

Re-envisioning the Arts PhD: Intellectual Entrepreneurship and the Intellectual Arts Leader

RICHARD A. CHERWITZ AND GARY D. BECKMAN

... in today's doctoral programs, there is a three way mismatch between student goals, training, and actual careers. —Golde and Dore 2001

As the problem of PhD oversupply continues, proposed solutions appear almost draconian in scope.¹ This issue is even more complex for those who hold degrees in the arts; with the traditional trajectory of a fine arts PhD unchallenged by the arts academy, meaningful solutions remain few.² However, this problem affects far more than those who hold degrees. Continued focus on hyperspecialization means that PhDs in disciplines such as music theory, musicology, composition, and art history are becoming increasingly isolated from the world beyond the proverbial ivory tower.

We believe that the discussion should take a turn from one of short-term reparations for real problems to one of long-term solutions for real opportunities. An entrepreneurial and innovative outlook such as this is not unusual for creative disciplines, and the arts academy is fertile ground for such a vision. It is in the artistic disciplines, after all, that creativity is most explicitly nourished. The creative impulse, then, should be the impetus for reasoned and innovative measures to confront what study after study has revealed—academic jobs are scarce. Change—somewhere—is needed.

It is easy to climb Olympus, perched on the backs of Bach, Beethoven, and Brahms, and shout for change, only to await the academy's habitual refrain regarding the difficulties of doing so. Confusions, misunderstandings, and a lack of dialogue between administration and students exacerbate the problem. In the end, most doctoral students in the arts do not fully appreciate nor celebrate the meaning of their PhD. Worse, the current system of graduate education perpetuates this state of affairs, with each generation of professors passing down their understanding of the doctorate to succeeding generations.

What is missing are not only new pedagogical and philosophical platforms, but a method by which change can occur in a meaningful and directed manner. In this article, we draw on aspects of "intellectual entrepreneurship (IE)" as a foundation and engine for change. Instead of simply illustrating the problems of PhD overproduction in the arts or proffering another editorial on the state of the academic job market, we contend that the philosophy of intellectual entrepreneurship presents significant opportunities for both fine arts graduate students and the universities that train them. Specifically, we re-envision the fine arts doctorate in the broader context of cultural leadership. So conceived, the fine arts PhD

is an intellectual arts leader; this person not only is a PhD specialist in the traditional sense, but also, and because of that, an expert constructively engaging the arts in a broader and more innovative manner.

The Arts Academy as Incubator

Our own graduate programs must become laboratories in which we experiment with unconventional approaches to preparing people for the Ph.D.—Manger 2000

Arts departments are uniquely positioned to reimagine the doctorate. It is within these disciplines that the intellectual capital of the arts is compressed into finely tuned machines of knowledge transfer and research. If we retune the meaning of this mission slightly, it becomes clear that arts faculty are among the most creative and often underutilized resources in universities and in society.

With this creative capital in tow, arts programs have the capacity to become bastions of educational innovation on campus. Can these departments retool their traditional pedagogical focus? The short answer is yes. However, changes to any system are disruptive; this is the explicit reply heard by those who scale Olympus only to discover that most academics take a safer route, acquiescing to status quo practices.

Surely many decision makers argue that the challenges of change are not worth the effort, citing the sheer size of the endeavor. Others might disagree, accepting the “no pain, no gain” philosophy. However, if we consider change not as something to be feared but as something to be embraced, a unique opportunity presents itself. Where better to incubate meaningful change in higher education than at the creative epicenter of campus? If a faculty’s creative and intellectual capital is engaged with potential new meanings of the doctorate, coupled with developing new infrastructures to support this effort, the prospect is exciting.

Academic Employment, Rhetoric, and Movement

The most difficult times often force us to look for creative solutions.—Prioleau 2001

As the arts academy confronts the reality of overproduction, alternative careers have been suggested as acceptable uses of the degrees. This justification tends to contain some interesting parlance: “It pays better” or “You didn’t really think you got summers off, did you?” Such self-deprecating rhetoric bolsters the notion of a career outside of the academy as a consolation prize—something for which one settles, implying a failure to utilize one’s degree. Similarly, roles in higher administration also are touted as possible alternative careers, without the caveat that these positions usually require tenure or service as a faculty member.

