* Figure 6, p. 30).

In addition to this fiscal reality, institutions of higher education are also confronted with the corporate-inspired rhetoric that urges them to be more "productive", more consumer-oriented, more efficient, and more accountable. The reduction of public funding that often leads to changes in an institution's governance is sometimes framed as a trade-off between funding and institutional autonomy. In the case of higher education, it gives institutions more leeway to make decisions such as raising tuition. So while the university may be less accountable to the state, it becomes more accountable to its "customers" (the parents or students) and to its "consumers" (the students). This puts still more pressure on the institution to make itself more appealing to potential customers while searching for cost cutting measures. As tuitions rise, the benefits of pursuing higher education and the value of a college degree must be weighed more carefully. Faced with the prospect of a huge debt burden and uncertain employability, some potential customers may opt out of pursuing a college education altogether.

In 1972, the *Higher Education Amendments* transformed the way individuals pay for a college education. This legislation dictated that monies that were previously given to institutions as block grants were replaced by monies to be allocated directly to students in the form of financial aid. Although seeming to empower students, in effect it put access to funding at the level of the individual, advancing a *student as consumer* ideology and thus supporting the view of education as a *privately* consumed good. Unfortunately for students, by the year 2000, the greater part of student aid took the form of loans. Although a portion of the loans available to students are government-subsidized and low-interest, it is still ultimately the banks that profit from them. Student loan debt has now reached an alarming one trillion dollars. According to the *Institute for College Access and Success* (2013), of the students who entered repayment in the year 2010, 600,000 of them had defaulted on their loans by the year 2012; the largest percentage (43 percent) had attended for-profit institutions; 42 percent (evenly divided) of defaulters had attended two-year and four-year public institutions (*New data confirm,* 2013). As loans replace grants and need-based financial aid, it places a much heavier financial burden on the middle class to afford a college education, and it increasingly deprives students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds to access to college education at all. Yet despite the increasing difficulty in financing a college education, enrollments continue to increase.

**The New Corporate U**

Distance education accounts for much of the increase in college enrollments although retention of online students in these courses is an ongoing issue (Lehman & Conceicao, 2014). Distance learning programs become operational through various means—through colleges that develop their own distance courses, companies that sell their educational products to colleges and universities, for-profit spin-off operations that originate in public universities (e.g. University of California Extension), and through for-profit companies' subsidiary corporations (e.g. Pearson eCollege). College administrators readily adopted distance education— enticed by the promise of revenues from the limitless expansion of enrollment and the cost savings from the elimination expenses associated with maintenance of the physical plant. Toward that end, several for-profit companies offered their services. They supplied the hardware, software, internet links, and technical support for online course delivery, and provided assistance with course development. One such company, Real Education, Inc. (Real Ed) was founded in 1996 and was created "so that universities could easily outsource instruction" (Noble, 1998, p. 823).

In 1998, the *Higher Education Act* redefined for-profit universities, such as Phoenix University, as institutions of higher learning thus allowing them to partake in tuition revenues generated from student financial aid (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004, p. 44). However, as it began to dawn on the universities and the online education companies that these commercial distance education programs did not produce the

financial windfall they had expected, they began to search for help. David Noble (2001) explains how the taxpayers came to the rescue:

> After several years of lobbying by vendors, universities, and trade associations, the Clinton-Gore White House secured the cooperation of the military in creating an artificial market for distance education at taxpayer expense. First the U.S. Army, in August 2000, and then the navy and the air force (sic) announced that the combined armed services had decided to dedicate almost $1 billion to provide taxpayer-subsidized university-based distance education for active-duty personnel and their families. (p. 28)

Meanwhile, the students who attend on-campus classes are being treated more and more as customers. A recent Chr*onicle of Higher Education* essay (Perry, 2014) attests to how professors are now being vetted for their "customer service" competence. In "Faculty Members are Not Cashiers: Why the 'customer service' lingo in academe is bad for students", the author observed that in a recent job posting, the ability to provide "excellent customer service" was featured more prominently than the duties of teaching, research, and service that are usually required for such a position. Additionally, in an effort to meet consumer demands, Cohen and Kisker (2010) observe that, "most institutions have directors of marketing, and new courses and programs are often prepared not because they advance the frontiers of an academic discipline but because there is a market for them" (p. 515).

A corporate mentality has also affected the internal governance of the university. As Henry Giroux (2002) explains, "In the name of efficiency, educational consultants all over America advise their clients to act like corporations selling products and seek 'market niches' to save themselves. Within this corporatized regime management models of decision-making replace faculty governance" (p. 106). As institutions grow in terms of the expansion of the student population, the addition of new programs, and the expansion of the physical plant, many of the concomitant decisions are increasingly made solely by administrators and trustees, with faculty committees going by the wayside.

Even student recruitment is being outsourced. The company ConnectEDU held an online database containing information about students that was used for recruitment decisions making purposes (Biemiller, 2014). Ominously, the company recently filed for bankruptcy. ConnectEDU also offered a service they called an Academic Management System, as well as software called CourseEval that evaluates courses and instructors. This outsourcing indicates how faculty members and administrators are being treated more and more as expendable employees of the university and less and less as professionals with a commitment to the mission of the university.

In his book, *Neoliberalism and the Global Restructuring of Knowledge and Education,* Steven Ward (2012) discusses *new public management,* the mechanism by which market-oriented strategies are applied to institutions. In higher education, the use of *new public management* represents a shift in college administration from "…the rule-governed, bureaucratic and administrative model borrowed in part from military organizations to an output-driven corporate style of managerialism taken from the business world and neoliberal models of organizational governance" (p. 46). Once seen as a "state-agency", the public university is now viewed primarily as a business. College presidents are now often referred as CEOs, and boards of trustees are increasingly populated by members representing corporate interests (Giroux, 2002). Given the current business— oriented discourse, their input carries more weight than it had previously. Corporate CEOs and billionaires are seen as the new education gurus— Bill Gates and Eli Broad typify this new mindset (Ravitch, 2010). Corporate endowment of faculty chairs, corporate sponsorship of athletic activities, and the corporate financing of sports arenas and other facilities ensure an enduring corporate presence on campus.

For anyone who questions the new corporate mindset, the consequences can be swift and severe. For example, the dean of the University of Saskatchewan's School of Public Health was recently escorted off campus by two campus police officers after being dismissed from his administrative position for writing a letter critical of the university's restructuring plan. Five weeks shy of retirement, Robert Buckingham was also threatened with having his tenure and retirement benefits revoked. Having been warned not to discuss

details of the restructuring plan, he felt compelled nonetheless to send a letter to politicians expressing his concerns. Reflecting on the events, Buckingham told *The Toronto Star*, "I always thought, of any place, freedom of speech would be at a university. I've learned differently" (Alamenciak, 2014).


**Neoliberalism Meets Higher Ed**

As we witness these trends on our campuses, hear discussions in the media, and read academic analyses about them, it indicates an urgent need to address these issues. We can begin to understand how we came to this state of affairs by uncovering their origins. Several scholars have connected these issues to neoliberal exploits and the discourses that promote corporate, commercial, and private interests. In his expose on the incursions of neoliberal ideology into the university, David Noble (1998a) explains its origins.

