

ROUGHLY EDITED COPY

University of Montana
Future of Public Education Lecture
February 23, 2017, 8:00 P.M. EST

CAPTIONING PROVIDED BY:
ALTERNATIVE COMMUNICATION SERVICES, LLC
PO BOX 278
LOMBARD, IL 60148

* * * * *

This is being provided in a rough-draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

>> Good evening. I'm delighted to provide a few remarks as a prelude to what is certain to be an informative and thought-provoking lecture. The sociology department is one of the largest in the college of humanities and sciences and offers students the opportunity to pursue general sociology degrees or pursue one or both specializations in -- [indiscernible] or criminology. At both the graduate and undergraduate levels, students prepare for positions in communities across Montana and beyond. These positions span across all sectors, public, private, and non-private, and offer our graduates the opportunity to improve the quality of life for a wide range of individuals.

The sociology speaker series is one of several events posted on the University of Montana's campus, which provides a venue for intellectual discourse and reflection and represents a central purpose of the academic enterprise. This series began in 2015 with a generous gift from Scott and Sally [indiscernible] for the purpose of allowing the speakers of national reputation to pro set their research to members of our campus and surrounding communities. This series has provided support for engagement with not only speakers external to UM, but as supported the presentation of the exit work of our own distinguished faculty.

These speakers have addressed the range of issues, including behavior, group behavior and dynamics, the importance of social service organizations that focus on social equity, social justice, and my own personal favorite, issues on public policy.

This evening's lecture focuses on the timely topic of the future of the public university and is co-sponsored by the college of humanity and sciences, the department of

communication studies, the department of history, the African-American studies program, the department of anthropology and the department of society and conservation. Both [indiscernible] have distinguished themselves through phenomenal administrative academic and scholarly accomplishment. Their commitment to expanding the visibility of these topics and importance of this discipline this knowledge and research is reflected in the support they have provided in this lecture series. On a personal note, I am particularly pleased to be able to acknowledge the significance of this series for two reasons. First as an undergrad and sociology major, exposure to this discipline was created my passion for understanding the fundamentals of social interaction in our society.

And secondly, my own research has focused on social equity and justice and public policy and public administration as a construct for good governance. I look forward to hearing from our speaker and on behalf of the UM family, thank him for this opportunity.

[Applause]

>> Thank you I want to keep this brief so we can get to the reason we all came here this evening. Thank you for the introduction, and thank you to the [indiscernible] and to the students in the department of sociology who asked our speaker to come, because as I've said, he's probably not going to come unless the students ask him, because he has seen way too much of his colleagues over the course of four decades of research and scholarship.

Housekeeping details, there will be a reception following the speech out in the hall. A professor will handle questions about -- professor Burawoy will handle questions by himself and take as long as he wants. I've given a handout so you can learn a little more about Dr. Burawoy and many of his publications are available online at his own website and I urge you to follow up on those things that might intrigue you.

And the other reason for giving the handout is, like you, I have gone to many a presentation where the person introducing the speaker talks longer than the speaker did and there's an inverse relationship between the quality of the presentation and the length of the introduction. So in the spirit of recognizing how distinguished our speaker is, I'm glad to keep this introduction really short, which is why you have the handout.

But briefly, to locate him in time in the sociological university, he is the past president of the American sociological association, the international sociological association. For the past decade he has written over 30 papers on what public sociology is. Prior to that time he distinguished -- distinguished himself in terms of his [indiscernible] work in Zambia, Hungary, Russia and Chicago. As he says on his own site, it got to the point where he could no longer work in factories so he began to

work on sociology within universities.

His work later focuses on globalization from the bottom up. That is, how do workers cope and deal with increasing globalization, which continues to be a timely subject. But his talk tonight is about the production of knowledge and its dissemination to a variety of audiences. And the topic is especially germane as the University of Montana contemplates its future. Please welcome Professor Michael Burawoy.

[Applause]

>> Can you hear me? Okay.

Well, thank you very much for your introduction, for being here -- [indiscernible] thank you.

>> Can't hear you.

>> I start very quietly. But the volume will increase.

[Laughter]

Thanks very much for your very nice introduction. Scott, I think we must have met 30, 40 years ago in university of Kansas -- 30 years ago. Let's not say 40.

[Laughter]

Yes, when we were sort of at -- visions of the new world.

Yes. Now we're defending an old world currently. But yes, it's just a great pleasure and honor to be here. I know your president is here somewhere, I meant to capture her face as I speak.

>> Oh, no.

[Laughter]

It's really a great pleasure -- the nearest I've been here is probably 40 or 50 years ago -- [indiscernible] and I am not a fly fisherman. That is not why I'm here. But I'm here to talk about something that is actually very important to us today. As Scott said I have spent a lot of my career as a sociologist working in factories in different parts of the world and either I got too old to do blue collar work or factories disappeared. Probably both true. I came home to my own factory, which is the university, and I decided that I would go local and really examine the character of the public university today. I come from the university of California Berkeley and it's going through a major crisis as most public universities are and I felt obligated to examine that and to play a part in trying to think about what its possible future might be. Not just its, but the public university in general. I'm delighted that you have a provost here who has made it in sociology -- majored in sociology. Because actually what you major in will shape the rest of your lives. A very famous sociologist said that the early [indiscernible] really go deep into the bottom and you can never get rid of them. So what I have to say about the administration today obviously will not apply to your local administrators.

[Laughter]

You know better than that.

[Laughter]

Really, I'm very -- I'm going to talk about safer terrain

here. Berkeley.

So look, actually Scott is actually quite right. That one of the major reasons that appealed to come here was the lecture that Peter wrote to me some time ago now inviting me and I would like if you don't mind to read it out, or part of it

>> Sure.

