The Futures Project: Policy for Higher Education in a Changing World
February 2001
Points for Discussion: Policy

A New Challenge for Higher Education Policy: Channeling the Power of Market Forces to Achieve a New Vision for Higher Education

<u>Higher Education is Growing Increasingly Competitive</u>

- Under the impact of powerful forces, the American system of higher education is becoming significantly more competitive.

- New forces are reshaping the system—a rapid growth of for-profit degree granting colleges and universities; an explosion of virtual courses available from traditional non-profit, for-profit, and completely new institutions; demographic pressures encouraging more and different students to attend higher education; the impact of digital technology on teaching and learning; and an emerging trend toward the globalization of higher education.

- The system is moving toward one dominated more by market forces, less by regulation. What is emerging is a new form of competition.

- Historically, the higher education system has operated in a heavily regulated and benign market, with only limited pressures for competition, efficiency and innovation. A few things are now clear: market forces are entering higher education, their entry is unstoppable and ubiquitous, and, increasingly, institutions are being forced to behave as competitors.

- The advance of market forces and the creation of new providers will come even if the higher education system does not change. Systems and institutions need the capacity to compete and deal effectively with these market forces.

<u>The New Competition Brings Threats and Opportunities</u>

- These new competitive pressures bring both opportunity and danger. As the system becomes more structured by market forces, it is likely to be more responsive to the needs of society, more concerned with access, efficiency and quality. At the same time, as market forces come to play a larger role, they may also create a system that undercuts or diminishes key attributes of the system important to society, such as concern for the less advantaged, the introduction of students to the role of citizenship, or the role of the university as the home of unfettered research and open debate of critical issues in society.[i]

- The challenge for policymakers is to think about what society wants from higher education and how the power of market forces can move the system toward those goals, and then to design policies that will create an effective and thoughtful market-oriented system of higher education. The task is not to choose between market forces or regulation, but to combine and balance the two.

Market Forces Are Not a Panacea

- Market forces are not a simple panacea for all of higher education's problems. Market forces don't always work perfectly. Consumers don't always make good choices, and consumers often want competing things such as more flights per day as well as more flights that depart on time. In addition, participating in a market requires the ability to pay for a product or service. Therefore, those without the ability to pay are excluded from participating. There are many examples of industries that were left to unleashed market forces, resulting in a visible, negative impact upon society.
  - Following the deregulation of the electricity market in California in 1996, a series of issues, including rising demand, limited new capacity built, and rising prices for consumers led to an energy crisis in 2000, leaving officials considering re-regulating the industry.[ii]
  - The move to market forces in healthcare has been blamed for leaving 44.3 million people, or 16.3% of the U.S. population, without healthcare in 1998.[iii]
  - There are examples of market failure in higher education as well. New Zealand began releasing state control and cutting funding to higher education in 1988.[iv] The unfortunate result was skyrocketing tuition fees, some of the weakest institutions facing bankruptcy, and a 20 percent decrease in enrollments from the country's poorer districts.[v] In 2000, the government began seeking ways of reasserting its control over the sector.

- A higher education system left to market forces, without a thoughtful plan, could result in…
  - Limited access for low-income students, or students who are not "easy to educate," and therefore require a higher investment of resources and funding and are less likely to return profit.
  - A two-tiered system, with traditional, high-quality institutions reserved for the elite class and all other institutions serving the "nontraditional" or disadvantaged students.
  - A decrease in the quality of offerings as institutions focus more on profitability and less on delivering a high-quality product, which is often quite expensive.
  - Loss of those experiences and processes by which higher education stimulates the life of the mind and introduces students to the role of engaged, thoughtful citizen.
  - Intrusion of market interests into the areas of research and scholarship.
  - More homogenization of institutions as they conform to industry standards in an effort to compete, resulting in fewer educational alternatives for students.
  - Closure of institutions, programs or disciplines that serve society well, satisfy a unique need, and provide students with real choice, but are expensive to run and are often cross-subsidized.

Channeling the Power of Market Forces to Achieve a New Vision for Higher Education

- Market forces are extremely powerful. While there are dangers inherent in their presence, there is also the opportunity to put them to use. Via thoughtful policy alternatives, the higher education system can channel the power of market forces for the benefit of society. The airline industry, which was deregulated in 1976, provides a good example of policymakers allowing greater play of market forces while instituting some thoughtful policies in areas where the market would not work well, namely safety assurance. While published safety records do figure into the choices consumers make, the FAA also continues to monitor safety behind the scenes. In an education example, at the K-12 level states, schools and systems have begun publishing performance data which pushes schools to perform better but also helps the consumers—parents and students—to make informed choices.