> The first phase began in the mid-1970s when, in the wake of the oil crisis and intensifying international competition, corporate and political leaders of the major industrialized countries recognized that they were losing their monopoly on heavy industry and that, in the future, their supremacy would depend on maintaining a monopoly on the kinds of knowledge that had become the lifeblood of the new "knowledge-based" industries (space, electronics, computers, synthetic materials, telecommunications, and bioengineering). (p. 109)

The research focus at many universities started to shift toward those areas that promised greater allocations of corporate funding concomitant with greater numbers of corporate representatives on campus research advisory boards.

As descendants of the liberal tradition in economics, neoliberals are also fundamentally concerned with the exercise of their rights in a "free market" economy, however, unlike their liberal predecessors, they eschew the laissez-faire approach. Instead, the neoliberals advocate an active, deliberate approach; taking it upon themselves to influence legislation, campus policy, and educational practice. Lave and colleagues (2010) describe it this way, "Contrary to classical liberalism, neoliberals have consistently argued that their political program will only triumph if it becomes reconciled to the fact that the conditions for its success must be constructed, and will not come about 'naturally' in the absence of concerted effort" (p. 661). This constructed nature and purposeful intent emphasizes the need to be cognizant of the thrust of the neoliberal discourse, their legislative activism, and their influence on college campuses.

While classic economic liberals desire an absence of government regulations that might interfere with the functioning of market forces, neoliberals prefer legislation that actively promotes their market-oriented agenda. Taking for granted that knowledge is a commodity, recent legislation has succeeded in transferring intellectual property squarely in the marketplace, with corporations at the ready to (partially) fund and fully profit from the commercialization of university research. Patent and copyright legislation paved the way for an easy transfer. The *Bayh-Dole Patent and Trademark Law Amendments Act of 1980* allowed universities to claim ownership of knowledge or technological innovations resulting from federally funded research that originated in the university. Prior to this amendment, the government kept title to the findings from the research that they had funded. This allowed the data and innovations produced from this research to remain in the public domain through non-exclusive licensure. Leonard Minsky (2000) outlines the sequence that follows after universities attain ownership in which they,

> pass the invention on to the corporations for a price, a price that never reflects the true cost of the development of the invention, already paid for up-front by the public. This sleight-of-hand dimension of "technology transfer," whereby public assets are basically handed over to transnational corporations for pennies on the dollar remains invisible to the public because the mechanics of patenting and licensing are ill understood and, unfortunately, boring. (p. 98)

Four years later, in 1984, the *Trademark Clarification Act* broadened the scope of the types of inventions that could be owned by the university, and extended their rights to grant property rights to third parties (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Furthermore, the *National Cooperative Research Act* of 1984 granted

antitrust status to university-industry joint ventures and consortia in research and development. It mingled federal and university monies with financial support from the private sector to facilitate collaborative research endeavors that enables firms within the same industry to become collaborative partners in these projects. The 1986 *Federal Technology Transfer Act* became relevant to higher education because it mandated collaboration between industry and agencies of the federal government that support biotechnology research. The significance of this legislation is that, as Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) note, it "…pioneered the legal structures that shaped collaborative research agreements between public nonprofit organizations and private sector corporations" (p. 52).

During the 1980s, most universities had established patent policies or were in the process of doing so (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Some policies went so far as to include undergraduate students, deeming them to be employees even when they were not employed by the university at all. Eventually, some colleges and universities claimed larger shares of the proceeds from intellectual property, as they laid claim *even* to faculty created spin-off companies, and placed more limitations on exceptions (such as work produced on a professor's own time). All of these provisos were necessary because patents can only be held by individuals, not by institutions. This necessitated contractual agreements between the university and the professor— often as a condition of employment.

This grab for intellectual property ownership is exemplified in the dramatic case of Petr Taborsky, a chemistry graduate student who refused to relinquish the rights to his patent for a water purifying process. Descended from a family of prominent Czechoslovakian scientists, and soon to graduate from the University of South Florida, Taborsky had been working in the university's chemical engineering lab in the summer of 1988. Claudio Sanchez of National Public Radio described how the project that was taking place in the lab proceeded:

> It was a project funded by Progressive Technologies Corporation, a subsidiary of a Tampa-based conglomerate that runs water and electric utilities in the region [Florida Progress Corporation], but the research the company was directing was going nowhere, says Taborsky. That's why he started doing his own experiments, which nobody seemed to mind, or notice, until company officials and Taborsky's supervising professor realized he had discovered something valuable. (Sanchez, 1996)

Working with a substance similar to cat litter, Taborsky made a discovery that has applications for municipal waste water purification. While his supervisor had signed an agreement with the research sponsor stating that any advances made as a result of that research project belonged to the company, Taborsky had not signed any agreement to that effect. He worked on his project at the university lab on his own time and when he realized the value of his discovery, he obtained a patent for it. While the corporation had offered him a compromise deal (to no avail), the University of South Florida had him arrested for theft of his notebooks from the university's lab. Tabosrsky went to court and was found guilty. Although similar cases were usually taken to civil court, the then president of the university wrote to the presiding judge, demanding that he be imprisoned. Taborsky was sentenced to prison and briefly ended up on a chain gang. Commenting on the situation, he remarked, "We never expected that I would go to jail or to prison, we thought it was just threats, and we never expected that …the university would push for prison" (DeQuine, 1996). Ron Grossman explains Taborsky's harsh treatment this way: "Academic observers recall that at that time, USF was anxious to move out of the research bush leagues and wanted to signal potential contractors that it would protect their interests" (Grossman, 1997).

## For Sale: Professor Lectures and Student Notes

In addition to the commercial exploitation of research that leads to new inventions, medicines, and other tangibles covered by patent laws, the commodification of knowledge opens another opportunity for exploitation—the selling of knowledge produced for pedagogical purposes. The commodification of this type of intellectual property— what has come to be known as "content" knowledge— turns subject area knowledge into consumables that take the form of curricula, lecture notes, and even student notes— all available for sale. On the matter of ownership of class notes, Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) contrasted two

court cases— one from the 1960s and the other from the 1990s— involving companies that bought student lecture notes which they then repackaged and sold. In the first case, *Williams v. Weisser* the University of California supported Professor Williams' claim to ownership of his lecture notes against the company, Class Notes. The university did not yet have a copyright policy and took a position consonant with that of the AAUP (American Association of University Professors) contending that professors own their lecture notes. The second case- *University of Florida v. KPB Inc.* shows how much the situation has changed. In this case, the university initiated the suit against the company and the rights of professors to their intellectual property were not a consideration at all. It was the university that made the claim that the note company infringed on *its* copyright entitlement. And now fully incorporated into the marketplace, the university also claimed that the company engaged in unfairly competitive practices because it was using university course numbers in its materials. This was problematic because the university was creating its own note-taking company.