Two more recent tactics include advocating for jobs in tangential fields; development and the publishing trade are popular themes. In addition, limiting doctoral enrollment is emerging as an acceptable “emergency stop-gap” measure.³ This raises the obvious and perhaps moral question: Why prepare PhDs for nonexistent academic jobs? The reply: the academy should not, so restructuring enrollment and creating a pool of PhDs small enough to meet demand seem logical and humane solutions.

On the one hand, measures such as these should be lauded, not maligned. For those who view academic culture as

glacial and resistant to change, these solutions, regardless of outcome, demonstrate that the academy has taken notice. The supply of literature addressing this problem illustrates the academy’s concern. On the other hand, these solutions are based on an older, arguably outdated, paradigm.

Recent oversupply studies share an implicit question directed squarely at students who wish to grab the brass ring: why pursue an advanced degree in the arts when the desired outcome is not guaranteed? The metric of a successful outcome used by most of these studies, however, is an academic position. By contrast, engineering students are immersed in a different, arguably more enlightened, educational culture. They are trained to create solutions for existing and emerging markets, and the departments that train them define a successful student broadly: employment in engineering careers—not simply academic employment. In addition to producing future faculty and scholars, engineering doctoral programs also produce the change agents who engage the world on a daily basis. In both instances, it is intellectual capability and engineering expertise that account for one’s success.

Re-envisioning Skill Sets

Fine arts PhDs are among the most creative in the academy; they find meaning in artistic objects and create connections that transcend disciplinary boundaries. They analyze the musical and artistic conundrums that define the Western arts experience. Moreover, they have communication, interpersonal, and entrepreneurial skills that are rarely acknowledged. They have an enormous skill set—one that, unlike engineering PhDs, has not been fully exploited.

We seldom recognize that fine arts PhDs possess a capacity to learn, explore, and integrate knowledge beyond their discipline. These are the thinkers, the authors, the problem solvers, and the creative sparks that cultures cannot do without; when this investment in knowledge transfer is lost, it is mostly unrecoverable. Unfortunately, PhD oversupply literature and current practices in doctoral education

ignore the consequences of losing this intellectual capital.

Should the broader potential of future fine arts PhDs be eliminated when we live in a society that values intellect, ingenuity, and, increasingly, creativity (Florida 2002)? With a new economic sector recently identified and many regions in this country recognizing that the arts and creativity are key engines for economic growth,⁴ cutting PhD enrollment in the arts may be counterproductive. The future solvency of communities that support arts higher education, and perhaps the legitimacy of the arts academy itself, could be at stake. Forging new connections through the arts cannot occur without leaders, and those leaders must have the skills necessary to develop new and innovative trajectories. Instead of only creating tenure-track professors affecting the lives of a few students each semester, universities might simultaneously educate leaders whose efforts impact thousands.

People who hold PhDs in the fine arts are skilled beyond the bounds of their discipline and should be viewed as an intersection of intellectual capital and creativity. They can contribute to their field’s knowledge and simultaneously have the capacity to utilize their expertise and skills as a lever for social good. Sadly, many walk across graduation stages believing that not securing an academic position is failure (LaPidus 1997). Quite the contrary; failure is not knowing or appreciating that a doctorate can be put to powerful uses in the arts—uses seldom envisioned during doctoral course work (Kajitani and Bryant 2005).

Reconnecting the Arts Academy

We must remember that doctoral students are assets, not liabilities. Without PhDs trained both as specialists and generalists, disciplines risk becoming marginalized and viewed as irrelevant. If the trend of restrictive enrollment continues, the arts also are at risk of failing to produce intellectual leaders able to shape the future of the arts in society, higher education, and academic disciplines. Perhaps it is time for arts academic culture and pedagogy to be contem-

plated in the spirit of Darwin Prioleau's important commentary:

The arts in higher education are at a crossroads. Many old formulas no longer hold; changing demographics and outside pressures are fueling the need for massive change in higher education. In too many cases, the arts disciplines are an underutilized institutional treasure. In addition to preparing students for the professional arts world and arts education, these disciplines can play a significant role in creating new solutions to many prevailing problems in arts and in education generally. Leaders of the arts in higher education have two choices: they can wait for drastic measures to come and respond by mounting reactive defensive maneuvers, or they can use this present fiscal and reform climate as a "window of opportunity" to re-examine the values of the arts disciplines from multiple perspectives. (Prioleau 2001)

Sooner or later, arts departments must find a balance between the existing pedagogical and aesthetic focus and the needs of communities, students, and their disciplines. For communities to support the arts, higher education must instill in all of its artists, arts scholars, and performers that "art," and the scholarly foundation that supports it, is not *for* or the exclusive domain of the "thinking class."⁵ As the arts (and the academy) are continually perceived as elitist, the chasm between the communities that support higher education and the universities that produce arts PhDs will only widen to the detriment of all involved. This is more than a public relations' problem. Consider community support in concrete terms—measured by the declining percentage of a public institution's state funding appropriation, the popular axiom "perception is everything" has real meaning and material consequences.