- In light of the current, unprecedented opportunity before us to capitalize on the new competition and market forces that have entered higher education, it is worthwhile to think about an ideal vision for the higher education system. The Futures Project has crafted a vision of a higher education system that…
    - Offers opportunity for all individuals wishing to gain access to postsecondary learning.
    - Embraces as a core value the appreciation and promotion of diversity of students, faculty and staff, treats all of its participants equally, and creates a climate that supports all participants and pushes them to their fullest potential.
    - Encourages diverse and unique institutional missions.
    - Offers a range of educational alternatives that are all of high quality and affordable.
    - Supports programs and institutions that are needed or beneficial to society but not necessarily attractive to the market (e.g., specialized institutions and outreach programs that encourage participation and attainment for previously excluded groups such as minorities, low-income students and women; high-cost programs such as pharmacy, biomedical engineering, and nursing).
    - Focuses on improving teaching and learning through effective modes of pedagogy.
    - Assesses learner outcomes on meaningful measures.
    - Recognizes the unique learning styles of students and offers a variety of learning options facilitated by technology and research on pedagogy.
    - Produces engaged citizens who are thoughtful, committed, and active in the community.
    - Develops the life of the mind of its students.
    - Strives to be efficient and cost effective.
    - Is flexible and able to respond to market demands.
    - Performs objective research, maintains distance from the market and promotes open debate on critical public issues.
    - Encourages institutional self-examination and evaluates performance against the institutional mission.

- Encourages collaboration between institutions and systems to expand choices for students in an efficient and affordable manner.

- The Futures Project is investigating policies tried or proposed around the world, with the goal of developing policy alternatives that will help the higher education system of the United States evolve toward a thoughtful, market-oriented system. The policies under investigation fall into the following categories:
    - Policies that Create a Market-Oriented Structure for Higher Education
    - Policies Designed to Assure, Assess and Report Quality
    - Policies that Address Societal Concerns
    - Policies Concerning Uses of Technology

Policies that Create a Market-Oriented Structure for Higher Education

Autonomy

- Higher education systems were designed to offer institutions, and states, many advantages, including efficiencies of scale, concentrated power and leverage, and free exchange of ideas. However, the reality is that institutions in a regulated system often get the disadvantages of regulation (e.g., inflexibility) without the intended gains (e.g., reduced duplication).

- Many states and nations are now seeking policies that will inject more autonomy into their systems. Policies that might be used for this purpose include deregulation, decentralization, charter colleges, public corporations, privatization, encouragement of new providers, and for-profit spin-offs.

- The differences between policies are often difficult to discern. The "charter" of a charter college might look quite similar to a "contract," "compact" or "performance agreement" in another state. Hebel illustrates this point by saying, "Officials in Colorado, Massachusetts, and Virginia also are debating proposals to develop charter colleges, or governance structures akin to that model."[vi]

- Despite the widespread confusion about terminology, one thing seems clear: institutions, states and nations are searching for ways of injecting more autonomy into the system after decades of building regulations.[vii] Benno C. Schmidt Jr., vice-chairman of the CUNY Board of Trustees and chairman of Edison Schools, brushes over definitions to champion the idea of greater autonomy: "Whether one calls the idea charter colleges or uses some other nomenclature, the movement toward greater operational and resource autonomy, coupled with higher accountability for results, is here….And, in my judgment, it will only build in the future."[viii]

Deregulation
Deregulation, defined by MacTaggart as “the removal or suspension of rules or controls,”[ix] shifts the role of government from being the main provider of higher education to steering the system. Efforts to deregulate strip away the heavy, protective hand of central legislation, allow institutions more local authority and flexibility, and heighten an institution’s ability and need to interact with the market and compete with other institutions.

Michigan: An Unregulated System. The higher education system of the state of Michigan is often held up as a model of a “comprehensive, high-quality system with little state regulation.”[x] …

Decentralization
MacTaggart defines decentralization as “a shift in the locus of authority from a higher to a lower level.”[xi] MacTaggart clarifies the distinction between decentralization and deregulation by stating that in decentralization “the rules do not change, but the level at which they are enforced does.”[xii] Defined by many as “institutional self-governance,” decentralization roughly translates to a reduction in centralized control of funding, authority, and accountability.[xiii]

Arguments in favor of decentralization include that it allows institutions to exercise more creativity and flexibility,[xiv] the pressures for accountability are more striking when enforced locally,[xv] cumbersome regulation and reporting requirements are eliminated, [xvi] and offerings can be made more relevant to local communities.[xvii] However, opponents of decentralization assert criticisms such as decreased commitment to access and affordability on the part of local trustees,[xviii] heightened competition between institutions, [xix] duplication of programs,[xx] and a tendency to focus more on local needs to the detriment of broader state or national needs.[xxi]

