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Pedagogy and Institutional Crisis: Higher Education as Public Good and Scholarly Advocacy After the Pandemic
Introduction

In January 2021, the auditing and consulting firm Deloitte and Strata Education Network released “The 10 shifts for the post-COVID university” (Selingo et al., 2021). Its authors argue that the COVID-19 pandemic is remaking the university around a “technology-enabled student experience.” The business sector of this transformation, they write (Ibid., p. 4):

Think of the hybrid campus as similar to the retail model that sits somewhere between the physical world, with little distinction between the two. Many retailers that started online also operate physical locations to spark sales on their websites and increase customer loyalty. Most customers, however, don’t really care between the two. The same thing happens when we shop at Home Depot, which started as a catalog company. We don’t differentiate between buying online or driving to the store. What’s critical here for institutions is not the technology necessarily but the changes to campus culture and operating models that go with online acquisition and deployment of new tools.

The report quickly made a splash. In his blog for Inside Higher Ed, Kim (2021) welcomed the use of retail-style restructuring the university and called on administrators to begin thinking about implementation. Others were more worrying when offered as a response to the pandemic and its related economic recession. Prior to March 2020, already a troubled economic sector as the tuition-dependent fiscal model of US colleges and universities was unsustainable. The sudden shift toward distance learning off-campus led many students to think twice about in-person housing costs. The result for some small colleges was insolvency and permanent closure (Nietzel, 2021). In the same way that businesses seek economic efficiency, distance learning can enable universities to improve instruction with minimal faculty and reduce institutional costs by eliminating instructional positions. Such changes are easily justified as an extension of fiscal austerity frameworks already practiced by higher education leaders consistent with the use of the university as a site of “workforce development” rather than an institution.

In this chapter, I argue that scholars ought to resist the use of education technology to further austerity for higher education. In this way, I mean that scholars must engage policymakers inside and outside of demand resources for the provision of a variety of pedagogical modalities. This objective requires rethinking the notion that universities ought to be subject to market forces. Rather than treat universities as a consumer goods to students as customers, we should defend education as a public good worthy of public funding. As Fabian argued (1916, 1938), education is necessary for a democratic society. It provides a site for reflective democracy that can learn to logically weigh the merits of various ideas and recognize their obligations to each other as citizens. In the aftermath of the Trump presidency and its authoritarian overtones, democratic education is needed more than ever. I argue that we must help students to defend formal rule of law and informal democratic norms, two aspects of democratic institutions that are under attack by aspiring authoritarians (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018). By reviving the university’s role as a public good, we can contribute to the preservation of a democratic society while simultaneously accounting for past injustices.

This argument is not new and has long been made by critical pedagogy scholars (Fabricant & Brier, 2018). However, the “political time” (Skowronek, 2008) in which our current crisis unfolds is certainly new and then more than half say that the federal government, large businesses, and state governments are the leading causes of economic hardship (Harris Interactive, 2020). This trend has fed a dynamic support for wealth redistribution and the strengthening of public services.
helpful to those institutions, unless they are absorbed by public university systems. In addition, my argument recognize that notions of social democracy which animate my argument have little purchase in developing nations where the position in the world economy has never afforded them resource flows which enable a Keynesian welfare state. The movement toward increased economic regulation and redistribution is one that ought to be considered.

merely an idea of the Global North—the New International Economic Order (NIEO) is a product of the Global South. Increased advocacy for public support should be understood as part of a greater need to regulate the way that global governance and provide economic rights to all.

I proceed in the following way. First, I discuss how the pandemic exacerbated higher education’s existing vulnerabilities by squandering the present political opportunity to challenge higher education austerity. Last, I suggest how scholars can identify new areas of funding for universities.

**Austerity and the Pandemic: Higher Education’s Perfect Storm**

Before the pandemic, the fiscal model for higher education faced significant structural challenges. Universities have faced the same personnel costs faced by all employers across the economy. They relied on a variety of revenue sources for expenses, including increased tuition paid and fees paid by individual students and their families as well as increased philanthropic giving. However, macroeconomic and political dynamics have placed this fiscal model under stress. As universities were forced to cut costs, they subsequently drove students into five- and six-figure sums of debt and unwittingly provoked a social crisis of a college education (Lapovsky, 2013). Today, universities are staring down a “demographic cliff” of declining enrollments, higher tuition, the Trump administration’s xenophobic immigration policies combined with the pandemic’s confinement orders, and declining state funding, forcing universities to increase tuitions even more (Quintin, 2020). Philanthropy has been an uneven source of revenue for universities, receiving far less in private donations compared to selective counterparts and yet are locked into a revenue model with them for both faculty and students (Cheslock & Giannesi, 2008, see also Ba, Chapter 7).