While some institutions began developing copyright policies in the 1960s, and several more did so in the 1970s, it was not until the 1990s with the advent of the "knowledge society" and the "knowledge economy", that copyright legislation became especially relevant to colleges and universities. In 1995, the *Digital Performance Right in Sound Recording Act* made it illegal to download copyrighted material. A year later, the *Telecommunications Act* deregulated the broadcast, cable, wire, wireless, and satellite industries (Rhoads & Torres, 2006). This allowed major corporations in the textbook and testing industry to develop e-businesses and to reconfigure in more profitable ways, while producing educational software and distance education programs. The legal onslaught on behalf of neoliberal interests continued. As Rhoads and Torres (2006) observed, in 1998 the *Digital Millenium Copyright Act* protected "content" (the legal term for intellectual property) and eliminated the fair use provisions that apply to print media (Rhoads & Torres, 2006). The discussion that follows shows how this legislation has reshaped instruction as well as the structure of the institution.

## The Outsourced Course

Teaching as a holistic activity is now under dire threat, signifying radical changes in the conception of teaching in higher education and the discourses that support it. In conjunction with the use of contingent labor, distance learning programs, course management systems, and *digital courseware* the outsourcing of the teaching function's transformation is now absolute with the commodification of the curricula, syllabi, lecture notes, and student notes. One of the techniques that helps make the outsourcing of teaching possible is called "course redesign." In effect course redesign bypasses a major aspect of the teaching function through the use of digital courseware that eliminates the need for a professor to present a live lecture or even to be present with the students at all. Politicians and administrators are having more influence on curriculum decisions such as course redesign because they are now advocating and shopping for it. As Guerlac (2011) noted:

> The governor of Missouri, for example, has committed to a major course redesign initiative for all public four-year institutions in his state, The University of Maryland is expanding its course redesign program to the statewide level, undertaking to "redesign [teaching] infrastructure over three years. California State University, Chico, has joined the Redesign Alliance. (p. 104)

The Redesign Alliance was an organization active from 2006 to 2012, whose institutions of higher education members were intent on reducing the costs of instruction through their programs in course redesign.

The concept of *course redesign* originated in the National Center for Academic Transformation (NCAT), which from 1999 to 2003, was supported by an $8.8 million grant from the Pew Charitable Trusts (*Who we are,* 2006), In their efforts to improve education, organizations like the Pew Charitable Trusts— generally considered benign and socially liberal— are sometimes actually helping the neoliberal cause. NCAT created and managed the Redesign Alliance and the *Program in Course Redesign* whose purpose was "to demonstrate how colleges and universities can redesign their instructional approaches using

technology to achieve improved student learning outcomes as well as cost savings" (*Program in course redesign,* 2006). This was a program that, without irony, in NCAT's own words, colleges had to "buy-in" to (*Five critical implementation issues,* 2006).

NCAT offers six models of redesign; one uses technology for out-of-class supplemental activities, another combines face-to-face with online instruction; another called the *emporium model,* uses digital courseware in a lab setting. In addition, there is a fully online version; as well as what is called the *buffet model* that allows a choice of combinations of the other offerings; and there is just-in-time approach called *linked workshop.* The content offerings vary from professional development courses in accounting, education, engineering, and nursing to humanities courses in literature, composition, writing, public speaking, history, music, visual and performing arts, Spanish, and gender studies. The redesign approach is evident in the English Composition course at Tallahassee Community College which is taught by tutors in a computer lab. These ready-made courses are being used by community colleges, technical colleges, and other public universities often as remedial courses, while several of the private universities are experimenting with developing their own online courses. Even the august Stanford University offers an impressive array of online courses that lead to a Statement of Accomplishment for students who successfully complete the courses (*Stanford Online,* 2014). However, when the impetus for developing online courses is purely for the attainment of profit, the product and the approach are very different. Next, a form of online instruction that is one component of course redesign will be examined.

**The World-Famous Academic Emporium**

According to the *New Oxford American Dictionary*, the word "emporium" is defined as "a business establishment that specializes in products or services on a large scale (often used for humorously formal effect): *the world-famous food emporium…*" Coined tongue in cheek or not, *emporium* is the word used to name this model of one of the National Center for Academic Transformation's redesigned curricula. NCAT's *emporium* model for the mathematics curriculum is called *Changing the Equation,* and it is funded by the Gates Foundation. Presented as an experimental program, NCAT initially redesigned 114 courses at 38 institutions that affected more than 120,000 students each year (Twigg, 2006).

The *Math Emporium* courses are held on in a computer lab campus (or in some cases at a location off-campus). This program eliminates lectures entirely and instead it uses commercial, instructional software or *courseware* consisting of modularized course materials. According to NCAT's website, this approach requires "active learning" which entails cognitive processes, in which the student discerns patterns, organizes them in a meaningful way, understands the utility of this knowledge, and retrieves it easily. This way of learning is necessary, according to NCAT because, "Many students are set in their ways after a lifetime (albeit brief) of passive instruction. They need preparation in making the transition to more active learning environments." NCAT goes on to say, "This active learning is to ensure that students are '"doing" math'". Yet NCAT's approach holds no guarantee that students will be "doing math." Student bloggers have reported socializing instead of working on their lessons and even falling asleep at the lab (Wees*,* 2012).

This type of program lends itself to teaching only that which is measurable. For the company, as for the university, measurability is a readily available shortcut indication of the program's success. Keeping in mind that the students can re-take tests until they pass the course, leads to a distortion of the program's reported results. In effect, students learn how to take quizzes and tests and do not necessarily learn the mathematics concepts being taught. As blogger, David Wees, an assessment specialist for mathematics put it:

> One does not develop analytical reasoning from guessing which multiple choice answer matches your solution, or learning the tricks to passing the course quizzes. Another purpose of university in general is to help students foster connection with other students, and begin to develop a network of peers that they will carry with them throughout their life. This purpose is not possible when students are isolated from each other so completely. (Wees*,* 2012)

The lack of classroom community in this program reveals the hidden curriculum in this method of teaching. The hidden curriculum, according to Michael Apple, is "the tacit teaching to students of norms, values, and dispositions that goes on simply by their living in and coping with the institutional expectations and routines of schools day in and day out for a number of years" (p. 14). A quick glance at a photo of a Math Emporium lab (see deVise, 2012) will instantly reveal the disciplinary function of the hidden curriculum. The resemblance to a call center workplace is striking. The hidden curriculum becomes more even more apparent when questions are asked about who promotes this curriculum and what motives them to do so.

The incursion of the corporate mentality is evident in the numerous intermediary organizations that originate from both the for-profit and the non-profit sectors. Some of these include: Business Higher Education Forum, University-Industry-Government Research Roundtable, Internet2, and the League for Innovation. Among the non-profits is EDUCAUSE, a 501(c) (3) non-profit organization whose membership is "… open to institutions of higher education, corporations serving the higher education information technology market, and other related associations and organizations." The organization "…actively engages with colleges and universities, corporations, foundations, government, and other nonprofit organizations to further the mission of transforming higher education through the use of information technology" (*Mission and organization*, 2014). In its 2002 monograph, *Distributed Education: Challenges, Choices, and a New Environment*, commissioned by the American Council on Education, EDUCAUSE describes an economistic way of reforming education through what it terms *distributed education—* the convergence of on-campus instruction and distance instruction. According to EDUCAUSE,

> The value of distributed education is that it gives an institution new ways to operate by: (1) renewing elements of its academic offerings and cost structure, (2) extending its existing offerings to new markets, and (3) creating new academic offerings and programs. (Katz et al., p. 1)

Sounding somewhat innocuous, the emphasis on "renewal", "new markets", and "cost structure" are the areas for neoliberal activism to gain a foothold for its furtherance of its agenda.