Perhaps the disconnect issues from a self-imposed isolation nestled deep within the pedagogy itself. Art students are held captive in small groups during their undergraduate training, learning techniques in various mediums. Music students are sequestered in practice rooms for hours at a time and the burgeoning academics in these disciplines are in class after class holding court in libraries. What, then, are the perceptions of stu-

dents? Simply put: the road to good art or scholarship is a solitary pursuit whose ends are destined for a small, expert audience. It is not surprising, therefore, that students believe the challenges facing the larger arts community (read: their *real* audience) are best left to those "who deal with those kinds of things."

Professors are not immune. We must ask, "What is the effect of continually creating hyper-specialists in the arts?" Junior faculty are expected to create

Most doctoral students in the arts do not fully appreciate nor celebrate the meaning of their PhD.

tenure files that demonstrate their *super*-hyper-specialization. Senior faculty conduct research and write for relatively small audiences who share their interests. In a similar manner, professors in the applied arts (instrumental music provides the best example) train students who, in turn, train elementary and high school arts students who then go to college to earn an arts degree without receiving career development instruction or being afforded opportunities to think about their art in broader ways. Each generation of artists participates in the reification of the system. To be clear, this critique is not meant to malign the motivation and important work of the thousands of faculty and music educators who are part of existing practices. Instead, it is offered to illustrate that future PhDs will do as they have been trained, thus perpetuating through their students the status quo model of arts education.

Nevertheless, reconnections and meaningful change are possible. Academics need not be fatalistic; they ultimately control their destiny. Arts departments *can* abandon entrenched aesthetics. University arts departments *can* meaningfully engage communities by reaching out

and encouraging bidirectional and synergistic initiatives. Faculty *can* be challenged to apply their knowledge beyond the interests of the few to the larger community, demonstrating accountability in the best sense of the term (Cherwitz 2005a). And all of this, we claim, *can* be accomplished without sacrificing expertise, specialization, and the high standards set by artists and scholars.

We contend that an intellectual arts leadership model, implemented through

a refocused curricular track, might serve as the progenitor for these reconstructions. Fostered by administration and faculty, the intellectual arts leadership model of arts education has the potential to empower fine arts PhDs to think creatively about the larger ends of their enterprise and redirect their intellectual capital in innovative ways. Re-envisioning the arts doctorate as a change agent creating solutions to problems can reconnect the academy (and its arts intellectual capital) with the larger world.

Developing the Intellectual Arts Leader

Arts education leaders have to make a choice. The arts can either help shape the future of academia or continue to adapt to initiatives made by other disciplines often considered more central to the academic culture. Continuous, proactive, mission-generating leadership must be undertaken in order to develop broad ties of mutual understanding and respect within and beyond the world of higher education. —Prioleau 2001

At its most basic level, reimagining the fine arts PhD is simply a shift in aesthetics from the "art for art's sake" ideology to one where an awareness of a larger world, and the role the arts can play in it, is paramount. Hence, in con-

trast to the “apprenticeship-certification-entitlement” model of doctoral education, we argue that a “discovery-ownership-accountability” paradigm might be developed and nurtured within our student body by faculty and administration (Cherwitz and Hartelius 2006; Cherwitz and Sullivan 2002). In the arts, this is a potent proposition. With the existing disconnections between communities, the arts, the academy, and public university funding, unified support for the arts cannot occur (Urice 2000). Even as leadership initiatives emerge in colleges and universities, their impact has yet to be fully realized.⁶ What, then, will it take to unite these disparate groups? Intellectual arts leaders: a broad-based group with the intellectual capital, drive, and willingness to reunify the arts with its larger audience.