All universities developed these novel sources of revenue over the past decade, but public universities were more reliant on declining state assistance. Since the 2008 financial crisis, public universities have faced a loss of $3.4 billion in funding which led to a 4% reduced spending on higher education by 11.6% per student (Jackson & Saenz, 2021). Public divestment was part of the broader trend toward fiscal conservatism and austerity budgeting which swept across the Eastern world during the 1970s (Blyth, 2002; Swartz, 2013). Policymakers adopted neoliberal economic practices which have failed. The notion that competition for private investment would fuel economic growth led to the rise of austerity battles to cut public spending in order to cut taxes. These policies are directly correlated to cuts in state assistance, particularly between 1961 and 2001 (Archibald & Feldman, 2006). When applied in the aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis, these policies triggered department closures and layoffs across US public universities. The entrenched acceptance of state dependence by Feldman to suggest that state universities “shift from being state-supported to state-affiliated or state-based, becoming less dependent on public funding (Ibid., 2010, p. 239). States would subsidize students rather than universities.

The broad adoption of neoliberal practices had additional effects on university governance and the production of students. The assumed economic efficiencies associated with markets led universities to develop public-private partnerships with private corporations to provide a variety of university functions, including bank management, dormitories and cafeterias as well as information technology software. Policymakers encouraged the public-private model to build entire new campuses or as a means of spurring economic development. For example, the University of Texas and Texas A&M at the Research Park in College Station, Texas, and major research universities in Atlanta, Los Angeles, and New York City.
Blankenberger and Williams (2020) call for accountability and oversight regarding how universities respond. But broader questions remain: to what set of norms will universities be held accountable? If neoliberal standards remain dominant, cost cutting becomes the appropriate response. In this context, the shift to distance learning can compel universities to reduce personnel costs and rely more in forms of pedagogy that minimize face-to-face interaction and online learning. While students at elite private colleges will continue to receive multiple forms of instruction and learning styles, students at public universities will have far fewer choices. The result may be increased reliance on online learning without institutional support rather than fulfilling the proactive recommendations made in Chapters 11 and 12, respectively.

As scholars, we should view the prospect of a two-tier higher education sector as a direct threat to our own futures and ourselves are students of politics who are bound by a commitment to educating every interested person for active participation in a democratic society. Achieving this objective requires reflective pedagogies that enable students to engage in continuous personal growth. We must provide students with social experiences which allow them to question and challenge institutions and propose new ones through deliberative interactions with their peers (Dewey, 1938). If our mission is implemented through dominant norms that promote efficiency and cost-cutting, the vast majority of students will be denied access to such opportunities. We must also recognize that the onset of the pandemic has caused the academic calendar to distance learning is institutionalized in ways that enable universities to avoid hiring full-time faculty, we are facing a significant recovery. Current doctoral students will be denied the possibility of a meaningful academic career, and some employment will be consigned to the use of cost-efficient pedagogies. Even if resource-rich private institutions continue to benefit from these trends, even their students will struggle to find a full-time position.

Reframing the Meaning of Higher Education

To preserve equal access to quality pedagogy as well as the future of the academic profession, I argue that we should reject public funding for higher education. To be clear: we should not harbor any illusions that the university can be saved by the private model and reject the use of distance learning. Doing so would deny some students who do benefit from fully remote or blended models, pedagogies which may be helpful to them. Instead, we should ensure that state funding is used to support instruction in all forms. Achieving this goal requires that state institutions increase their public funding to universities and overcome neoliberal expectations about university management.