>> I thought it was a wonderful letter and this was clearly an offer I could not refuse.

I didn't know that Scott had put him up to this. But I do believe this was really his letter.

So Dear Professor Burawoy already a great beginning, on behalf of the graduate students of U of M. I am writing to discuss an invitation to discuss your recent thoughts on the vocation of sociology with us. To discuss it with us. Yes.

So it happened at the time I was actually writing an essay called sociology as a vocation.

As members of both the sociological community and the rural west, we assume a precarious role in the academic division of labor. Continual budget cuts in administrative negligence leave our department to negotiate the vicissitudes of our discipline by scrapping us alone.

[Indiscernible].

[Laughter]

Okay. Do you really want me to continue? All right.

We Dodge and weave within and an outside professional, policy and public and critical roles almost continuously. While we take pride in our tactical acumen, we see a need to open a discussion with you regarding long-term strategy. Under graduate and graduate students at the U of M almost invariably gravitate to our discipline to learn how to change society for the better, yet these students often leave U of M with a sense of the rest of society has abandoned societies agenda to suppose false Utopias. How should we teachers and students -- legitimate concerns about feeding themselves with the meager wages that social critique brings most of us.

Then he goes on to talk about the department. We don't need to talk about that. Okay.

So that's why I'm here. Is to try to begin to respond to those questions. And perhaps that we will perhaps focus more precisely on those questions in the Q and A. But I want to give a bigger picture within which those questions can be addressed.

So that is where I will begin.

Now, I am here, I realize that this is a talk that's sponsored by many departments, but I am going to talk still as a sociologist. And I'm just going to remind -- well, perhaps some of the older generations of sociologists, Scott anyhow, who talk about university. On the first -- the first person I want to remind you of, probably the greatest of all -- oops. What happened there? Great.

This is before I begin, let me just tell you, this is 2011.

This is protests against increased student fees that coincided with the occupy movements particularly in Oakland. We came on to campus, saved our university. That's 2011. Yes. And that is really going to sense what does it mean to save our university. Whose university is our university? These are students talking about "our university" but I've got a problem with that. Whose university is the public university? The problem with this is the university of the public. The university of California, the university of Montana. It is not just the student university or the faculty university. A public university is a university of all and we have to, I believe, recognize that. That is where I will conclude. But before I conclude, I'm going to give you 40, 50 minutes of talk.

[Laughter]

Which is supposed to be the foundation of the conclusion. And I will begin that talk with actually this. I don't know if you know this, but sociologists know this, there's one thing that distinguishes sociologists, one is capacity to generate -- [indiscernible]

[Laughter]

That is our reason for existence.

[Laughter]

It is a craft that we have nurtured for a long time. Especially in the United States, I think. Anyway, this is an early one. This is an early 2 by 2 tape generated by what I believe -- [indiscernible] really one of the greatest of U.S. sociologists, world sociologists. And he was very much interested in science, sociology of science and he saw the ethos of science as composed of these four pictures a universalism, an organized skepticism towards universal knowledge, a disinterestedness, and I use the word communism interestingly, but that's collectivism. It's interesting this was written in 1932, when he was trying to actually define an essence of science in the content of potential challenge from outside fascism.

[Indiscernible] not widely known a sympathizer which is probably why he put communism in there. He did not later become continue to be a sympathizer, but in those days many sociologists were such sympathizers. He was not being critical of the emergence of Stalinism in the Soviet union. 2 by 2 table universal but they've always got some sort of project behind them and I think what he's trying to do here is to argue that in a democratic society, this is what science will look like. This is how we have to define, defend science. That was in the context of fascism.

[Indiscernible]

He discovered a whole new sociology, transformed sociology in this country, and in other places in the world. Is anybody here write anything about par sons?

[Indiscernible] you look very young.

[Laughter]

[Indiscernible]

>> Mission accomplished.

>> Three, four people. You know, it's amazing. You must have read Parsons. Probably not -- [indiscernible].
[Away from microphone].

We did pretty good -- he was a very, very significant figure and basically reinvented sociology for everybody. And were against it but it dominated the discourse and this is his imagination. He was brilliant 2 by 2 table, incomprehensible most of them.

[Laughter]

He didn't call it university. He called it the [indiscernible] complex and so essentially his 2X2 table, all his tables actually followed a principle of AGIL. Adaptive, no maintenance -- and basically what he saw here is the prototype of the U.S. university which involves general education for undergraduates, training specialists, research and graduate training and some sort of societal understanding of the knowledge that is societal engagement of university, very unspecified at the time. This was his imagination of the university written at a time of student protests of which he was not very sympathetic, written at a time of student protests in a sense that this is the university we must defend on those critical movements of students, free speech movements, the world movements, civil rights movements, women's movements. Those movements must always take care to defend this vision of the university. So this was written in 1960s. And so that's -- well, '73. I'm sorry. Okay. So it was written in the context of civil society ferment.

So that's the second one.

The third one is a very interesting one that appears in the 1990s with some of you in education know about, an important figure in a book called scholarship reconsidered and basically the 1990s project here was to emphasize that there -- various types of -- scholarship is also about applying knowledge and most importantly also integrating disciplines, knowledges, and most more important, teaching. But we have to actually, this is the 1990s, when students are now paying for their education in public universities. It's important -- focus much more on the importance of good teaching.

And of course also very important in the 1990s, a foundation [indiscernible] was the ways in which teaching and research can be brought together. All sorts of novel ideas were being proposed at that time. I think this was the beginning of a response to the contexts which we now live in, a context in which the university is subject to all sorts of budgetary constraints and has to think about how it is projecting itself.