Taking the Business Higher Education Forum (BHEF) which claims to be "the nation's oldest membership organization of Fortune 500 CEOs, prominent college and university presidents, and other leaders dedicated to advancing innovative education and workforce solutions and improving U.S. competitiveness", as one example of the neoliberal ideological influence on higher education, the hidden curriculum again becomes more visible. The organization's members seek to influence public policy at the national, state, and local levels in accord with neoliberal directives. They describe how they intend to accomplish their objective in this way:

> Using strategic business engagement, developing new undergraduate pathways that give students expert content knowledge as well as 21st century workplace competencies, and utilizing disruptive technologies to improve learning outcomes**,** BHEF works to scale workforce innovations. (*BHEF Member Meeting,* 2013)

Again, the discourse of "business engagement", "new pathways", "content knowledge", "learning outcomes", "competencies", and "disruptive technology" (a newly created technology that unexpectedly dislocates an existing technology) reflects a neoliberal ideological influence.

The Business Higher Education Forum's website describes its mission this way: "A unique group of business leaders, BHEF members are positioned to address the education-workforce misalignment exhibited in many regions across the country" (*Business-Higher Education Forum,* 2014). In addition to correcting the *workforce misalignment*, they advocate for what they term "deeper learning." They declare,

> Despite this need, employers frequently cite the growing deficiencies in the deeper learning capacities [critical thinking, analytical reasoning, and the ability to work in multi-cultural teams] of their current and upcoming workforce, and the significant costs associated with employee training and turnover. (*Workplace competencies*, 2014)

The implication is that higher education has failed to educate students for the world of work- specifically that they lack the skills needed for working in a corporation. This training and the costs associated with it then become the responsibility of the institutions of higher learning from which this potential workforce emanates. In addition to catering to the job-training needs of corporations, colleges and universities are now called upon to provide the continuous training and retraining known as "lifelong learning."

**Goodbye Mr. Chips**

After viewing photos of the computer labs where these courses are held it is understandable why some student bloggers have described the Math Emporium program as "soul-less" and "soul-killing" (Wees, 2012). Contrast what these students have said to what Alfred North Whitehead (1967) believed about higher education:

> The justification for a university is that it preserves the connection between knowledge and the zest of life, by uniting the young and the old in the imaginative consideration of learning. The university imparts information, but it imparts it imaginatively. (p. 139)

For students who are having difficulty grasping mathematical concepts or who have failed previous courses, it is especially important to engage them intellectually and personally, and to create positive feelings about the subject matter, something that arguably can best be accomplished by teachers who are present with the students—inspiring them, and providing encouragement; helping them to see the connections among the conceptual aspects of the topics being studied. It is certainly more difficult to attain inspiring instruction and love of the subject from a computer-mediated course for students who are under pressure and struggling with required courses. Of course, for anyone seeking out knowledge for personal pleasure (representing a lower stakes scenario) there are inspiring and engaging lecturers via the internet but the important distinction is that these courses are undertaken voluntarily.

Although not taught by a professor, in-person help is available in the Math Emporium lab. Students in the lab can summon help by placing a red plastic cup on their computer monitors. This will muster what NCAT calls "one-on-one, on-demand assistance from highly trained personnel." For universities that adopt this model NCAT suggests that they use peer tutors and aides whom they call *Undergraduate Learning Assistants* (the undergraduates referred to are the assistants). This, according to NCAT, "…can radically increase the amount of personalized assistance available to students and do so cost effectively." One might wonder if the cost savings are passed on to the consumer (the student). In fact, the software for these courses is often an additional expense. Some of the costs of this program are externalized when students frustrated with this method repeat the same course at another institution or when they hire a private tutor to help them pass (Wees, 2012).

NCAT promotes its programs by emphasizing that traditional courses are costly. At its annual conference in 2007, NCAT representatives pointedly asked the question, "Are highly trained faculty members needed to conduct all tasks associated with delivering a course?", and then offered a solution,

> By constructing an instructional support system that comprises various kinds of personnel, institutions can apply the right level of human intervention to particular kinds of student problems. Large-scale course redesigns have created new kinds of positions such as course assistants, preceptors and course coordinators that have specific roles within the course, leaving faculty free to concentrate on those tasks that require their level of expertise. (*New instructional roles,* 2007)

This seems to indicate that NCAT does not believe that the pedagogical function requires a professional level of expertise and that there is a "right level of human intervention." Vexingly, this model will be passed on to future generations. As blogger, Wees (2012) exclaimed, "The worst part of the Emporium? Four of the courses offered in the Math Emporium are required courses for future mathematics educators."

**Fragmentation $_+$ Contingent Labor = Cost Savings**

Striving for the goal of fiscal cost savings, institutions of higher learning have begun to scrutinize the teaching function, dismantling it into component parts that can be filled by disparate workers— each fulfilling a specific task. David Noble (2001) described the Tayloristic fragmentation that is possible with online courses. "At NYU Online, for example, which considers itself in the vanguard of institutional change, a team of different specialists in course design, development, content, delivery, and distribution handles instruction" (p. 30). This kind of labor fragmentation also applies to e-learning programs that take place on campus. Slaughter and Rhodes (2004) note, "Under many of the copyright policies we have considered, colleges and universities could hire managerial professionals to develop curricular materials and part-time faculty to deliver them, and the institution would own the courses" (p. 152). Not only is the teaching function parsed into fragments, but the development of the courseware that will serve as the course content is segmented as well. As Guerlac (2011) explains,

> The courseware is created by a team of specialists made up of instructional design professionals, technologists, editors, and artists who work with a professor designated as the "content expert" of the course. He or she functions more as a consultant to this team than as a teacher/scholar/researcher, and once the course is produced he or she becomes entirely dispensable. (p. 107)

Instruction goes from being an on-going operational expense (paying a professor's salary) to a one-time capital expense (buying the courseware). The expenses incurred by labor are kept to a minimum through the use of contingent labor "delivered" by graduate students and part-time, non-tenured faculty. Thus the courseware has come largely unbundled from the professor who might have a minor role, if any, in the development of the curriculum. Course management has also come unbundled from the teaching function and can thereafter be considered an administrative matter rather than part of the teaching function. In addition, this offers another opportunity to use contingent labor to function as "course managers." Utilizing such a system, the university increasingly comes to rely on contingent faculty who now comprise about seventy percent on average of the total faculty in higher education. Contingent faculty members are paid less for their labor, and the situation is even worse for women when gender pay disparity is factored in as well (McQuail, 2014).