The contemporary political climate creates an opportunity to challenge these norms. Scholars of American politics present political contention as a struggle among coalitions with alternative visions of the political order (Skowronek, 2008). As “political time” unfolds (Skowronek, 2008), some coalitions institutionalize their preferred regime by blocking alternatives. These moments take place during disjunctive presidencies, in which the old regime collapses and rehabilitation and a new regime is inaugurated by a transformative president. For Skowronek (2020) 2008, assuming that the conservative regime institutionalized by Ronald Reagan and the Republican Party—the institutionalized neoliberal norms of economic governance—is breaking down (Kreitner 2020). What remains is a collapse of the ancien régime suggests that a transition away from governance based on market logics should recognize these events as an opportunity to redefine the value of public education and demand an effective governance of institutions.

Evidence of this opportunity is widespread. As recently as 2016, 67% of Americans were found to support increasing public funding (Sawhill and Pulliam 2019)(ANES, 2016; see also Brookings, 2019). Similar policies have become a priority for leaning Democrats, including Senators Bernard Sanders and Elizabeth Warren, as well as growing blocs of Republicans.
Defending higher education as a public good can complement emerging norms within the university. Struggles for equality have led universities to mainstream Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI). Universities dedicate administrative positions toward fostering institutional cultures that enable all community members to feel the consciousness of how historically marginalized peoples are excluded from US institutions. But DEI initiatives have often been co-opted by market logics which treat education as a means to adapt to economic competition. Instead, we need a radical critique of inclusion and promote an “education of transfiguration,” (Bourassa, 2019, p. 19) one that is informed by the knowledge of subaltern peoples and works toward a more equal society. A more emanate possible if we treat it as a right to which all persons are entitled, but it requires curriculum and resources and instructors that challenge neoliberal norms. Most importantly, it requires hiring persons of color, especially scholars, who have been historically marginalized in institutions of higher institution. As we describe the importance of education essential to the creation of a multiracial democracy, we can justify policies that guarantee these resources.

Framing higher education as a public good also overlaps with growing awareness of obstacles to college; federal financial aid programs offer assistance to students seeking a college education, their stringent requirements as well as complex bureaucratic procedures leave many students behind (Goldrick-Rab, 2013). Similar problems. New York State’s Excelsior Scholarship requires that students complete thirty credit hours a requirement which many students who work part-time or have other commitments are unable to meet. While university education as a societal benefit can be mutually supportive of proposals to reform financial aid, if higher education is supportive of a democratic society, then it ought to be publicly funded and students graduate without incurring significant debt.

**Advocacy for State Support of Public Universities**

Reimagining the purpose of university education is only the first step in ensuring new technology is adopted by students. The second, and more important, involves compelling government institutions to raise revenue for education. Scholars should incentivize policymakers to enact redistributive policies and treat public education as tax dollars. This is no easy task. Success requires that scholars go beyond merely the study of politics and advocacy. We know how to do this. Many of us study how social movements and political institutions influence policy outcomes. By putting our own expertise into practice, we can ensure that all students can enjoy the benefits of a college education without sacrificing in-person instruction to the need for cost cutting.

The key target of scholarly advocacy must be state governments which ostensibly manage public universities and educate governors and legislators on the ways in which higher education has suffered under austerity budgets and decades of pre-pandemic budget cuts have devastated our ability to educate our students. Nonprofit universities are exposed to the public benefits to their respective constituencies. They do, however, often voice success, rising graduation rates, democratic governance, and racial equality. We should call on policymakers to abide by their deeds. Funding public higher education can enable them to meet the above objectives and ensure that such resources are available to students regardless of their institutional affiliation.

Educating policymakers is only one step. The other involves educating ourselves about state budget priorities political mobilization. Based on my own experience, most faculty and staff at universities are unaware of the priorities of state lawmakers. How budget processes begin, when they are initiated during a state’s fiscal year, and how between executives and legislatures is information that is meaningless unless one is actively invested in educating ourselves about budget processes and reducing uncertainty regarding public university funding. We must engage in basic forms of advocacy common to democratic citizenship. These include direct phone and
Mobilizing faculty to advocate for funding and basic mission of the university will not be easy. Unlike other professional groups such as the American Medical Association which operate as a unified collective. The discipline-specific focus of our scholarly organizations, combined with the separate educational unions, has created a more fragmented landscape. Some organize academic conferences and promote pedagogical innovations while others focus specifically on labor protections. We should generally respect their staffing and budgetary limitations, neither APSA nor ISA should get into the business of political advocacy.