Well, in a context that began to be anticipated in the 1990s, appeared which I called third-wave marketization. Other people call it neo liberalism. I call it third-wave marketization because this period in which we're living in in which markets seem to penetrate all spheres of society,

this idea of market expansion is not something new. I'm a great devotee of another famous sociologist [indiscernible] bless you, bless him, all through the great transformation. Some of you may have read that book. He talks about the importance of the consequences of marketization, particularly the destructive ones. This is a third wave of marketization, deeper, longer than the previous two. And it involves processes of commodification, he talks about the commodification of labor, the buying of selling of labor in an unregulated way we see that today. We see that precarious labor -- precarious labor, we see that in the modification of nature -- the second fictitious commodities, entities that should not be regulated and the third is the commodification of money which turns out to be nothing other than finance capital, making money from money. How can you make money from money? That's nonsense. But many people are making money from money at the cost of many others. Those are the three entities that he talked about. I think we have to extend it to a fourth commodity. The fourth factor of production. Knowledge. Knowledge is being commodified. But production of knowledge and the dissemination of knowledge. Knowledge was supposed to be for all. But now increasingly we have to pay for it. And you in this audience, young and old, know about that only too well. Though the fees that the university of Montana are by know means as high as they are at other public universities around the country.

Okay. Commodification. All I'm saying what happened to the university outside the context of what is happening to all spheres of society. Finally in a sense these markets have begun to penetrate university. All sorts of problematic consequences.

Into a commodity, you have to extricate it from the context in which it's imbedded and that involves dispossession. When I want to sell my lung, I have to take it out of my body. That of course is a very destructive process. There is of course a lot of training in all of these in our world today. What I want to emphasize is only by analogy that actually just begin to the process of commodification of knowledge is going to involve some process of dispossession and that is why I want to talk about today, in part what I'm going to talk about today is the ways in which the university is changing and those who used to control the university are becoming more and more separated from that control. More and more dispossessed. Yes.

And something I won't talk much about today, though you may want to raise it, is that all of this is taking place in a world economy that is experiencing marketization. And that many of the processes I will talk about today are affecting universities all over the world. But in their own national specificities. But nevertheless, we will see or can see these processes occurring everywhere. And not only that, globalization [indiscernible] universities have to think

globally. Some of them sort of plant satellites in China and middle east, Dubai, dense, condense, [indiscernible] interconnected campuses now. China, Singapore, all these places have Saturday lights of their universities in the United States, and to some extent Europe. So there's globalization of universities moving out in the world, there's also, as you know, students coming in. So this process of globalization doesn't mean -- not only that all universities are being marketized, but also we're becoming much more in a sense integrated, but integrated in a hierarchy. In a hierarchy. In the United States we are -- we are so often oblivious of the consequences of our domination of the field of education in different parts of the world. That's about as much as I'll say about globalization. All right. That's the context and in that context I think I'll have a 2 by 2 table. So [indiscernible] here we go. I believe there are four functions of the university. A policy function in which the university and its knowledge is actually engaging with those outside who are problems to solve. And we are problem solvers for these clients. And often there's some exchange. Sometimes a monetary exchange. I come from sociology. In the United States, you can't imagine well it's difficult to imagine administration taking sociology seriously giving you tasks and problems to solve. Because at the bottom of our discipline, and I will speak for anthropology to some extent, they smuggle their ways into all sorts of military operations from time to time. Human geographers and others. Anyway, the point is there are policy sociologists but they are not very -- they're not that numerous as they would be for example economists or political scientists who have somehow managed to legitimate their presence in the corridors of power. We are much more of a critical discipline. So there is policy sociology, there has been policy sociology, in particular for example in the area of education. And of course I believe that a strong criminology program [indiscernible] another arena in which sociology has played a significant role in actually engaging with the world beyond, fulfilling problems that or pursuing problems that defined by clients outside the university.

But then there is the call you might say of our practice. That is what we do in the university as professionals. We do research and we teach. We talk to one another, writing papers, sending them to our friends, getting critical remarks and getting published in journals.

[Indiscernible]

And the teaching of course is also very central to practice as professionals. And the idea of the U.S. university is that the two should be very closely connected. We'll talk about that.

And then there is a critical function. Very important today. That we saw subject what we do as professionals to critique. We examine what we do as academics. We

reflector should reflect upon what it is we are about in a university. It's particular that we do that today and we do that in a transdisciplinary manner. We think about what we are about in the university. And finally, the university a public entity. That is to say, not only to be accessible to all, but we should be accountable to others beyond the university. We should actually begin to recognize that we are a situation where our legitimacy is in peril and we have to justify our existence now. Now we have to justify our existence and that means engaging the public's, not just the students in classrooms, but also in publics beyond the university. And what that means is a very interesting question.

So my 2 by 2 table -- obviously I think it's relevant today. And we have to see it in the context of I believe 4 crises. Everything comes in 4. The first is a budgetary crisis. The university, the public university is in -- even here I believe. [Indiscernible] and what that means is in part the state has withdraw funds per capita, student per capita funding [indiscernible] hasn't fallen as rapidly as it has in other places. But still has fallen. And of course if the revenue falls from the state, it has to make up other sources of revenue. Students.

[Indiscernible] thieves -- they have increased here - fees. As you probably know. Many of you. Most of you. All of you. So yes, there are other sources of revenue. Indeed there are other sources of revenue. Public-private ventures, emerge all sorts of things. Pharmaceutical companies get interested in subsidizing cheap research, grad student research, why not actual response to research in a university. Then we have all sorts of charitable donors, alumni. To seduce them you have to [indiscernible] they say the money will come back. It does come back and how does it come back?