Adjunct instructors have recently received some media attention, putting a spotlight on the exploitation of a group of highly qualified teachers who struggle to make a living despite having the academic credentials and commensurate teaching experience (e.g., see Solman, 2014). Given this state of affairs, the rise to fame (and presumably fortune) of NCAT's founder, Carol Twigg, is consistent with another neoliberal scenario. Miller (2010) describes her career trajectory:

> Unable to find a professorship following her graduation from the University of Buffalo in 1978 with a doctorate in English literature, Twigg began her career in the administration at Empire State College, the distance education arm of the State University of New York System… After spending several years developing online courses for Empire State, Twigg realized that the increasing spread of computers and the Internet had the potential to change the cost and learning structures of higher education as a whole. (p. 2)

**Leaning structures:** *Advanced delivery modalities*

Fragmented course delivery and the use of course management systems are radically changing the types of interactions that instructors have with students. These methods also dictate the way that students are evaluated- with frequent testing predominating. At many institutions, even student advising occurs online. For instance, Arizona State University's eAdvisor (*How does eAdvisor$^{TM}$ benefit me?*) claims that it "…provides you with personalized, on-demand tools to guide and support you on every step of your college journey." E-advising does not stop there. The website, HigherEdJobs listed a job posting from Northcentral University which described itself as:

> a global leader in online graduate education with students, alumni, and faculty in over 50 countries around the world. Working professionals have the opportunity to earn a U.S. regionally accredited graduate degree in the areas of business, education, psychology and marriage and family therapy, while working One-to-One with our 100% doctoral faculty via advanced delivery modalities. (*Adjunct dissertation chair*, 2014)

The position for which NCU posted was for a part-time Adjunct Dissertation Chair. They were seeking someone to guide doctoral students through the dissertation program in a "highly compressed period of time" (*Adjunct dissertation chair,* 2014).

Undoubtedly, affording convenience, it must be asked if e-advising provides the best quality for student services, and if e-learning provides the best learning experience. Addressing these issues, Wayne Ross (2000) asks, "Is education merely a form of information-transfer ("banking" as Paulo Freire labeled it) or is education fundamentally about a relationship between people? Can computer mediated interaction substitute for the human interaction/experience that is at the heart of learning?" (pp. 488-489). Answers are beginning to emerge, and it can be argued that the pedagogical success of using technology is contingent on many factors, as is successful pedagogy of any kind— including face-to-face instruction. Certain factors such as race, class, gender, and ability must always be taken into account to insure a sound and relevant learning experience. Rovai and Wighting, in their review of studies on alienation and the virtual classroom, cited a study (Flannery, 1995) the results of which

> revealed African-American participants generally felt more normless and had lower sense of social community and learning community than their Caucasian peers in a predominately White virtual classroom community. Some ethnic groups, such as African-Americans, place higher emphasis on communal values, which include knowledge that is valued, how learning occurs, and communication patterns of working together for the good of community. (Rovai & Wighting, 2005)


**The Right Tool for the Job**

However, it must be recognized that computer mediated instruction technology is a tool, and like any tool, its effectiveness depends upon the skill of the craftsperson using it and the purpose for which it is applied. In the hands of a skilled and experienced teacher— one who understands the technology and how to use it in pedagogically sound ways, and who is also well-versed in the subject area— technology can be beneficially employed. Merry Merryfield (2000) describes how she used the electronic format of threaded discussion in a graduate course in social studies and global education to achieve meaningful discussions on controversial and sensitive issues. Furthermore, the use of this method allowed the course to be offered to international students who could not be present on the campus. The accessibility issue also applies to students within the United States who live in remote areas— a case in which technology provides a viable solution to overcome the learning impediments of distance.

It must also be acknowledged that the use of technology for educational purposes is still experimental and in its early stages— at least on a mass basis. To be an asset to education, this tool requires a strong pedagogical foundation and a highly adept educator to administer it. Ultimately, what is required is the appropriate use of technology. Just as environmentalists have called for the use of appropriate technology, educators can insist that technology be applied appropriately to educational objectives. There are good pedagogical reasons for adopting technology as an enhancement to classroom learning, and to accomplish special projects. Guerlac, (2011) describes how digital instruction led to collaborative projects in the humanities, archival undertakings in art history, and curricular enhancements in archeology. While worthy purposes abound, in practice, the deployment of technology of late, has been used in counterproductive ways— harming education, and serving the profit motive rather than enhancing student learning and improving educational access.

**Fighting Back: Reclaiming Public Education**

As students, as contingent faculty, as tenured faculty, and as administrators we all have a role to play to in making education, accessible, non-biased, free of corporate control, and a profession worthy of working toward and working in. Whether taking a bold action like Francisco Tapia in Chile who burned $500 million worth of debt papers from the private Universidad del Mar (Goodman & Gonzalez, 2014), or organizing resistance, refusing marketplace incursions, or interrogating harmful discourses and initiating discussions about the goals of education, we all have opportunities to preserve and protect the educational ideals upon which higher education were founded.

To students, a major issue of concern about their futures is the negative impact of mounting debt from student loans, an effect that is only intensified by the dwindling prospects for employment. Nicholas Hartlep and Lucille Eckrich (2013) express the hardships of student debt through narrative accounts, and offer a numerical accounting to indicate the extent of the problem. They recommend mending this catastrophic system through education, solidarity, and monetary transformation (Hartlep & Eckrich, 2013). One avenue of educating on this issue is for instructors to encourage students to write narratives about their own academic journeys and compute their own projected debt obligations, thus stimulating interest in the issue as a personal matter as well as a political issue.

Students can also organize to take local action, and join established groups that are already working on the issue. For example, Studentloanjustice.org is a grass roots group "seeking the swift return of standard bankruptcy protections and other consumer protections to all student loans in the U.S.." It is committed to creating legislation that will serve the interests of college students and their families (Citizens must act, 2014). The Institute for College Access and Success (TICAS) is an independent, nonprofit organization with a mission to make higher education more available and affordable for people of all backgrounds. Their Project on Student Debt seeks to increase public understanding of student debt and its implications (*About the Project on Student Debt*, n. d.).

In a similar way, contingent faculty (including graduate students, part-time non-tenure track faculty, and adjunct instructors) have narrated their particular struggles, exposed their financial problems, and emphasized the importance of activism (see e.g. Maisto, 2009). As contingent employees now comprise the majority of the teaching staff in many departments, the professional authority of tenured faculty diminishes, adjuncts continue to be exploited, and students are deprived of the full advantages of instructors who are fairly compensated for their work, have decision-making power concerning the curriculum and campus affairs, have access to library and office facilities, and are able to hold regular office hours. As adjuncts become a permanent underclass in the academic hierarchy no one benefits except for the corporate profit-takers and high-paid university administrators presiding over their academic fiefdoms.