Decentralization in New Jersey. In 1994, New Jersey Governor Christine Todd Whitman announced her intention to dismantle the cabinet-level Board of Higher Education (BHE) in favor of a smaller, state-sponsored governance system and a more decentralized institutional structure. The destruction of BHE, a cabinet-level agency applying strong regulatory authority, allowed for substantially greater autonomy by channeling power to local boards of trustees rather than a single regulatory authority.[xxii] Specifically, the new structure empowered local trustee authority over tuition and fees, academic programs, trustee nominations and facilities construction, while eliminating elements of state-level budget and program review. To oversee the local boards, a non-regulatory, state-level coordinating body known as the Commission on Higher Education was formed as well as a Presidents’ Council composed of university leaders. The new structure requires presidents of all public and private institutions to directly assist in coordinating higher education. The underlying policy goal behind the autonomy movement and the subsequent restructuring reforms was the following: innovation, quality, educational service and accountability are all more likely to be attained through policies set by local boards of trustees rather than through a centralized state bureaucracy.[xxiii]

A 1996 interim assessment of the reorganization revealed that most of the 85 assignments initially planned had been implemented (only 18 were still in the planning stage). The report was also characterized by more positive responses than negative ones. In spite of these achievements, however, concerns about the new system also emerged, focused on two areas in particular: first, the newly autonomous institutions were advised to work together on joint advocacy for higher education. Also, the groups were told to better coordinate their efforts. Specifically, college presidents were directed to find ways to "submerge individual campus interests" in an effort to advance the common good.[xxiv] However, as more and more new providers enter the market, it will be harder and harder for presidents to do this. Thus, while the New Jersey reforms have brought about significant positive changes in higher education administration, the reorganization remains a work in progress.

China Pushes Institutional Oversight to the Provinces. From **CHINA EDUCATION NEWS <Volume 3, Issue No. 4, Feb 3 2001>**

(China Education Daily, Jan 15 2001) Ms Chen Zhili, Minister of Education, summarized the achievements in 2000 during the Ninth 5-Year Plan. She mentioned that the 85% of region with residents realized 9-year compulsory education in 2000, and recruitment of higher education rose from 1,840,000 in 1995 to 3,760,000 in 2000. She noted that in the past years over 900 higher education institutions were involved in restructuring. Among them 556 institutions mainly maintained by central ministries were merged into 232 institutions. The Ministry of Education and other ministries now only maintain 120 institutions, and most higher education institutions are under provincial authorities. The Minister also noted that there were over 45,000 non-governmental educational institutions by the end of 1999.Among them 370 were higher education institutions which were titled as "pilot institutions of the National Higher Education Self-study Examination". | Chinese Original |

Public Corporations

SHEEO offers the following definition of a public enterprise: "A public enterprise is a corporation whose major stockholder is a public body….The public enterprise is not a new or revolutionary concept. Crown Corporations, entities of the federal and provincial governments, have long existed in Canada. In Minnesota, through the joint powers agreement, governmental bodies may join to form their own corporations."[xxv]

Chalmers University of Sweden Becomes a Semi-Private Foundation. In 1991, a new conservative Swedish government—more interested in a free-market approach—offered *any* university "foundation" status.[xxvi] Chalmers was the only one that accepted. All others backed off: why take such a drastic step if the present system is not broken? Under its new form, Chalmers University is run under the same legal form as a *private company.* Chalmers received a large lump sum at the outset to create an endowment. It signed a 15-year contract with the government stipulating general performance targets and guaranteed annual support from the state. Some state rules (work conditions, faculty unions) still apply, but it could eventually buy its own property.

Its management is henceforth independent. A 10-person Foundation Board replaces the state as owner (major industrial executives sit on the board). Below this board is a 15-person Chalmers University of Technology Ltd. Board, chaired by a leading industrialist, with representatives from the ranks of faculty, students, municipal commissioners and industry presidents. At the internal school level, "steering boards" are chaired by an outsider, whose position is next to that of the deans.

Chalmers agreed to foundation status for the following reasons:

- Wanted rights over its own resources, from physical plant to weekly wages;
- Wanted a more flexible organization
  (with the ability to recruit its own staff, from abroad as well, to develop its own admission procedures for students and to increase staff movement between industry and university);
- Wanted to compete to be one of the top 10 technology universities in Europe;
- The idea of a foundation conformed to Chalmers' history of independence (see below).

In 1995, only one half of Chalmers' funding came from the government, much less than other Swedish institutions. At that time, however, a new social democrat government viewed Chalmers' foundation as the extreme case of what had gone wrong, claiming that chaos had been introduced into the otherwise well-integrated Swedish system of higher education. The new government was also concerned that there had been an inappropriate allocation of resources to research. The new government took back Chalmers' right to negotiate the purchase of its own property, allowing the university to now only rent. In every other respect, however, Chalmers' independent status remains intact.

[This case may be unique, due to Swedish historical circumstances as well as the particular history of Chalmers. Founded in 1829 as a small, private "polytechnic" institute, Chalmers received regular government funding from the beginning. Control swung between public and private over its more than 150 years. Chalmers remained small even when Swedish enrollments boomed (1940-1960) because the high cost of the equipment needed to expand.