You build a new building. Who's going to maintain that building? That's going to cost money. Who's going to finish the building? Half built. There are lots of problems with many of these sources coming from the private sector. Yes, indeed. I could talk a lot about this budget crisis and absolutely will talk about it more. Another way of dealing with the budget crisis of course is to reduce costs. So there are ways of reducing costs. You know the ways. Reduce the number of faculty. And increase the number of? [Indiscernible] yes.

And there are all sorts of ways of reducing the costs of service workers on campus, outsourcing. These are the sorts of things we have witnessed, I have witnessed, we have witnessed at the university of California. So reduce, reduce the costs. Yeah.

But this process of focusing on survival, monetary survival, begins to create a whole new idea of the management of the university. Governmental crisis. Governance crisis.

Because we are now in the university so concerned with

being solvent, we organize an administrative, an administration that is really very focused increasingly not on producing the knowledge research teaching, but particular -- [indiscernible] the character of that administration changes as a result. I will talk some a little bit about how it's affecting faculty. Who become in a sense dispossessed of power in the name of revenue seeking. And students too. Of course students never have much power. [Indiscernible]

[Laughter]

So a governance crisis creates an identity crisis. The chair of my department is always scratching your head saying what are we doing here? They're making it into executors [indiscernible] spend our time getting money. Not running the department, but getting money for the department. This is what is happening. That the university becomes a money-making machine. We're all in the business of making -- are we in the business of making money or are we in the business of teaching and producing knowledge? It's a real crisis of identity among particularly the faculty. Yes.

And there are aspects of this identity crisis, but then you move on to the legitimation crisis. What the university as I said earlier could take for granted is legitimacy, a sanctioned institution of society that will be sponsored by the state who has taken for granted -- not just in this country, but in most countries. My early research was in Africa in the 1970s when in the '60s and '70s when countries around Africa became independent. And the first thing they did when they became independent was do what? A university. This was a sign of nation building. It was taken for granted as the fining feature of a nation. No longer can we assume that the university is to be taken for granted.

So which becomes a problem. The crisis carries to our members too. The students. Who pay more money for a degrading education, in general. For jobs that are more precarious. At the same time one is absolutely having to pay back on the loans that made that education possible. So we call the university into question. So there are these multiple crises corresponding to these functions. And what happens trying to engage with those crises, there is a distortion of the functions. Yes. I'm sorry, I've got stories for you. I'll try to end them --

[indiscernible]

So what I believe one has to do is to see what are the processes the dynamics within the university that is actually leading to the distortions under the pressure of external forces. And to do that I believe we didn't tell the story about sociology --

>> One of my former colleagues --

>> Speak up.

>> So when he was up for review for tenure and in Berkeley they don't just ask your colleagues whether they like you

or not, they ask people from other departments, sometimes randomly. And this person and I were working on a magazine together and he said what about this guy Burawoy. I said what do you mean? Is he a real sociologist?

[Laughter]

>> And what did you say?

>> I defended your honor.

>> And you said?

>> You were indeed a real sociologist.

>> But what sort?

>> I believe it was a Marxist sociologist very good, yes.

I think we cannot save the university, here we are. I assume there are no sort of models from the political administration here. University is a -- entity, that there are people with different interests. This is my class analysis, these are my quote classes. [Indiscernible] categorizations, class faculty classes and students those are my four interest groups in the university and I divide each into two and we'll see how it works. Administrative class when there are senior managers, the executive class, and then there are academic administrators who are promoted from the faculty. Many of these senior managers, these executive class, perhaps not here, but in many universities are coming from outside. They are finance IRS coming from the world bank, to make sure the university is solvent, make money has all sorts of consequences for who runs the university. Faculty, well, we have the faculty we call in California -- [indiscernible] the tenure track faculty but now we have contingent faculty, adjuncts, they're called different things in different places. Some universities outsource workers and then there are two groups of students. And we have to look at these four groups, classes, to really understand the way the university is responding to outside pressures. The dominant class is this executive class. And they tell a story. Dominant, I don't know if anybody hear reads the journal -- Peter, when you teach classical, do you teach Marx?

>> Of course.

>> Nothing is of course anymore. Do you teach the German ideology by any chance?

>> We're reading it this week.

>> Well-timed. In the German ideology, Marx refers to the dominant ideology of society. They say that the dominant idea -- the idea of the dominant class, and I think we can say that is true in the university. And I'm not talking about Berkeley. Executive class at Berkeley as a vision of what the university is about. It's a fascinating vision and of course, it has a lot of truth to it. But it is a [indiscernible] it's an ideology. These great leaders, they say ah, this is a place of excellence or so they refer to these ranking systems. They choose the right ranking systems to suit their ends, the Shanghai ranking system.

Gives Berkeley top three of four. If they choose the QS system they would have found that Berkeley is only 26. So don't choose the QS system. So they say okay this is the top public university in the U.S. They say not only are we excellent but we have great access. As measured by the number of Pell grants. We have great graduation rates on these students, 53% go away with no debt and the average debt for those who do have debt is less than other public universities. 30% less. So, yes those students are less in debt. In part they will claim because they have a very progressive, basically it's high tuition, high aid. So re distribution of the tuition. And then they claim on what sort of span of time students are more diverse than ever. When I began in 1976, the student body today is more diverse than it was then.