Non-tenure track instructors, and graduate student employees need what every campus worker needs- just compensation, benefits, adequate working conditions, and collective bargaining rights. The struggle for these rights provides an opportunity for graduate student organizations, graduate student unions (see Rhoads & Rhoades, 2006), part-time faculty (see for example, the *California Part-time Faculty Association*), and adjunct organizations to join forces with tenured faculty members. While some gains have been made, these problems seem to get addressed in a piecemeal fashion. As Marc Bousquet (2003) noted,

> The recent CSU contract, through which the California Faculty Association compelled the administration to raise tenure-track hiring by 20% annually over the life of the contract in exchange for concessions in their cost of living adjustment is an eye-opening, and heartening, exception to the rule. (p. 2)

Bousquet (2003) characterizes the shift from hiring tenure track professors to hiring mostly contingent instructors as using labor "in the mode of information", which means that a person must be "flexible" and deliver their labor "on demand" and "just in time."

Gary Rhoades (2013), in his article, "Disruptive Innovations for Adjunct Faculty: Common Sense for the Common Good," addresses these exploitative labor practices and offers several practical, disruptive innovations to counter them through, ironically, the use of technology. He suggests countering just-in-time hiring by disclosing this practice through online surveys such as the New Faculty Majority's Back-to-School-Survey (*NFMF-Back-to-School-Survey*, 2014). In addition, he suggests using departmental websites to make contingent faculty more visible and accessible, thus putting a face on "Professor Staff." Perhaps faculty are already using Facebook and Twitter to counter these troubling trends, yet how extensive this practice is and whether it will be enough to make a widespread difference remains to be seen.

To counter the tenuous and disconnected nature of "at-will" employment, tenured and contingent faculty must demand due process for hiring and renewal decisions. Rhoades (2013) notes,

> In most higher education settings, renewal decisions regarding contingent faculty, particularly of part-time faculty, are characterized by an extreme degree of managerial discretion. There is extraordinarily little peer involvement or due process (p. 80).

He suggests using the Higher Education Contract Analysis System (HECAS)— an online tool from the NEA that provides a searchable database— for contract templates. These guidelines can be referred to when new hires review the contracts they enter into with the university.

In addition, the NEA, the AAUP, and the AFT have taken positions regarding the use of distance learning and the intellectual property rights of the creators of distance learning curricula. Calling on his experience as a freelance writer and online instructor, Paul Collins offers several suggestions for protecting intellectual property. "Because writers and their unions already have much hard-won experience with these issues, academic unions and professional groups would be wise to cultivate relations with writer's groups, and even retain copyright lawyers" (Collins, 2003). Furthermore, looking at the issue in the long term, Collins argues that instructors would be better able to safeguard their rights if it were to become a condition of accreditation for the institution.

Educators who wish to counteract the negative neoliberal trends that obstruct academic freedom must initiate the conversations that offer possibilities, and they must actively work toward the goals of democratic education. Many organizations are working toward those ends and one that has been in existence for over twenty years and openly struggles against outsourcing, privatization, and the corporatization of education is the political action committee, National Association for Multicultural Education (NAME). In its position statement against educational teacher performance assessments, NAME notes that it is:

> committed to respecting and appreciating cultural diversity, ending racism and discrimination, promoting economic justice, and developing curricula that are culturally responsible and responsive….Further, NAME rejects any incursion of outsourced, private, corporate interests into this sensitive and critical human work, deeming it contradictory to our commitment to critical multicultural public schools that are responsive to the voices of the communities they serve, and seek to develop a socially and economically just world. (*NAME Position Statement on the edTPA*, 2014)

Campus activism and political involvement can be supported by reclaiming the discourse about the purpose of education and the role of higher education in society. For example, the Campaign for the Future of Higher Education was formed in 2011 as a coalition of faculty, students, labor and nonprofit organizations. Their mission is to make sure that higher education is accessible and affordable to everyone. Among the factors the organization lists that contributes to the crisis faced by higher education is defunding by states that leads to higher costs and decreased access for low-income students, and "reforms" that are not sufficiently scrutinized for their effectiveness or consequences. Taking note of the current discourses, its website states, "Calls for "accountability" and "efficiency" too often lead to lower quality and away from rich educational experiences for students" (*About/Contact*, 2014). It further declares, "To make sure that these changes are good for students and our country, we need to REFRAME

THE CURRENT DEBATE (emphasis in original) to focus on quality higher education as an essential right for our democracy" (*Join the Campaign for the Future of Higher Education,* 2014).

**Redirecting the Discourse of Education**

By revisiting the fundamental goals of education, we can interrogate practices that fragment and displace labor, and the discourses that support the neoliberal trends occurring on campus, as well as the changes in the curricula that emphasize test scores and promote fragmented, disconnected knowledge. With democratic equality as the goal, it is necessary to change the question from "How do we raise test scores?" to, "How do we teach toward the goal of educating students to become citizens who are capable of active democratic participation in society?" If democratic equality is the goal, this question must be asked on a continual basis. Democracy is not a *fait accomplis*; it is a process of becoming. As Dewey (1916/1966) articulated it, it is "a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience" (p. 87).

In an effort to bring back democratic practices to higher education, Henry Giroux (2002) proposes creating a bill of rights "identifying and outlining the range of non-commercial relations that can be used to mediate between the higher education and the business world" and further implores,

> If the forces of corporate culture are to be challenged, progressive educators must also enlist the help of diverse communities, local and federal government, and other political forces to ensure that public institutions of higher learning are adequately funded so that they will not have to rely on corporate sponsorship and advertising revenues. (p. 113)

In addition to the political action it promotes, Giroux's bill of rights counteracts the discourse of the so-called "academic bill of rights" that in fact aims to limit academic freedom (Mattson, 2005). Giroux's proposal also provides an opportunity for a teachable moment that can include students in the drafting a bill of rights— thus creating an important lesson in civic engagement.

The freedom to learn and the freedom to teach are two of the principles of academic freedom as set forth by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) nearly one hundred years ago. As its *Declaration of Principles* explicates, "Academic freedom in this sense comprises three elements: freedom of inquiry and research; freedom of teaching within the university or college; and freedom of extramural utterance and action" (*Appendix I, 1915 Declaration of principles,* 1915). This anniversary provides an auspicious occasion to re-visit the founding principles of this organization and the philosophies of its founders.

Under the neoliberal schema, the freedom of inquiry and research is in jeopardy when corporate interests dictate the research agenda, and when institutions of higher education usurp intellectual property. Petr Taborsky never expected to go to jail for theft of his own notebooks. The challenge for creators of intellectual property is to guard against such usurpation while at the same time maintaining the collegiality that allows for the free flow of ideas. As knowledge has become a commodity, it is more important than ever to ensure that it remains in the public domain rather than in the marketplace. Knowledge must be shared and easily accessible and one avenue for doing this is through teaching.

It is important to continue to revisit what *teaching* means— in the same way that the concept *democracy* needs constant attention lest it become a quaint, old-fashioned, and irrelevant notion. Teaching needs to be reclaimed as a profession, as a holistic set of practices that aims to enlighten and stimulate the imaginations of the students and the teacher. Teaching is meant to engage students; it is not meant as an activity to be "delivered" like a package for student "consumption." The direction, administration, and guidance of students through a course of study are but steps in the process, not ends in themselves. The "management" of a course should not be detached from the overall process if the instructor is to be truly involved in the entire process of teaching.