To create these new intellectual arts leaders, a new pedagogical philosophy must be put into place within the arts academy. Doctoral students must understand that their education is not about either/or choices; contributing to academic disciplines *and* society are appropriate, valuable and not incommensurate uses of advanced degrees. We believe that intellectual entrepreneurship (IE), an initiative that began in 1997 at the University of Texas at Austin (and is now a university-wide consortium), provides both the philosophy and vision to accomplish this task if integrated into arts graduate education. Our objective here is not to make a case for or advertise IE; nor is it our intention to advocate that other institutions implement replicas of this initiative. Rather, we wish to suggest how the terminology and core principles of IE provide a way of thinking ideally suited and applicable to the creation of intellectual arts leaders.⁷ Instead of viewing it in programmatic terms, we believe there is greater potential in examining the concept of IE as a mindset and an engine of change—a way of thinking and talking that might revitalize doctoral education in the arts. By conceiving of IE in this manner, administration, faculty, and students have a platform to encourage integration, collaboration, and, most important,

innovation—all of which are critical resources for an intellectual arts leader.

So what is IE? It is a view of education claiming that intellect is not limited to the academy and entrepreneurship is not restricted to or synonymous with business. Entrepreneurship is a process of cultural innovation. At a more profound level, entrepreneurship is an attitude for engaging the world. Intellectual entrepreneurs, both inside and outside universities, seize opportunities, discover and create knowledge, innovate, take risks, collaborate, and solve problems in any number of realms, including corporate, nonprofit, government, and education. The philosophy of intellectual entrepreneurship eschews the typical academic/nonacademic binary preoccupying university educators. In the words of Thomas Jackson, former president of the University of Rochester:

The best teachers and researchers are all “intellectual entrepreneurs.” They’re in the business of creating new information, new ways of thinking, new ways of seeing their particular discipline. [A] young musician figuring out how to create his or her path through the art world [is] every bit as entrepreneurial as someone establishing a new business. (Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation)

IE’s mission is to develop “citizen-scholars.” These driven individuals own and take responsibility for their education; they creatively utilize their intellectual capital as a lever for social good through meaningful contributions to disciplinary knowledge. IE seeks to fulfill this mission by increasing learning across disciplinary boundaries; forging collaborations between the academy and society, resulting in greater synergies among the many institutions in the public and private sectors that discover and put knowledge to work; and encouraging and promoting creativity as the primordial spark of this effort (Cherwitz 2003).

Intellectual arts leaders draw on IE’s mission. It is the catalyst for re-envisioning the arts doctorate. To complete the endeavor, the intellectual arts leader focuses on four core principles of IE:

1. *Vision and discovery.* Intellectual entrepreneurs reconsider and reinvent themselves as individuals in the con-

text of their disciplines. They envision new ideas and initiatives through this process based on a broader view of the world and what matters most to them.

2. *Ownership, agency, and accountability.* After reconceptualizing themselves, intellectual entrepreneurs recognize that jobs are not entitlements. Instead, they realize that jobs originate from personal initiative and commitments. Employment is a manifestation of one’s vision and a full consideration of what is possible.

3. *Integrative thinking and action.* By creating synergy, the intellectual entrepreneur marshals the intellectual capital from disparate disciplines and utilizes numerous skill sets. This is more than an awareness of cross-disciplinary scholarship. Intellectual entrepreneurs use and maximize personal connections in these areas to bring their vision to fruition.

4. *Collaboration and teamwork.* The intellectual entrepreneur views the collective creativity of large groups as a critical resource. Without collaboration, synergy and integrative thinking cannot develop.

We believe that IE is an attitude that provides a broader and more intellectually enriched sense of entrepreneurship. It allows faculty in the arts to direct students and the ends of the doctorate in new ways. Shared accountability and agency are the keys to this approach, making it distinctive from status quo educational models. For the intellectual arts leader, success is not measured by the expectations of others, but by a new set of individual values. When professors engage society in an entrepreneurial manner, students will not be far behind. Good modeling, supported by a philosophy that advocates for new ways to apply intellectual capital, broadens the meaning of the PhD. It follows, therefore, that the metrics by which we measure a successful outcome of the degree will change from securing an academic position to applying intellectual capital *to* the arts—whether done in academic or nonacademic venues. Intellectual arts leaders draw on IE’s core values to make meaningful contribu-

tions to the arts. These contributions (manifesting inside or outside of academe) occur because of—not instead of—disciplinary expertise.

Taking the initiative to become citizen-scholars, doctoral students become engaged and recognize their own creative potential. Rather than concentrating exclusively on how to be more proficient at their craft, doctoral students (now citizen-scholars) interrogate themselves and their disciplines. They imagine new ways to apply their expertise.