And our university makes great contributions to the individuals, if they get a degree, they calculate -- now of course you can play all sorts of numbers on these sorts of things. \$1.3 million over a lifetime. Interesting. And for every dollar that states get a 450% return of students staying in California. Yes. Anyway, this is the vision. This is the vision that is promoted by the people who are running the university. Yes. Yes. And this model is under threat, they say. The state contribution to the budget is falling. It's fallen in the last 25 years from 34% to 13%. Yes. And the university faces

[indiscernible] a deficit of \$160 million.

This is a vision, a view that suits their interests.

[Indiscernible].

The trouble with PowerPoint, you've got to follow it.

[Laughter]

This is just illustrating what I've just been saying.

Indeed the UC, the University of California as a whole share the state budget -- about 2.5%. So less important than state budget, student fees are increased. Here the figure is from 1992 to the present. And you can see how it's gone up [indiscernible].

General campus, this is quite interesting. What this shows, this picture shows is that an average expenditure on any individual student has actually fallen and the presumption therefore is they're getting not as good an education as they did before. But why is it fallen? Well, because state general funds were earlier 1990, 25 years ago, 18,000, they're now down to 7,000. And of course the fees have largely made up for that. And that's sort of compensation mechanism of course is going on all over the country.

And there's another way of looking at that. You can see this purple line is the increase of the number of students over the last 25 years, and here you have the state funds as the blue, and you can see the yellow one is the student tuition contribution of student tuition to the budget, as opposed to university -- as opposed to states. So in

state contribution to the university budget. So, yeah. And then they have these figures these expenditure by function, basically what's interesting, what are these functions? Student financial aid is an expenditure, auxiliary enterprises, other inflation support activity, instruction -- always what do you notice? All these figures obscure something. They all obscure divisions within university. Yes.

So what we have here is a vision that object secures in terms of the vision. But let's put that division front and center. There it is. This is the university. This university of California Berkeley. This is numbers on the left, these columns reflect the numbers of personnel in each of these categories. Senior administration, academic, faculty, lecturers, graduate students and enrolls. Do you notice anything? What?

(Inaudible)

>> Senior administration. You see it yourself. Yeah.

[Laughter]

You see in 1993, 256 of these senior administrators, now there are 1256. A five-fold increase. In 25 years. Do you see anything else?

Lecturers have expanded or doubled. And faculty have remained basically furloughed. The members of faculty. Students have increased by about 20%.

So this is the picture that we have for the last 25 years. And we have to ask, and we have been asking, time and time again, who are these administrators. Five-fold increase. We never get an answer. I don't know if they know.

[Laughter]

Okay. Let's look at this. [Indiscernible] class where how do they justify any expansion at all? They justify it, well, federal regulation and all genuine justifications. They do require more leadership, more administration. Federal regulation, research expenditures. And actually trying to get money from others requires a lot of money. The development of this expand expands in order to get money from donors, and the hope is that there will be a good return on the investment in that develop -- yet in my view to be prudent. But in any way that is how they defend it. So essentially anybody who comes along with any money to give to the university -- they have to accept it even if it's going to cost the university more money to actually maintain the project that's being sponsored.

[Laughter]

Make sense? Very good. I'm really glad you're here.

[Laughter]

Okay. Projects. Now, this is very unique to Berkeley. I mean, I can spend the rest of the evening talking about these projects. But this is typical, the rebuilding of the football stadium. We need a new stadium. Earthquake. All the experts on campus say you cannot rebuild this stadium to be earthquake proof. No, we can do it.

[Laughter]

So, we pay a lot of money -- do I actually need this?

No? . It's not even working.

[Laughter]

Here I am. Okay. All right.

[Laughter]

That's probably the source of -- [indiscernible]

So rebuilding the stadium costs a lot of money. We're up to 300, 400 million, it's going to cost a lot of money every year. How are they going to recoup the money?

They're going to sell tickets to alumni. We're going to pay -- who are going to pay \$100,000 for a seat for life.

Who wants a losing football team?

[Laughter]

Disaster. That's the words. All these hair-brained schemes, you invest money, you're supposed to get money back. But it doesn't happen. It just becomes ever-increasing debt, debt. That's why \$160 million every year in debt. And nobody wants to lend us any more money. Because of course we know trust worthy because of these crazy things. It's -- so, I have a name for these people. I call them spiralists. It's very great that the two administrators I know are here are not spiralists. They are loyalists. But spiralists do exist. They spiral in from other places. From elite universities, from the World Bank and they see the university of California Berkeley a total mess and they say we're going to have a project. We're going to define my career with a project and then I'm going to spiral on and let Berkeley with debt. This has been an unfortunately frequent event. It has happening increasingly universities are being run by outsiders who are here or there who come to actually produce the revenue, but they're not there for good. They spiral on. They spiral on. So, yes. I got in lots of trouble for this concept because I think it really captures a lot of what is happening in the big universities and I'll leave it for you for an empirical examination as to whether it happens here. So that's the administrative class. That has a project to make money and that often costs money. Privatization is a very costly business. So, yes.

Now, faculty. Well, as I said, they are in numbers frozen, but we do notice that -- at least the latter half they increase. And if you look at the national trends what you see, and this is from '75 to 2011, that's about 35 years, 56% of instructors were tenure-tracked faculty 35 years ago. Today it's 30%. And what we see is we have a lot of part-time instructors who have increased from 31% to 51% and then these full-time non-tenure track. So one of them you have to know what's happening is the increase in the numbers of contingent workers, adjunct workers and the conditions those workers vary a great deal. If you go to the city University of New York, a public university, they are getting their part-time workers and they're getting \$2,000, \$3,000 a course. I like to say my university, which is behind the curve on this one, they get anything

from \$8,000 to \$12,000. You can actually live on that sort of salary. But in most places it is not the case. It's very, very -- and what areas, greater security. You cannot talk to an adjunct professor without feeling that insecurity. Whether they will continue to have a job. Well, you probably know more about this than I, but I am have spend a lot of time studying it recently. In the university of California Berkeley what we see here is the students hours by instructors. The regular factors are still teaching more credit hours, more students than the other faculty in this case which are the lecturers. But you do see the increasing numbers of -- increasing proportion of students are facing actually their increasing over time. Yes. So that's a very, very important and very significant a very significant shift in the character of the university over the last 50 years.