However, our professional organizations can promote greater engagement by their members in the labor movement and supporting organizations. They can foster a culture of advocacy that encourages political scientists and other union activists to connect with policy makers. At the organizational level, leaders and representatives should build cooperative relationships with the higher education leadership of national unions, as well as with the leadership of local progressive organizations that promote economic redistribution. Union organizers and leaders can work with state legislatures to sponsor legislation that protects workers’ rights and provide information about budget processes to associations, which can then distribute such information to their members. APSA and ISA should be well aware of budgetary threats or opportunities and encourage their members to mobilize accordingly.

Third, we should acknowledge that the dynamics of political polarization will enable scholarly advocacy to some success in some states than others. When Republicans control both legislatures and executive chambers, revenue improvements are most likely in states that feature one-party rule by Democrats in which existing movements are quite strong and policymakers are likely to be more receptive. However, if the present political moment of transition from our existing governing regime to another, then demands for raising taxes on the superwealthy will not only public institutions will only grow stronger. In this context, it is plausible to expect that redistribution of revenue will increase in swing states outside of Democratic strongholds. As social movements and organized labor continue to join as partners and demand that additional revenue is dedicated toward public universities.

### Conclusion

In this chapter, I have argued that stronger political advocacy on the part of scholars can enable us to transform the contemporary political moment and ensure that higher education institutions remain viable in the future. I have also asked if these suggestions are overly optimistic and rely on a rosy picture of the mobilization potential of the faculty. I agree that rosy projections about our own agency will be unrealistic. The fiscal problems faced by public universities are extraordinary and will not be solved with rallies and protests. However, sustained reinvestment in public universities, even at moderate levels, will only be possible if faculty and staff embrace public advocacy and put higher education on the agenda. If policymakers have to answer for flat funding or reductions, they will be less likely to continue providing support.

The need for greater advocacy dovetails with this volume’s multiple recommendations regarding how to respond to the pandemic. Technology that enables online learning can be pedagogically useful if faculty, organizational, and institutional resources to employ them. Doing so is necessary to ensure that disadvantaged students can overcome the variety of barriers they may face while also preserving a role for in-person learning. Without such resources, faculty will struggle to provide quality educational experiences while students will struggle to learn the skills of learning modalities, none of which receive necessary institutional support. The scarring experience of the pandemic should remind us of how difficult that instructional environment will be. The potential for future disruptions, whether they be health crisis or other emergency, should motivate us to take seriously the need for more stable funding.


Some might question this statement as a containing a hidden liberal ideological bias—indeed, some conservatives have argued universities discriminate against conservatives and conservative thought. They might claim that my proposal, consistent with the education agenda of indoctrinating students with liberal or leftist political orientations. However, these arguments are a straw man. Recent survey data to demonstrate that over 90% of US college students reported not experiencing pressure to adopt the beliefs of funded college education can do is enable students to have open and honest conversations that expose them to various perspectives. Opposition to fully funding public universities would ultimately undermine such educational experiences.

According to data analyzed by Wolbrecht, IR job postings for tenure-track positions declined from 143 in 2018–2019 to 65 noted across other major political science fields. See Christina Wolbrecht, Twitter post, February 11, 2021, 4:44 pm: https://twitter.com/C_Wolbrecht/status/1359981596594601986/photo/1.

Faculty and staff at SUNY New Paltz organized around contract negotiations between their union, United University Professionals (UUP), and Governor Andrew Cuomo. After a semester of rallies and protests which incorporated state senate candidates and primary challengers to the governor, they concluded contract negotiations with UUP in June 2018 and accepted merit raises and salary compression bonuses, two proposals previously opposed.

Arguments against the tax flight myth are not new. See Tannenwald et al. (2011).

These are the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, and the American Association of University Professors. An organization promoting economic redistribution is People’s Action.

We already see similar policy initiatives gaining traction at both the international, federal, and state levels. Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen is currently negotiating with G7 countries about a global minimum corporate tax rate which would lessen tax competition among developed nations. The Biden administration is proposing a variety of tax increases on the superwealthy (Iacurci, 2021). The New York State legislature is considering increases in its 2022 budget (Vielkind, 2021).