Let us examine what the intellectual arts leadership model portends. Initially, intellectual arts leaders embody a philosophy or an attitude by which one lives, modeling to communities and peers. These individuals use their creativity to openly imagine how their intellectual capital can serve the arts. By capitalizing on an entrepreneurial disposition, they manifest their vision. Intellectual arts leaders are educated to imagine and articulate a multitude of opportunities and possibilities. For example, this model of education holds that tracking arts students nationally after their undergraduate years to determine career trajectories is a vital need within arts higher education. By securing a broad funding base and partnering with the National Office of Arts Accreditation and other key institutions, the intellectual arts leadership model reaffirms the need for long-term studies capable of informing arts departments about outcomes, enrollment, and curricular trends. With the recent emergence of rural entrepreneurship efforts, another opportunity arises; when coupled with regional creative economic initiatives, intellectual arts leaders believe that the arts can play a major role in revitalization.

As higher education confronts new funding realities, intellectual arts leaders envision solutions: merging the resources of foundations and state and local governments to provide specialized research. This would give arts departments a method to develop innovative curriculum and respond to changes in the market. For regions confronting youth drain, intellectual arts leaders can change the landscape of local economies. By developing new out-

comes for undergraduate arts students, merged with the economic initiatives mentioned above, they can help to reunite the academy with local communities. Additionally, intellectual arts leaders may be essential to revitalizing public policy in the arts—a rarely discussed, yet highly important, topic that affects all who participate in the arts.

Intellectual arts leaders, then, are a crucial link between the future of arts higher education and the realities of a changing economic landscape. They have the capacity to create new funding streams and quality research for higher education, revitalize communities, and develop synergies with government leaders to bring communities and higher education together. Although only sketched in broad strokes here, it is clear that intellectual arts leaders might provide the intellectual and entrepreneurial bridge necessary to renovate arts higher education, develop new audiences, and economically legitimize the arts (and arts higher education) to the public at-large.⁸

The scholarly ideal does not disappear when re-envisioning the arts doctorate in this manner. Rather, it is transformed into a vision of intellectual and entrepreneurial engagement with the world of the arts. When degree holders are educated and viewed as intellectual arts leaders, there is emphasis placed on harnessing and integrating knowledge and skills to solve problems, whether those problems are purely academic or have ramifications for society at large. Intellectual arts leaders still contribute *to* their disciplines; but they also are empowered to utilize their skills and knowledge *for* the future of their disciplines.

Consider a brief illustration. Western music history is becoming marginalized in undergraduate music degree plans. An intellectual arts leader, motivated by a desire to reaffirm the importance of music history, might study why this is occurring. The results would be published and presented to accreditation boards and disciplinary conferences. Moreover, the data might give new meaning to the music history sequence in the context of curriculum reform and national standards. It might even be utilized to persuade campuses to incorpo-

rate arts history into the undergraduate experience of *all* students—a result that positions the arts as a valued and supported enterprise in society.

Implications for K–12

In the K–12 environment, the philosophy of intellectual entrepreneurship and the intellectual arts leader model hold real promise. During periods of decreased local, state, and federal support for the arts, intellectual arts leaders might help alleviate severe curricular and financial challenges faced by administrators and school boards.

Consider a brief example. Although this illustration goes well beyond the scope of this article and therefore is not fully developed, it at least suggests a new, entrepreneurial way of thinking, demonstrating how intellectual arts leaders can confront challenging issues by creating solutions that have personal, community, and educational value.

When localities are faced with cutting K–12 programs, the arts often are the first to receive close scrutiny. Intellectual Arts Leaders might forestall and mitigate cuts in these programs by engineering new community ventures—new ways of thinking about how to support and sustain the arts. Initiating summer arts programs is a case in point. By marshaling the support of parents, local business leaders, government officials, and private foundations, intellectual arts leaders, who have been trained to think like entrepreneurs, can create myriad opportunities for the many audiences who value K–12 arts education. In this case, financial support for the venture might come from a consortium of parents, local businesses, private foundations, philanthropists, and local, state, and federal sources. Equipment such as musical instruments, costumes, and art supplies might be found at reduced rates or may be donated for ventures such as this.

In view of the new approach to graduate education described in this article, potential arts faculty for staffing these summer programs would be prevalent and affordable. A large pool of college arts undergraduate and graduate students, all of whom already will have been educated as citizen-scholars via

the platform of intellectual entrepreneurship, will be available. These students would be teachers in summer arts programs, receiving valuable professional development and perhaps stipends and the eventual opportunity for jobs and careers heretofore not contemplated. Best of all, students would be part of a larger collaboration bringing communities together under the rubric of arts education. They would experience firsthand the synergies that can be produced by a partnership between academe and society—something currently lacking in arts doctoral education.