When the teaching function is fragmented it becomes vulnerable to outsourcing which puts the system of tenure at risk, and also puts academic freedom at risk. Tenure, by and large, does not apply to distance

learning or to contingent faculty. Furthermore, it is in the interests of distance learning companies and contingent labor to avoid controversial issues and those that may reflect negatively on themselves or on the company. Outsourcing has a direct impact on pedagogy— on **how** the student learns, and the loss of academic freedom has a direct impact on the curriculum— on **what** the student learns. Delivering "course content" in this fragmented way can never substitute for the sparks of insight that occur in knowledge communities that engage creatively with challenging ideas in a space of academic freedom.

E-learning is one of many teaching methods, and technology can be an important aid to teaching and learning. However, discussions about the role of technology in education must also take account of the real purpose behind the use of technology. Is technology being used to enhance the educational experience (thereby advancing the freedom to learn and the freedom to teach) or is it being used to undercut the labor involved in the teaching process (thereby thwarting the freedom to teach and the freedom to learn)? The concept of freedom to learn is especially relevant today as rising tuition fees preclude access to higher education for more and more students. The concept of the freedom to teach is pertinent as tenured academic labor becomes a more tenuous goal and both the freedom to learn and the freedom to teach are threatened when technology applied to educational endeavors is used in the service of the profit motive.

As the percentage of tenure and tenure track faculty diminishes, so too does the professional status of faculty and their authority over curriculum decisions, input concerning departmental affairs, and campus-wide decision-making. David Noble (1998b) summed it up this way:

> For faculty and their organizations it is a struggle not only over proprietary control of course materials per se but also over their academic role, their autonomy and integrity, their future employment, and the future of quality education. (p. 817)

Related to the struggle described above by Noble is the AAUP's founding principle of "freedom of extramural utterance and action." Robert Buckingham, the aforementioned Dean at the University of Saskatchewan never expected curtailment of his freedom of speech for his critical stance on the privatization planned for his university. However, as universities face the current realities of globalization, outsourcing, marketization (university as business entity), commercialization (commercial enterprises on campus, branding rights), corporatization (endowments and sponsorships from corporations), managerialism (University presidents now called CEOs who run the university on business principles), "restructuring" (tenured faculty replaced with contingent labor) commodification of knowledge (having attained economic currency), "redesigning" of curriculum and implementation of "course ware", privatization and the diminution of the "public good", it is imperative that everyone affect by these changes has the right to freely engage in discussion.

By revisiting such fundamental notions as "democracy", "teaching", "knowledge", and "education" we can engage in discussions that are relevant to current circumstances and begin to question the discourses that take us away from the primary ideals of higher education and the *democratic equality* goal that strives to provide equal access for all students in order to produce an educated citizenry capable of taking part in a democratic society. While we may question whether we can be Davids slaying Goliath or whether the corporate juggernaut is unstoppable, it is in that struggle and in that discussion that democracy abides. Change is inevitable and the future of higher education may take new forms to provide that education, with new learning technologies, and physical arrangements, as well as different labor provisions, but such transformations must always take account of democratic ideals if public education is not to become a completely privatized exercise in a competitive struggle to own and exploit knowledge that should rightfully be employed in the service to society as well as to the individual.

## ACKOWLEDGEMENTS

**REFERENCES**

About the project on student debt. (n. d.). *Institute for College Access & Success*. Retrieved from http://projectonstudentdebt.org/about.vp.html.

About/contact (2012). *Campaign for the Future of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://futureofhighered.org/about/.

Adjunct dissertation chair, Graduate school. (2014). *HigherEdJobs*. Retrieved from http://www.higheredjobs.com/search/details.cfm?JobCode=175894706&Title=Adjunct%20Dissertation%20Chair%2C%20Graduate%20School

Alamenciak, T. (2014, May 14). University of Saskatchewan fires dean who criticized spending cuts. *The Star.com Canada.* Retrieved from http://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2014/05/14/dean_who_challenged_university_cuts_is_stripped_of_job_tenure_and_access_to_campus.html.

Appendix I 1915 Declaration of principles on academic freedom and academic tenure. (1915). *American Association of University Professors*. Retrieved from http://www.aaup.org/report/1915-declaration-principles-academic-freedom-and-academic-tenure.

Apple, M. W. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum*. (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Biemiller, L. (2014, April, 30). QuickWire: ConnectEDU files for bankruptcy. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/blogs/wiredcampus/quickwire-connectedu-files-for-bankruptcy-protection/52179.

Business-Higher Education Forum. (2014). *Business-Higher Education Forum.* Retrieved from http://www.bhef.com/.

BHEF Member Meeting (Winter 2013). Thursday, February 21, 2013 to Friday, February 22, 2013. Retrieved from http://www.bhef.com/news-events/events/bhef-member-meeting-winter-2013

Bousquet, M. (2003). The information university. Retrieved from http://www.electronicbookreview.com/thread/technocapitalism/muscular.

Citizens must act. (n.d.) *StudentLoanJustice.Org*. Retrieved from http://www.studentloanjustice.org/

Cohen, A. M & Kisker, C. B. (2010). *The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system.* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Collins, P. (2003). What's mine is mine, and what's yours is mine: Ownership in online universities. Retrieved from http://electronicbookreview.com/thread/technocapitalism/contractual.

DeQuine, J. (1996, July 11). Volatile mix of corporate cash and academic ideals. *Christian Science Monitor*. Retrieved from http://www.cptech.org/ip/csm.html.

de Vise, D. (2012, April 22). *At Virginia Tech, computers help solve a math class problem* Retrieved from *http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/at-virginia-tech-compute*.

Dewey, J. (1916/1966). *Democracy and Education.* New York: Free Press.

Emporium. *Oxford Dictionaries*. Retrieved from Retrieved from http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/american_english/emporium

Five critical implementation issues. (2006). *The National Center for Academic Transformation.* Retrieved from http://www.thencat.org/PlanRes/R2R_Imp_Issues.htm.

Giroux, H. (2002). The corporate war against higher education. *Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor*, 9, 103-117.

Goodman, A. & Gonzalez, J. (Hosts). (2014, May 23). Exclusive: Chilean Robin Hood? Artist known as "Papas Fritas" on burning $500M worth of student debt. *Democracy Now*. Retrieved from http://www.democracynow.org/2014/5/23/exclusive_chilean_robin_hood_artist_known.

Grossman, R. (1997, March 21). Patently unfair: Researcher scoops world with discovery, ends up on chain gang. *Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved from http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1997-03-21/features/9703210317_1_cat-litter-chain-gang-petr-taborsky

Guerlac, S. (2011). Humanities 2.0: e-learning in the digital world. *Representations, 116*(1) 102-127.

Hartlep, N. D. & Eckrich, L .L. T. (2013). Ivory tower graduates in the red: The role of debt in higher education. *Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor* 22, 82-97.

Hassard, J. (2012, November 19). Why education must be public & not privatized. Retrieved from http://nepc.colorado.edu/blog/why-education-must-be-public-not-privatized.