In the 1980s a rector with American experience pushed professors to be more academically assertive. Out of this "bottom-up" initiative, a project-oriented periphery was created, the most notable of which is the science park where university research meets industry research in joint applied efforts (in 1995, there were plans to double the park's size). The Swedish National Board for Industrial and Technical Development provided financing and the university provided the space. Clark states that for a university to work this close to industry is unique in Europe. An alumni "club" became an important force for the university, also unusual in Europe. One-half of Chalmers' graduates remain in the Chalmers Engineering Association.]

Oregon Health Sciences University Converts to a Public Corporation. A public corporation, as defined by the State of Oregon, is an entity created by the state to carry out public missions and services. It participates in activities or provides services that are also provided by private enterprises. The corporation has operating flexibility, but still abides by the principles of public accountability and public policy. Responding to the competitive healthcare market, Oregon Health Sciences University in Portland became a public corporation in 1995. The university expected to become more efficient and responsive to the market by reducing bureaucracy associated with state agencies.[xxvii]

The university provides medical research and education to residents of Oregon. The university is charged with the explicit task of providing continuing educational opportunities for doctors and emergency medical technicians in rural areas.[xxviii] Oregon Health Sciences University is also charged with the public mission of assisting disabled individuals in acquiring gainful employment in order to lead more independent and dignified life.[xxix] In order to achieve these goals, the state of Oregon provides funding and facilities. Although the state maintains the rights to the property, the university has a ninety-nine year lease on all property and facilities currently used for operating the institution.[xxx] The university receives funding from the state by submitting a budget every even-numbered year.[xxxi] The board of directors for the university is appointed by the governor and confirmed by the Senate.[xxxii]

Charter Colleges

The K-12 charter school movement has gained much momentum, and publicity, in recent years. Now, the idea of charter colleges is also starting to take shape. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* recently defined charter colleges as "public colleges and universities [that] gain management flexibility and a fixed amount of state spending in return for agreeing to meet detailed performance goals."[xxxiii] Berdahl and MacTaggart constructed a more detailed definition:

> Charter colleges are publicly owned institutions managed independent of most controls imposed by state bureaucracies and higher education systems. They are subject to applicable local, state, and federal laws and required to follow standard financial accounting and reporting procedures. They are governed by their own boards of trustees, although their charters are granted and evaluated by the state's coordinating agency. Charter colleges enjoy almost complete discretion in managing their administrative affairs. For example, the authority to contract for services, finance and oversee capital projects, set salaries and titles for non-represented employees, set tuition rates, build and hold reserves for multiple years, establish foundations for the receipt of private gifts, and, in some instances, negotiate employee contracts with bargaining units or manage under a flexible sidebar to master agreements.
>
> The charter that details the institution's relationship with the state confirms the mission of the institution, the level of its educational programs, the funding agreement with the state, the specific management authority delegated to the college, and the educational and other results that are expected to be achieved within a fixed period of time. [xxxiv]

The limited number of examples of charter colleges, and their relatively short length of existence, makes it difficult to gauge their success. St. Mary's College of Maryland is widely considered the only true charter college in the nation. However, Berdahl and MacTaggart's in-depth study of charter colleges concludes that, "charter colleges make sense because they capitalize on the profound desire within academic culture for more autonomy. In return for greater independence, the state receives more accountability for results."[xxxv] And, many believe, autonomous campuses are more efficient, innovative, distinctive and responsive to market needs.[xxxvi]

Critics assert that charter colleges will encourage duplication of programs, allow fraud, weaken state higher education systems by dividing their resources, and, due to the freedom exercised by leaders of charter colleges, lead to tuition increases as well as the elimination of some programs and practices such as remediation, tenure and collective-bargaining rights.[xxxvii]

St. Mary's College of Maryland Becomes A Model Charter College. In 1992, St. Mary's College of Maryland took bold steps to increase its autonomy.[xxxviii] Robert Berdahl describes the legislation that granted St. Mary's that autonomy as:

> Giving a state institution a hybrid public-private status by state law, to see whether privatizing some of its functions would allow it to become so efficient and effective that it could increase quality, maintain access, and raise increasing amounts of funds from nonstate sources.[xxxix]

Via the legislation, St. Mary's received a lump-sum budget and freedom from most state regulations. This freedom did come at a price. St. Mary's agreed to a state tax support ceiling (plus inflation) as well as a plan to use some of its tuition revenues (tuitions were doubled over the 5 years subsequent to the change in status) to provide access to the school for low-income students.