Well, this is sociology, it's an interesting story. I wish I had enough time to tell you. [Indiscernible] anyway, so here this is the red is lecturers. This is an undergraduate enrollment by instructor. The lecturers are teaching more students than the faculty, about 2010. Basically my job is to look after the lecturers. So-called look after. And [indiscernible] they teach some teach six courses why do we have this great number of lecturers? A very famous sociologist, he goes around to all the universities and recruits students to come to Berkeley. So we have 150, 200 Norwegian students. But the university of California says that's great, very entrepreneurial, but you cannot give a position, post a position to a place to a Norwegian student for a Berkeley student. All the Berkeley students have to be satisfied first. We have to first of all allow all the Berkeley students to come in and then we allow the other state students to come in and of course the majors -- [indiscernible] tremendously and that's why we've had to have all these other lecturers. We believe, and I'm very skeptical, but I still believe that actually we're now able to a better education to Berkeley undergraduates. Yeah, it was great. You have a Norwegian student in your class. You're perhaps teaching Marx and talking about exploitation. You're talking about student fees and how expensive it is at university and how precarious the job situation is afterwards and then the Norwegians say oh, what fees do you pay in Norway? No fees. Ah! We're not a state. I mean, this is education for students.

[Laughter]

Anyway, the point is by being entrepreneurial and making money, bringing in students from outside. Not all universities can do that. We have a beautiful location next to the Pacific but you could do it here. Fly fishing, I mean, that will, Yellowstone -- all right. So. We've been through the lecturers and the faculty. Well there has been an increase in financial services, not surprisingly. People employed financial increase student services and

more or less low paid workers. You can see from these figures but what we see here is the way the clerical and allied workers, the so-called secretaries as they used to be called who have become few and far between, even the most prestigious faculty no longer have assistants as they did. Basically their computer is their assistant. So basically this is the story. Student services, yes of course you've got to the students now, but to control, regulate and serve the students in ways you didn't before. Costs money and not just the personnel. And of course the fiscal management has also increased doubled in the last 20 years.

Okay. So that service personnel, just a little about students. Well, the story told financing the university education, fee increases, yes. But guess what? Perhaps not so true here. But Berkeley costs a bloody fortune to live. So just having tuition pay for in any way because we do have a situation in which those families whose income is less than \$80,000 don't pay tuition. But still they've got to pay to live which is very expensive. And they've got to pay to eat and we've had surveys showing how in fact students are skipping meals in order to survive. Financial aid, re distribution, indebtedness, not as bad as it is in other places. Yes we do have a lot of people with Pell grants. Education, yes. Graduation rates are up. Get their degree in 4.5 years though it is the case that many many students we can't figure out exactly how many, don't have a choice of major. That's amazing. There are all these people in the computer sciences. A senior over some major computer sciences -- we don't have places for students to be lectured to so it has to be in multiple rooms and they have to have an army of teaching assistants which turn out to be undergraduates. So some places on the campus are oversubscribed. There is a increasing diversity and of course the big thing, the big political time bomb ticking away is the number of out-of-state students. Because we have to get money from out-of-state students. They can be foreign or the United States, they pay not \$14,000 but \$33,000 for their tuition. So that's a good business. So Berkeley has 27% constituents in California, their kids get straight A's. They have wonderful success in high school, they can't get into Berkeley and the parents 40% of Berkeley students are -- [indiscernible] they're taking the positions of my children. It's politically. So what happens? The president of the university says okay, this is not acceptable politically. We're at Berkeley going to have to accept 700 new students next year, just like that. Drop of a hat. Where are you going to put 700 students? Now instead of -- there's no space. How are we going to be -- it's a political problem is the ways in which we continue to try to get more money. All along students are paying more and getting less. And getting less in a sense of probably less effective education, but also that future is of course not

guaranteed. The labor markets they face are more precarious than they ever were.

That's just a picture of increase of out-of-state students you can see from 2008.

All right. Now we come to graduate students here. We're nearly at the end. Back to you and your letter.

Well, there are fewer tenure track positions. Yeah. The departments, some departments, many departments are actually accepting fewer students. It means that more and -- that more and more graduate students will face a career not of a tenure-tracked faculty position, but of an electoral position. Yeah. -- lecturer position. And of course therefore is very important that one struggles for the best possible condition for lecturers. And what it means, I think, this is very brief. But what it means, I think, is there is emerging a separation between two function of university that we went over before. Research and teaching. Increasingly the university is becoming divided between those who do research and those who teach. I'm embarrassed to say that my teaching load, and all my colleagues' teaching load falls. When I arrived in Berkeley, I was teaching five courses -- it then become four a semester -- and then my colleague said [indiscernible] we're teaching too much. We should teach three courses, not four courses. Okay. So we now teach two courses. So the faculty are becoming an aristocracy. They are becoming well-heeled and they're teaching less and they're ever-more complaint with this whole transformation. Yeah.