Historical Perspective. (2013). *Florida Gulf Coast University.* Retrieved from http://www.fgcu.edu/info/HistoricalPerspective.asp.

How does eAdvisor benefit me? (n. d.). *Arizona State University*. Retrieved from https://eadvisor.asu.edu/.

Join the campaign for the future of higher education! (2014). *Campaign for the Future of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://futureofhighered.org/.

Katz, R. N., Ferrara, E. M., & Napier, I. S. (2002). *Distributed education: Challenges, choices, and a new environment.* (Partnerships in Distributed Education). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Kolowich, S. (2014, May 21) Middlebury faculty seeks to cut ties with online-education Company. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/blogs/wiredcampus/author/skolowich.

Lababree, D. F. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal, 34*(1), 39-81.

Lave, R, Mirowski, P. & Randalls, S. (2010, October). Introduction: STS and neoliberal science. *Social Studies of Science, 40*(5), 659-675.

Lehman, R. M. & Conceição, S. C.O. (2013). *Motivating and retaining online students: Research-based strategies that work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lyall, K. C. & Sell, K. R. (2006, January-February). The de facto privatization of American public higher education. *Change, 38*(1), 6-13.

Maisto, M. (2009, September 10). The adjunct's moment of truth. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2009/09/10/maisto.

Mattson, K. (2005, April 4). A student bill of fights. *The Nation*.16-18.

McQuail, J. (2014, Summer). Contingent realities for women: National and regional trends. *Modern Language Studies, 44*(1), 51-71.

Merryfield, M. (2000, Fall). Using electronic technologies to promote equity and cultural diversity in social studies and global education. *Theory and Research in Social Education 28*(4), 502-526.

Miller, B. (2010, May). The course of innovation: Using technology to transform higher education. Washington, D.C.: Education Sector Reports.

Minsky, L. (2000). Dead souls: The aftermath of Bayh-Dole. In White, G. D. with Hauck, F. C. (Eds.) *Campus Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower* (pp. 95-106). Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

Mission and organization. (2014). *EDUCAUSE*. Retrieved from http://www.educause.edu/about/mission-and-organization.

NAME position statement on the edTPA. (2014). *National Association for Multicultural Education*. Retrieved from http://nameorg.org/blog/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Statement-rr-edTPA-1-21-14.pdf.

New data confirm troubling student loan default problems: For-profit colleges still have highest rate. (2013, September 30). [press release]. *Institute for College Access and Success*. Retrieved from http://www.ticas.org/search_g.php?cx=001768047319358177660%253Aso8447y_2wk&cof=FORID%253A10&ie=UTF-8&q=new+data+confirm&sa=Search&siteurl=www.ticas.org%252F&ref=&ss=3752j1136418j16.

New instructional roles. (2007, March 18-20). *Redesign Alliance agenda annual conference* Retrieved from http://www.thencat.org/RedesignAlliance/Agenda.htm.

NFMF back to school survey. (2014). *New Faculty Majority Foundation*. Retrieved from http://www.nfmfoundation.org/NFMF-Back-to-School-Survey.html.

Nichol, L. (2013, February). Saving City College of San Francisco: Faculty initiate campus and community coalition. Retrieved from http://www.socialism.com/drupal-6.8/articles/saving-city-college-san-francisco-faculty-initiate-campus-and-community-coalition.

Noble, D. F. (1998a, Autumn). Digital diploma mills, Part 1: The automation of higher education. *October, 86,* 107-117.

Noble, D. F. (1998b). Digital diploma mills Part II: The coming battle over online instruction. *Sociological perspectives, 41*(4), 815-825.

Noble, D. F. (2001, September - October). The future of the faculty in the digital diploma mill. *Academe, 87*(5), 27-32.

Perry, D. M. (2014, March 17) Faculty members are not cashiers: Why the 'customer service' lingo in academe is bad for students. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Faculty-Members-Are-Not/145363.

Program in course redesign (PCR). (2006). *The National Center for Academic Transformation*. Retrieved from http://www.thencat.org/PCR.htm.

Ravitch, D. (2010). *The death and life of the great American school system: How testing and choice are undermining education*. New York: Basic Books.

Rhoades, G. (2013, Fall). Disruptive innovations for adjunct faculty: Common sense for the common good. *Thought & Action,* 71-86.

Rhoads, R. A. & Torres, C. A. (Eds.). (2006). *The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Rhoads, R. A. & Rhodes, G. (2006). Graduate student unionization as a post-industrial social movement: Identity, ideology and the contested US academy. In R.A Rhoads & C.A. Torres (Eds.), *The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Ross, E. W. (2000, Fall). The promise and perils of e-learning. *Theory and Research in Social Education. 28*(4), 482-492.

Rovai, T, & Wighting M. J. (2005). Feelings of alienation and community among higher education students in a virtual classroom. *Internet and Higher Education,* 8, 97–110.

Sanchez, C. (Reporter) Edwards, B. (Host). (1996, September 30). Disputes rise over intellectual property rights [Transcript # 1966-10]. *Morning Edition, National Public Radio*.

Slaughter, S. & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Solman, P. (2014, February 6). Is academia suffering from 'adjunctivitis'? Low-paid adjunct professors struggle to make ends meet. Retrieved from http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/is-academia-suffering-adjunctivitis/.

Stanford Online. (n.d.) *Stanford University.* Retrieved from http://online.stanford.edu/courses/all#top.

State Higher Education Executive Officers Association. (n.d). *Figure 6, Educational appropriations per FTE percent change by state, fiscal 2007-2012.* 30. Retrieved from http://www.sheeo.org/resources/publications/shef-%E2%80%94-state-higher-education-finance-fy12.

TICAS recommends big changes to Pell Grants, student loans, tax benefits. (2013, February 12). *The Institute for College Access and Success.* [press release]. Retrieved from http://www.ticas.org/pub_view.php?idx=874.

Twigg, C. (2006). Changing the equation: Facts at a glance narrative. *The National Center for Academic Transformation.* Retrieved from http://thencat.org/Mathematics/CTE/CTE_FactsNarrative.html.

Valimaa, J. & Hoffman, D. (2008). Knowledge society discourse and higher education. *Higher Education, 56*(3), 265-285.

Ward, S. C. (2012). *Neoliberalism and the global restructuring of knowledge and education.* New York: Routledge.

Wees, D. (2012, April 29). The Math Emporium - The Walmart of higher education. *The Reflective Educator.* [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://davidwees.com/content/math-emporium-walmart-higher-education.

White, G. D. with Hauck, F. C. (eds.) (2000). *Campus Inc.: Corporate power in the ivory tower.* Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

Whitehead, A. N. (1967). *The aims of education*. New York: Free Press.

Who we are. (2006). *The National Center for Academic Transformation.* Retrieved from http://www.thencat.org/whoweare.html.

Workplace competencies. (2014). *Business-Higher Education Forum*. Retrieved from http://www.bhef.com/our-work/workplace-competencies.

AFFILIATIONS

*Ellen Boesenberg* is a doctoral student in the School of Education at Binghamton University in Binghamton, N. Y.