St. Mary's was in many ways a prime candidate for such an experiment. Its status as a "public honors college" meant that it already had a good academic reputation at a public tuition cost. It also had a strong board and leadership, as well as a commitment to diversity and a diverse student body.[xl]

Since becoming a charter college, St. Mary's has received much praise. In 1995, a Middle States accreditation team declared, "St. Mary's College is a strong, healthy institution."[xli] Berdahl conducted an analysis of the institution in 1996 that found improvements in governance, academic planning, percentage of the students that are minority, quality of the student body as measured by SAT scores, quality and diversity of faculty, employee morale, and savings on procurement and construction, all attributable to the College's changed status.[xlii] A follow-up visit by Berdahl in 1999 revealed that the College continues to enjoy political support as well as improvements in SAT scores, diversity, graduation and retention, faculty quality, fund raising, and physical facilities.[xliii]

Berdahl concludes that individual governing boards, as well as increased autonomy, both make valuable contributions to the quality and vitality of an institution. However, Berdahl is careful to point out the distinction between procedural autonomy, which affects how an institution goes about achieving its goals, and substantive autonomy which affects the actual goals of an institution, and notes that, "the state should retain a partnership role in the substantive goals and programs to ensure that the public interest is being served."[xliv]

CSULA Launches a Charter School of Education. The first Charter School of Education (CSOE) in the nation was established in 1993 at California State University, Los Angeles. Charter status for the CSOE enables experimental and creative behavior, freed from regulatory constraints, as the CSOE encounters shifting demographics of California's school-age population, increased reform movements in U.S. education, a growing body of evidence that collaboration in school partnerships is beneficial, and heightened accountability and focus on teaching.[xlv] Berdahl and MacTaggart note that the charter status of the CSOE is different than other charter colleges because it is a school within a broader university. Therefore, its charter status frees it from system regulations, not state regulations.[xlvi] An external review team described CSOE's charter authorization as "certain institutional rules and regulations that traditionally governed the operational activities of this academic unit could be waived in recognition of its efforts to engage in major education reform."[xlvii]

As part of its mission, the CSOE collaborates with public schools in urban L.A. in an attempt to adapt to the schools' changing needs. As a charter institution, the school features a coordinated, multidisciplinary approach to learning designed to foster innovation in curriculum and research with emphasis on reform efforts, with a main benefit of charter status being faculty flexibility in program development. Features of the CSOE program include: an integrated Model Teacher Education Program, a Literacy Cluster focused on improved teacher preparation in reading and language arts, an Accelerated School Reform model developed by Henry Levin at Stanford University, and the Program Evaluation Research Collaborative. The school, primarily composed of graduate students, boasts a diverse enrollment: 40% Latino, 30% Caucasian, 15% Asian-American, 10% African-American, 5% Native American. As in many teacher education programs, CSOE enrolls more women than men at a ratio of 2:1.

Evaluation of the CSOE program in progress reveals both strengths and weaknesses: while the school's distinct administrative structure has increased collaboration within the university system and shared decision making, its curriculum has been criticized for leaving out inquiry methods. The program's creative scheduling, MTEP (Model Teaching Program) and use of Internet technology have all been praised as innovative means of using limited resources, but the program's use of space has been criticized for being traditional and conventional. (These assessments were made by an external evaluation team that assessed the program's progress after its first five years.[xlviii]) Specific recommendations offered by external evaluators for the CSOE's future consideration include: an increased focus on human resource development, the sharing of the CSOE model with other schools which may launch similar programs, and an effort to reduce student turnover while enhancing communication with students and prospective students. In July of 2000, CSU Chancellor Dr. Charles Reed granted the CSOE a ten-year extension.

Privatization

SHEEO defines privatization as, "Privatization, as practiced by many governments today, means contracting with private companies to perform certain services," thereby replacing a "public bureaucracy."[xlix] Wilson, as quoted in MacTaggart, defines it as, "the substitution of private providers for public ones."[l]

Privatizing Higher Education: The Chilean Case. In 1981, Chile adopted a policy to privatize its higher education system to increase access, diversify the types of institutions, reduce the influence of its public institutions, recover costs, and increase competition.[li] In order to achieve these goals, the following policies were enacted:

1. Public funding was reduced and public institutions had to compete for infrastructure funds. Research funding was transferred from institutions to individual researchers on an open, competitive basis. Student support was transferred from institutions to individual students through scholarships and student loans.
2. Costs were recovered through tuition fees set by institutions.
3. Scholarships and subsidized loans were provided to needy students.
4. Open admissions were permitted in all institutions except public universities.

5. A strong system of accreditation, regulation, and evaluation was established to assure quality of services.

The adoption of the above policies had the following results:

1. Access was increased as evidenced by the tripling of enrollment rates from 1980 to 1994 especially in private institutions. Access was also improved by the fact that the new institutions established themselves throughout the nation.
2. The system was diversified as evidenced by the existence of a three-tier system of universities, professional institutes, and technical training centers. The diversification reduced the influence of the public institutions.
3. Costs were recovered as evidenced by the fact that by 1995 tuition fees cover approximately one third of operating costs per institution.
4. Transferring from institutional support to direct student support improved efficiency of public higher education funding and increased access to needy students.
5. Increased competition was evidenced by the fact that the system went from 8 institutions in 1980 to 270 in 1994.
6. Although quality and equity had not been fully evaluated by 1995, it does not seem that the policy changes have negatively impacted these areas of concern.

(Next step: See Donahue, John. The Privatization Decision: Public Ends, Private Means. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1989.)