Well, the politics of this, I'll go through this very quickly because I suspect there is a lot to say -- the university of California has 10 campuses and is overseen by the president. [Indiscernible] she's appointed by the regents. Regents are businessmen and others, lawyers, political appointees, appointed by the governor, Jerry Brown, who is always having a [indiscernible] relationship with the university and obviously now is the legislature who is having a bargain relationship with the governor and also trying to dictate to the regents. And this is the political field in which we operate. We can't ignore that field if we want to actually work on the reconstitution of the public university, this is the field we are [indiscernible] but we are completely [indiscernible] we have to do that, however. -- ill-equipped to do so. We have a democratic majority in both houses -- [indiscernible]. Well, that's the story here. Yeah.

So the politics different places is going to be very different. Yes. But anyway, this is the terrain in which we have to operate if we are going to actually have any headway in recovering the character of the public university. So what is to be done? I think first is the critique of the administrative class. We have to, and we

reappropriation of control over the administration. Insofar as the administration is operating according to logics that are [indiscernible] to the core and here in university research and teaching. We have to develop therefore a critical community in the university. That means transcending disciplines. An incredibly difficult thing to do. Breaking our silos. And we're used to that. We communicate within them but not between them. Very difficult project. Crisis is amazing how much communication can affect take place. But I don't know what is going on in civil engineering, in chemistry. We have to make an effort to begin to communicate across disciplines. That will be a matter of division because interests will look differently. Interesting the engineers has thought of the humanities as somehow a lesser part of the university because we're a drag on the funds. It turns out when you look at the accounting, it isn't humanities or social sciences doing most of the teaching and bring in the money and are subsidizing the engineers, chemists and physicists whose research is costing more and more and the grants do not cover that. It's covered by the impoverishment of the French department so to speak. It's a very interesting story. All right.

Rebuild the character, the public character of the university, which I said in the beginning, is a matter not just making the university accessible but making it accountable. But engaging the communities in the university that's a big question. Can they be -- the legislature is furious about what? About the salaries of these executives, the administrators. Furious! How can they justify to their constituents, how can they justify to their constituents Berkeley students out of state? So if we're prepared to make concessions at the university, perhaps the legislature may take a more positive view towards University. The public relations of the university in Sacramento is bad news. We have to change that.

[Laughter]

Thank you.

[Applause]

>> I went on too long. I mean, Scott was saying introductions were very good but I didn't -- anyway. I really would love to hear what you think about this all. I've only just begun giving this talk. It will look different in different places so I'm very interested in your questions and criticisms and thoughts about your own university. Yes?

>> What do you think of the San Francisco community college -- that ripple effect?

>> Can you repeat it?

>> The city college of San Francisco has made a move to have no fees. And what is interesting is that no fees idea is part -- in California, has become part of public discourse. And even the legislature has actually made proposals of what it would mean to have no fees. And we

have a project -- I am the cochair of the faculty association. And so we often refer to that as an opposition group on campus. The countries and the senate. But so together with the faculty associations of the other campuses have produced a report that says that if we could only tax, a median tax of \$48 per family, then we could fund the whole system, the three level system, the community college system, the state system, and the university of California system, no fees. No tuition. But of course people still have to live. But still that would -- I think it's very interesting. I think that's becoming part of the discourse. And perhaps, perhaps sanders put that on the agenda. So we can talk about this now. Before it was seen to be Utopia, city college as an example. I think the administrators -- [indiscernible] no?

[Laughter]

>> I think you made some really excellent points including the challenges with higher education is similar to balance -- and administrative trying to -- [indiscernible] so one of the challenges I guess I would ask your perspective on is dealing with the legislative body. Because obviously that is -- [indiscernible] realities of regents has an awful impact. So any thoughts? >> This is a [indiscernible] we are abysmally bad. And when the office of the president, for example, last year had to engage with the legislature in a public way, the legislature produced a report scandal situation vis-a-vis out-of-state students. And the legislature not always complaining about the numbers of out-of-state students, taking place of California students and were already in excess of demanding places far greater than any other state. But the legislature -- you're inviting people in who have no academic credentials and the California students applied. So that became a huge debate. Developing their own indices of academic credentials. But it was such bad publicity of the university. So we are very inept at dealing with the legislature. We should make concessions. That's how politics works. But no, we're the university of California. We're the best in the world. And you should be paying for it. That's not going to win any friends in the legislature. So I think we're particularly -- [indiscernible] so we have to build up a very different type of relationship. We just taken for granted that the university of California will be funded by the state. And we can't take that for granted anymore. So it requires, as you say, a very different -- and we should have regents who we can talk to. Whoever the regents, are. Three regents we can talk to. Three with whom we feel we can have a discussion. Of course the regents are appointed by the governor. So I think better that might be with the legislature too because they have some sort of monetary

political picture is very important. But academics, we're not very good at this. Administrators, I think -- [indiscernible] have the time to engage in politics. [Indiscernible].

You want to say anything?

>> No, I think it's all good.

[Laughter]

>> Spoken like a true administrators.

>> Actually, in Montana our regents have more independent from the legislature -- [indiscernible].

>> Whatever that means.

>> What that means is our constitution accommodate a law around the power of the regents and then the supreme court upheld in the '70s the legislature -- our governor cannot try to do unto the university the overpowered purse but they're not allowed to do via policy agenda. In other words, when the governor in 1974 said we want the administration we are going to reach into the university and freeze salaries -- [indiscernible] and we can do that because the legislature will back us up. And it went to the courts and the supreme court said no you cannot. You cannot do -- [indiscernible]. So that has given Montana a little more insulation. We have to negotiate. We negotiate hugely with the legislature, absolutely. Because however much they put in our face does -- they cannot set tuition here as they can in most states. The legislature cannot. Only the regents can. But as a couple of your grads pointed out so well, the extent to which they continue underfund the university, the more to maintain some level of quality. Always debatable, will have to be made up and have been since maybe only the '90s in California, but the '70s in Montana, if not earlier, tuition has gone up as state support has gone down. I actually think that started earlier in Montana. So you still have to communicate with, suck up to, whatever you call it, the legislature. And engage their standing of that. That's still important.