Families and K–12 schools would experience both direct and immediate benefits. Children would receive arts education during the year without the added burden of increased local taxes to subsidize the operation. Moreover, these summer programs might offer a real exercise in intellectual entrepreneurship: an opportunity to develop innovative curricula at the K–12 level by providing an arts incubator for testing new pedagogical methods. Additionally, this venture might become the basis for longitudinal studies, testing the long- and short-term value of a focused K–12 arts education over time as opposed to integration within the traditional school year.

The point of this very brief example is not to show mechanistically how to apply the concept of intellectual arts leadership to a typical arts education experience. Rather, it is to suggest the enormous value of a doctoral education grounded and situated in the context of community needs—a new ethical outcome for arts doctorates, if you will. What we are proposing is much more than a nod to the concept of town and gown. Intellectual arts leaders not only can produce change, but also have the intellectual capacity and ethical drive to solve problems by bringing communities together. We can only imagine the value of this type of venture if these same intellectual arts leaders choose to engage the community where their doctorate was earned or where they grew up.

Other examples of how the philosophy of intellectual entrepreneurship and the intellectual arts leader model hold

real promise in the K–12 environment include:

- Filling the gap of arts education for those districts that have cut programs by providing those services
- Creating a web-based clearinghouse of new and innovative arts curricula
- Creating local angel networks dedicated to funding K–12 arts education initiatives or organizing groups of visiting artists to engage students, parents, school districts, and communities in the promotion of ethnic diversity

With their intellectual skills and firm commitment coming to bear on these pressing issues, the future arts doctorate holder has the potential to impact students in ways we can only imagine.

Conclusion

When surveying the prospects available to newly minted PhDs, it seems obvious that a broader view should be embraced. If doctoral pedagogy is considered a means whose end *may be* an academic position, it will be possible to envision individuals who are more intellectually rounded and aware of the world, culture, and society. As hyper-specialization continues to be the norm in doctoral training, it is no wonder that PhD recipients who do not secure academic positions feel betrayed by their disciplines and the higher education system. Ownership of one's education must be taken seriously, because students not only envision their future but *invision* it as well. Perhaps by reexamining the curriculum of the academy advanced centuries ago, the liberal and classical arts could reemerge as powerful forces in academe and society.⁹ This reexamination should be nothing less than an exercise in reimagining—conceiving the new arts PhD (the intellectual arts leader) as a leader engaging the arts, the disciplines, and society.

To broaden the degree plan commensurate with these ends, the arts doctoral curriculum may need to be restructured, introducing new knowledge and skills. Recalling the “discovery-ownership-accountability” metaphor, arts students should be exposed to the concepts of

nonprofit culture, rhetoric, and arts policy as a key to discovery; entrepreneurship in broader, intellectual terms as a key to ownership; and ethics as a key to accountability. Without integrating these vital leadership components into doctoral education, we fear that students will remain victims of the aesthetic advanced a century ago.

As argued throughout this article, intellectual entrepreneurship is about empowering people—artists and arts scholars—to maximize their potential and that of their disciplines. This is accomplished when they seek audiences for whom their expertise makes a difference, whether academic or nonacademic. We are not so naïve as to assert that the task of re-envisioning the arts PhD is a simple matter, nor will it occur in a single step. Adopting the philosophy and vision of IE, however, is a modest move in the right direction. It is a means of developing intellectual arts leaders—those who have the intellectual capital, arts experience, and entrepreneurial resolve to confront the most critical problems the arts face today. When thought of in these terms, IE emerges as a method that simultaneously preserves the best of the current educational model, by continuing to produce cutting-edge scholars, as well as cultivating a broadened arts doctorate capable of innovating in ways not yet imagined.