Encouragement of New Providers

As the demand for higher education expands, many state and national systems of higher education are stretched too thin to accommodate all of the potential learners. In an attempt to fill demand, some policymakers have turned to strategies designed to encourage new providers—such as private institutions, for-profit institutions, and virtual providers—to enter the state or country and take up the slack, thereby easing the burden on the public system while increasing the number of educated students in the state or country. Two key questions related to such policies are: 1) to what extent does the state count on the market to reduce inefficiencies and redundancies; and 2) what policies are already on the books that reduce flexibility and limit a system's ability to compete? Examples of policies designed to encourage new providers, and to not limit competition in a geographic area, include:

- Recognizing the decreasing importance of state borders and geographic boundaries to higher education and the increasing ability of both in-state and out-of-state providers to offer distance education and electronic coursework in "virtually any geographic area," the Citizens' Commission on the Future of Oklahoma Higher Education[lii] believes that, "Future higher education strategies attempting to formally or informally reserve geographic market areas exclusively for service by local institutions are likely to fail."
- In order to accommodate rising enrollment rates at public institutions, the state of California would need to build "more than 20 new campuses." Noting that the state can barely maintain its existing institutions the California Postsecondary Education Commission[liii] recommends meeting the increased demand by passing students on to independent institutions. The Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities

estimates that the independent institutions may be able to accommodate between "18,000 and 20,000 additional Californians." The commission suggests awarding grants directly to needy students to bypass the constitutional prohibition against grants to non-public institutions.

- In June 1999, China's Premier Jiang Zemin proclaimed that it was time for private schools to enter the market, an announcement that was eagerly-awaited by private investors.[liv]

Private Universities Gain Influence in Egypt. The presence of private institutions in Egypt has been perceived by some as a "national threat."[lv] Although 4 private institutions only provided courses to about 6000 students, the schools have "rapidly acquired a major political significance." Debate has centered on the new "universities law" which would replace the 1972 universities law and provide "unified legislation for all sectors of higher education." Eighteen private universities are waiting for "official authorization." The "national threat" label especially targets those institutions which are branches of foreign universities, and whether they will be "totally Egyptian universities" with Egyptian shareholders. Private universities made more progress in January 1999 when they "won a legal battle against the Physicians' Syndicate (Naqabat al-Atibba), which had claimed that only graduates of a state university should authorized to practice medicine." A committee was assembled in 1999 to "focus on the development of higher education" and to deal with the issue of privatization. The government reforms forced by the privately educated physicians serves as a case study for the increased influence of private institutions and accreditation changes that the growing private sector will require.

Creating an Integrated System: The Case of Uruguay. Uruguay has demonstrated signs of developing a higher education system that integrates public and private institutions.[lvi] However, before describing how Uruguay has done this, it is important to consider its recent history in relation to higher education. Up until a few years ago, Uruguay's higher education system consisted of only one institution, the "Universidad de la Republica (the Republic's University)." In essence, higher education was a governmental monopoly. However, since 1995 Uruguay has embarked on major educational reform to improve quality and access of education at all levels. The catalyst of the reform was South America's free trade agreement (Mercosur). One of the goals of the agreement was for each member nation to have comparable higher education systems, which Uruguay did not. The evidence was that each of the other member nations (Argentina, Brazil, and Chile) had several important universities and different types of institutions, while Uruguay did not. The disparity compelled Uruguay to compete with the other member nations.

As a result of Uruguay's efforts, a decree (308/95) was passed in August 1995. The decree gave the Ministry of Education and Culture the responsibility to authorize, recognize, and regulate private institutions and also accredit the degrees of all institutions. The ministry in turn created an advisory board whose members represent public and private institutions to implement its new responsibility. The effect of the decree was to formally end governmental monopoly in higher education and facilitate the growth of private institutions. Since the decree, eight private universities have been established, 19% of students are now enrolled in private institutions, and 16% of faculty work in private institutions. The decree also compelled the public university to evaluate itself and make changes in order to compete with the new private institutions. In response, the private institutions are also engaging in internal evaluations.

(Next step: Research on Hong Kong and Turkey.)

For-profit Spin-offs
Several high-profile traditional universities, seeking greater flexibility and a means of accumulating capital for investment, are opting to spin off a for-profit arm that can behave as a for-profit corporation in the interests of the university. Michael Goldstein, an attorney who has been involved in the establishment of several for-profit arms, delivered a presentation to the National Association of College and University Business Officers in which he detailed the following reasons to create separate, for-profit entities:

- "Provide for organizational flexibility, particularly as an alternative to outsourcing.
- Allow different ownership structures.
- Help insulate the university against uncontrollable loss.
- Enable the university to raise money in the capital marketplace and to benefit from appreciated value.
- Create better ways to compensate faculty and others who contribute to value."[lvii]

Goldstein also elaborated on the "fundamental elements" of a for-profit subsidiary:

- "Academic control remains with the institution and its faculty.
- Marketing, R&D, product delivery and business services reside in the capitalization entity.
- The structure does not adversely affect either accreditation or state authorization.
- The venture can negotiate the rules governing the ownership of intellectual property and courseware technology.
- Control is appropriately balanced between the university, the new entity and the investor(s) and strategic partner(s).
- Economic risks and rewards are appropriately shared, protecting the key interests of the university."[lviii]

University	For-Profit Arm
Columbia University	Morningside Ventures, Inc.
Cornell University	eCornell
New York University	NYUonline
State University of New York at Geneseo	DGB Enterprises, Inc. (Holding Co.)
Temple University	Virtual Temple
University of Maryland	UMUC OnLine.com, Inc.
University of Nebraska	Class.com

University of Maryland Goes For-Profit with UMUC OnLine.com, Inc. In order to compete with corporations in online education, the University of Maryland University College became the first public university to create a for-profit company. The company will market, sell, and support the university's online degree programs to out-of-state and international students. The University System of Maryland Board of Regents supported UMUC's revenue-seeking venture.

This new company will allow the university to attract private capital and other funds not available to other public institutions. The university plans to use the profits from its online program to reduce costs and improve the services for on-campus students. Proceeds will also help UMUC provide more competitive salaries and opportunities to faculty and staff. The intent is to eventually make a public offering.[lix]

Cornell Establishes a For-profit Entity. On September 14 of 2000, the trustees at Cornell University authorized the creation of a for-profit branch, which they called eCornell, to market its distance learning programs. Hunter R. Rawlings, Cornell's President, said that the university embarked on this venture because "it is clear that the Internet is going to be a major new avenue for the delivery of education."[lx] eCornell will offer nondegree educational programs developed in conjunction with the faculty and staff of Cornell. To fund this program, the trustees approved "an initial capital funding allocation for eCornell of $12 million from the university's endowment for the period beginning July 1, 2000, and ending June 30, 2001."[lxi] They decided to make eCornell for-profit as a way to increase revenues for the University—hopefully it will increase capital funding. Funds brought in will go to funding of already existing on campus programs, as well as provide further compensation for faculty.[lxii]

NYU Goes Online with a For-profit Subsidiary. In 1998, NYU became the first major American university to found a for-profit branch when it founded NYUonline, an online provider targeting the business community. NYUonline's courses are taught by leaders in their respective fields with the support of NYU resources, schools and experience. These courses have been designed asynchronously so that they can be accessed any time, anywhere in the world.[lxiii] The courses at NYUonline are a direct result of a partnership between NYUonline and the corporation. Courses and assessment are both designed in consultation with the corporation so as to accomplish each corporation's specific goals. NYUonline creates courses that are designed to be online; these are not NYU courses posted on the web. This ensures quality, and assures that course material is suitable for what the corporation and NYUonline wish to accomplish. As an added bonus, NYUonline offers to translate its courses into any language so as to allow for global participation within each company.[lxiv]

NYUonline offers two different types of programs for the corporations it has formed partnerships with: targeted learning and blended learning. Targeted learning is designed to supplement whatever employee training is already in place at a specific company. NYUonline teaches students how to access and use resources from the university online, or could supplement an instructor-led course by providing a web-based component. Blended learning is where NYUonline teaches an already existing course, but targeted specifically at the individual company. For example, the course could be taught with guest lecturers that are top executives in the company, or using case study examples that the company provides—hopefully this will also serve to deepen and strengthen corporate culture.[lxv] Courses are offered in areas such as E-Law Modules, Banking Modules, and Human Resources Management Modules among others. Each of these modules contains a number of different courses. The E-Law Module contains the fewest number of courses, but offers courses with titles such as: Legal Issues in e-Security, and Legal Issues of Intellectual Property on the Web.[lxvi]

Incentives

Contracting, performance-based funding, incentive grants.

Contracting with the State

Contracting in France. In the case of France, the system was extremely centralized until the passage of the Savary Laws in 1984, which granted French universities the possibility of financial, academic, and teaching autonomy. While general acceptance of the government proposals took nearly a decade to be accepted—and are still resisted by a large number of institutions—90 institutions now negotiate four-year contracts with the Ministry of Higher Education. These contracts replace a traditional system of annual grants and are designed to guarantee university autonomy while empowering the State to exercise responsibility for quality standards within the system. The contract system represents structural changes in higher education administration as well as an important philosophical shift.

(Next step: Research UK example.)