>> I was looking at -- if you're interested, there's a last week the Cato institute produced a report on state by state how tuition and state expenditures have moved in opposite directions.

>> Absolutely.

>> Their claim is that tuition increases have for many states exceeded the actual -- the cuts of the states. So they wanted that position too, there are ways in which --

>> That's a very reasonable question.

>> Montana is not among those states.

[Laughter]

[Indiscernible]

>> Montana actually has a relatively less cuts and less increase in tuition. Relative.

>> Actually, our legislature worked with us for eight years

state resident students has been frozen for 6-8 years. Non-residents, sorry about that. But, yes.

>> Yes?

>> Thank you very much. It was a lovely talk. Very informative.

>> [Indiscernible] thank you.

>> You made the point a couple of times how at one point, 40, 50 years ago, we could all assume that -- [indiscernible] value the university and now obviously we're having a crisis in which the nations have said -- [indiscernible] what accounts for that shift? I mean, is it declining state dollars? Or is it a more general phenomenon in society?

>> Both. Everybody -- [indiscernible]. There's two possibilities. A financial one. As soon as [indiscernible] becomes an issue, then people [indiscernible] and then they say the legislature says [indiscernible]. [Away from microphone] state funds. The questions in my mind is why did it happen in the first place. And two sides. One is that -- specific to each state so it's not very good. But one we were more concerned prisoners and therefore we had to take money from the university. [Away from microphone].

You don't have any sort of immediate threat. So the point is that there are other competing demands on state funds. State funds are not always there. That's one side of the argument. That basically the state took the initiative and withdrew funds and then -- the fees go oh --

[indiscernible] another interesting one Chris newfield has written a great book on this matter. About the cost of privatization. And basically -- [indiscernible] it's very interesting it seems to me -- [indiscernible] why. Some people say administrators. But he argues science -- [indiscernible] scientists with their laboratories,

they're costing more money. To have someone at Berkeley -- [indiscernible] it costs a lot of money so -- the do not cover. So the -- an initiative may have administrators who

faced already a problem of declining revenues. And once you started producing -- [indiscernible]. I think -- and of course that's why I said a little bit about this man living in a world with marketization where you know, there's nothing that commodify. So why should the

university accept -- [indiscernible] the project is interesting. [Indiscernible] you try to basically privatize university because she thought the faculty were doing nothing, financial accountable, but she couldn't actually privatize. So what she would actually what the result was paradoxically, but in England the conservative government, 17 years in power, in that period, induced the universities to monitor themselves. To actually monitor everything that they do. Monitor their productivity. The research -- [indiscernible] the research assessment.

[Indiscernible] the research excellent framework. So

their actions and generate indices according to which they would get funds from the government. And of course the faculty bought into this whole thing. And how to monitor each other. So it was -- [indiscernible] the plan. So basically when I saw this, I thought my career -- [indiscernible] I used to study economy. And it was a long time ago. Anyway, it's a planned economy. And it followed these sort of manipulations around indices. So I rediscovered my Soviet past and basically what was happening was England was basically that our minister planned a colony in which everybody was operating according to the indices not privatization but a very over democratized, over monitored culture they called it, and actually sort of stymied so much. Unfortunately that has not -- that has not hit us to the same degree in this country. That's another story all together of response to their attempt. This was a failed attempt in those days to bring market to university. And that of course the government basically introduced fees which they never had the guts to do. And then a whole new budget -- [indiscernible] -- [indiscernible] the only thing that's significant now is how many students you can bring in. Because they are the real source of revenue. So again, different places, the response to this marketization is slightly different. Yeah. Yes?

>> Obviously different responses -- [indiscernible] one thing that your state and our state does share is we both share I would say a voting position on [indiscernible] that invest more per capita on spending in corrections than higher education. [Away from microphone] so [indiscernible] university of Montana, and one of the big programs we have on a national level -- [indiscernible] invest in higher education and when you touch on direction study and higher education -- [indiscernible].

>> No, I can't. [Indiscernible].
[Laughter]

This is always there are some winners. And there are all these academics and corrections going to go down. So we played the game. I mean, I would love to know what you think political strategists who actually to -- [indiscernible] excessive corrections or --

>> You guys are making issues of -- [indiscernible] you just have -- here in Montana we're run by a group of reactionary profiteers. [Indiscernible] we don't see -- we see a lot more of the same, a lot of lip service and a lot of nice -- so your state is in the right direction. I think part of the reason is because of the supreme court -- under court -- [indiscernible] which you guys have been successful in doing. So here in Montana we're not seeing that criminal justice reform.

>> What do you --

>> I go to school.

>> On a national level. We [indiscernible] it's just a

level that seems to divest -- [indiscernible] and then redirect Colorado to higher education -- [indiscernible].

>> I just I can't -- I think what's important education isolation. It has to be seen -- lecturers organized lectures. Many place there is unionization. Many places there are not. The union is often a union is connected to the university. It might be the case that the union of adjunct workers should be connected to the unions of other precarious sectors. Now the SCIU, what is their strategy much more than to build this connection within the university. We have to branch out. I have to see how we survive. Just automatic. You're on the day-to-day job, I understand that. But there should be a body of thinkers in the university thinking about -- which is why a critical community within universities.

>> Michael, there's a reception and a lot of food and the students might want to get to that.

[Laughter]

>> Okay. Very good.

[Applause]