Notes

1. See Bowen and Sosa, *Prospects for Faculty in the Arts and Sciences*. This work suggested that there would be a dramatic *undersupply* of PhDs available beginning in the late 1990s. Although the study has been cited frequently in oversupply literature, little statistical attention has been paid to its prognostication's not being fully realized. Some, however, see the increased use of adjunct faculty as the primary cause of oversupply in conjunction with a “corporatization” of the university. See Kelly, Pannacker, and Wiltse, “Scholarly Associations Must Face the True Causes.” Others have cited the importation of foreign students in some disciplines as a foil to Bowen and Sosa's outcomes. See Triggles and Miller, “Doctoral Education: Another Tragedy of the Commons?” (288). Triggles and Miller do not, however, suggest limiting the entry of foreign students into U.S. doctoral pro-

grams as a solution. For other remedies, see Wright, "A Market Solution to the Oversupply of Historians" for a "market-oriented approach" of lowering entry-level faculty salaries, and Kuh, "Is There a Ph.D. Glut?," which advocates cutting the number of PhD programs to meet demand.

2. See the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation's "The Responsive PhD" program <http://www.woodrow.org/responsivephd> (accessed August 2, 2005); the Carnegie Foundation's "Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate," <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/CID/index.htm>, and the University of Washington's "Re-envisioning the Ph.D." initiative. Unfortunately, the University of Washington's effort ceased in 2003 with the retirement of principal investigator Dr. Jody Nyquist. The university still maintains the initiative's Web site, however. See <http://www.grad.washington.edu/envision/index.html> (accessed August 2, 2005).

3. See Hartle and Galloway, "Too many Ph.D.s? Too many M.D.s?" Hartle and Galloway do not advocate cutting PhD enrollment, citing an inadequate prognostication model.

4. This trend of recognizing the arts as a critical component in economic development cannot be underestimated. The explicit result of these efforts is, perhaps, the most important boost for the arts in a half-century. Artists have not only the ear of local governments, but a ready-made economic sector waiting the establishment of innovative arts programs. For a very short list of initiatives, see The New England Council, June, 2000, *The Creative Economy Initiative: The Role of Arts and Culture in New England's Economic Competitiveness*. <http://www.nefa.org/pubs/index.html>; The New England Council, 2001, *The Creative Economy Initiative: A Blueprint for Investment in New England's Creative Economy*. <http://www.nefa.org/pubs/index.html>; and lastly, New England Foundation for the Arts, 2000, *New England's Creative Economy, The Non-Profit Sector: 2000*, <http://www.nefa.org/pubs/index.html>. Also see Susan Christopherson, 2004, "Creative Economy Strategies For Small and Medium Size Cities: Options for New York State," revised version of a paper prepared for the Quality Communities Marketing and Economics Workshop, Albany, New York, April 20, 2004; Dave Swenson and Liesl Eathington, 2003, "The Creative Economy in Iowa," research and report prepared for the Iowa Department of Cultural Affairs; "Vibrant Arts—Thriving Economy: Arts, Culture, and Prosperity in Arizona's Valley of the Sun," a summary report of the Maricopa regional Arts and Culture Task Force, 2004. For a recent study of the financial impact of the nonprofit arts sector, see Americans for the Arts, 2002, *Arts and*

Economic Prosperity: The Economic Impact of Nonprofit Arts Organizations and Their Audiences.

5. See Kadi, *Thinking Class*; and Peart, *Ceiling Unlimited*.

6. See The University of Rochester's Eastman School of Music's Institute for Music Leadership <http://www.rochester.edu/Eastman/iml/kauff.html> (accessed August 1, 2005), the University of Texas at Austin's Intellectual Entrepreneurship Program <https://webspace.utexas.edu/cherwitz/www/ie/> (accessed July 3, 2005); the Ohio State University's efforts in arts education; Prioleau, "Arts Education and the American Campus."

7. The logistics of how this philosophy is implemented, of course, would be constrained by the needs and circumstances of each educational institution.

8. At the risk of appearing defensive, we wish to emphasize that the examples above are not a methodology for alternative career paths. The language of alternative careers or entrepreneurship education as vocation prejudices the case, perpetuating an unhealthy binary. "Alternative" assumes a career for which one settles and is unrelated, if not in opposition, to one's academic training. From the perspective of IE and the intellectual arts leadership model, however, the concept of "alternative career" is a misnomer. Careers are not "academic" or "alternative"; they are possibilities created when one's passion is defined and when one discovers how their expertise might meaningfully be used. This is precisely what we meant earlier in suggesting the necessity of replacing the apprenticeship-certification-entitlement metaphor and model of graduate education with one of discovery-ownership-accountability. Entrepreneurship is a mindset and a philosophy—not simply a method for material gain. Thus, this approach to arts education would be as valuable even in the absence of the currently depressed academic job market.

9. In the majority of fine arts degree plans, these topics are seldom required beyond undergraduate core curriculum. What were once thought of as foundational classes in higher education four or five centuries ago are missing. Perhaps this points to higher education responding to past market demands. But as the market changes for fine arts PhDs, it seems axiomatic that the pedagogical focus can adapt, as it clearly has in the past. One might also consider how these lines of inquiry could better inform the arts scholarship of the future.

References

Bowen, William G., and Julie Ann Sosa. 1989. *Prospects for faculty in the arts and sciences: A study of factors affecting demand and supply, 1987 to 2012*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Cherwitz, Richard. 2003. Intellectual entrepreneurship: Educating citizen scholars, a cross-disciplinary consortium. <https://webspace.utexas.edu/cherwitz/www/ie/> (accessed July 29, 2005).

———. 2005a. A new social compact demands real change: Connecting the university to the community. *Change* 37 (6): 48–49.

———. 2005b. Creating a culture of intellectual entrepreneurship. *Academe* 91 (5):69. <https://webspace.utexas.edu/cherwitz/www/ie/academe.html>.

Cherwitz, Richard, and Charolette Sullivan. 2002. Intellectual entrepreneurship: A vision for graduate education. *Change* 34 (6): 23–27.

Cherwitz, Richard, and E. Johanna Hartelius. 2006. Making a great "engaged" university requires rhetoric. In *Fixing the fragmented public university: Decentralization with direction*, ed. Joseph Burke. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Florida, Richard. 2002. *The rise of the creative class*. New York: Basic Books.

Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation. Fostering intellectual creativity: An interview with Thomas Jackson, <http://www.kauffman.org/items.cfm?itemID=504> (accessed August 21, 2005).

Golde, C. M., and T. M. Dore. 2001. At cross purposes: What the experiences of today's students reveal about doctoral education. A report prepared for the Pew Charitable Trusts, <http://www.phd-survey.org> (accessed August 17, 2005).

Hartle, T. W., and F. J. Galloway. 1996. Too many Ph.D.s? Too many M.D.s? *Change* 28 (5): 27–33.

Kadi, Joanna. 1996. *Thinking class: Sketches from a cultural worker*. Boston: South End Press.

Kajitani, Megan Pincus, and Rebecca Bryant. March 24, 2005. A Ph.D. and a failure. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. <http://chronicle.com/jobs/2005/03/2005032401c.htm> (accessed August 21, 2005).

Kelly, Mark R., William Pannacker, and Ed Wiltse. December 18, 1998. Scholarly associations must face the true causes of the academic job crisis. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. <http://chronicle.com/free/v45/i17/17b00401.htm> (accessed September 1, 2005).

Kuh, Charlotte V. 1997. Is there a Ph.D. glut? Is that the right question? <http://www.cgsnet.org/vcr/kuh.htm> (accessed July 15, 2005).

LaPidus, J. B. November 14, 1997. Why pursuing a Ph.D. is a risky business. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. <http://chronicle.com/data/articles.dir/art-44.dir/issue-12.dir/12a06001.htm> (accessed July 14, 2005).

Magner, Denise K. April 17, 2000. An overhaul of Ph.D. training is urged, as survey suggests frustrations of doctoral

- students. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. http://www.phd-survey.org/news/chronicle_article1.htm (accessed July 15, 2005).
- Peart, Neil. 2003. *Ceiling unlimited*, 83531-2 (compact disc).
- Prioleau, Darwin. 2001. Arts education and the American campus: The leadership factor. *Arts Education Policy Review* 102 (4): 35–38.
- Triggle, David J., and Kenneth W. Miller. 2002. Doctoral education: Another tragedy of the commons? *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education* 66 (3): 287–94.
- Urice, John K. 2000. The coming crisis in public higher education: Implications for the arts. *Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 30 (2): 160–69.
- Wright, Robert E. April 12, 2002. A market solution to the oversupply of historians. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. <http://chronicle.com/free/v48/i31/31b02001.htm> (accessed July 1, 2005).
-
- Richard A. Cherwitz** is a professor in the department of communication studies and in the division of rhetoric at the University of Texas at Austin. He is the founder and director of the Intellectual Entrepreneurship Consortium. **Gary D. Beckman** is a doctoral candidate in musicology and assistant instructor (teaching arts entrepreneurship) in the College of Fine Arts at the University of Texas at Austin.

Copyright of Arts Education Policy Review is the property of Heldref Publications and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.