Performance-based Funding

Performance-based funding, or the allocation of state funds and bonuses based on a series of established academic standards, has been implemented, or is under consideration, in states such as Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Missouri, South Caroline, Tennessee, Virginia and Wyoming.[lxvii] Designed to encourage institutions to meet agreed-upon standards in areas such as student attainment and placement rates, as well as to make institutions accountable for receipt of public funds, performance-based funding aims to shift the focus from regulating a process to awarding successful outcomes. Performance-based funding has received much attention in recent years, especially as a means of satisfying the recent interest in accountability in education. However, concerns have been raised about the viability of performance-based funding during an economic downturn, the potential for increased bureaucratic reporting and meddling, and the power of legislatures over institutions.[lxviii] Furthermore, critics suggest that performance-based funding impacts different types of institutions unevenly, as large, research universities rely to a lesser degree on state-level appropriations than do community colleges.[lxix]

Performance-based budgeting in Colorado. The Colorado Commission on Higher Education's[lxx] performance-based budgeting system will measure qualitative and quantitative goals against a list of indicators including: two and four-year graduation rates, faculty instructional productivity, freshmen persistence, achievement rate on post-degree professional exams, class size in freshman and sophomore courses, a diversity plan, evaluations of institutional support costs, and two other institution-selected indicators reflecting the institution's individuality. While 25% of new funding above the base institutional support will remain enrollment driven, the Commission plans to base 75% of the new funding on performance-based standards.

Oklahoma Recommends Financial Incentives. The Citizens' Commission on the Future of Oklahoma Higher Education suggests that changes made in higher education should result from financial incentives as opposed to regulation. The Commission recommends placing financial incentives within a "competitive framework" where "institutions compete in the development of effective proposals for achieving stated objectives and successful institutions receive financial awards to implement their proposals."[lxxi]

(Next step: Research Virginia as an example. Performance agreements for 5 universities will be decided on next year.)

Potential sources:

Archibald, Robert B. and Michael J. BeVier. Virginia Institute for Public Policy. "Imposing Market Discipline on Public Colleges and Universities." 28 July 2000 <www.virginiainstitute.org/mdpc.html>.

Berdahl, Robert O. and MacTaggart, Terrence J. "Charter Colleges: Balancing Freedom and Accountability." White Paper No. 10. Boston, MA: Pioneer Institute for Public Policy Research, 2000: 15.

State Council for Higher Education in Virginia. "Virginia Higher Education Performance Funding Model" 5 May 1999.

Collaboration, Consortia and Internationalization

Mexico Fosters National and International Collaboration. As a way of encouraging consortia and opening the higher education system in Mexico, the Mexican Association of Higher Education Institutions (ANUIES) has proposed a number of policies to foster national and international collaboration.[lxxii] These policies are found in the association's proposal entitled, "Higher education in the 21st Century: Strategies for development." In the proposal, the ANUIES argues that the fostering of national and international collaboration must be a priority to strengthen the higher education system in Mexico. As such, the ANUIES proposes the creation of a network of academic networks. It is expected that these networks will contribute to the growing need of building the capacity of students and faculty so that they can be competitive in an increasingly interconnected world.

The network that the ANUIES proposes would be based on its existing regional divisions whose task will be to develop strategies for national and international collaboration. Each participating institution is expected to develop a strategic plan regarding national and international collaboration by 2001. Each participating higher education institution is also expected to have inter-institutional agreements of mutual recognition of credits with its national counterparts in order to facilitate student mobility at the state, regional, and national level by 2001. Lastly, each participating institution is expected to develop new organizational models to facilitate collaboration, namely in the areas of administration, curricula development, and programs of study.

As a whole, the ANUIES has set out to increase the number of intra-national projects of collaboration especially in the areas of research and teaching at the doctoral level by 2001. Also, the ANUIES will aim at having academic mobility programs at the regional, national, and international level by 2002. In terms of outside support, the ANUIES calls on the state and federal governments to enable higher education institutions to create permanent mechanisms to address the issue of national and international collaboration and to increase funding of higher education to improve its quality.

Mercosur Establishes Educational Integration Policies. In 1991, Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay signed Mercosur, a free trade agreement among the four countries.[lxxiii] However, the agreement aimed not only at integrating the economies of the member nations, but also other sectors of their societies, including education. Educational integration is considered key to economic integration and as such, member nations have adopted policies toward that end. Since Mercosur is not in itself a legislative body, the policies must be ratified by each national legislature. The following describes some of the educational integration policies that have been adopted.

From 1994 to 1997, the Mercosur nations agreed to mutually recognize each other's primary and secondary educational levels' certificates and grades accredited by each of the member nations' governments. In this way, for example, a student from Uruguay that had completed primary education in that country would be able to pursue secondary education in Argentina. The country that receives a student from another member nation is expected to assist such a student in adapting to the new system he or she enters. Since each of the countries has different forms of primary and secondary education they also agreed to equivalents across the four countries. As another way of fostering integration, the Mercosur nations agreed to incorporate each other's history, geography, and languages (Spanish and Portuguese) into their curricula. In order to continue the process of educational integration the Mercosur nations established a regional commission to which each ministry of education was required to send representatives. The commission meets any time two of the nations request a meeting, however the location of the meeting must rotate equally among the four nations. In addition, the Mercosur nations agreed to notify each other of changes within their educational systems.

From 1996 to 1998, the Mercosur nations agreed to mutually recognize each other's undergraduate and graduate university degrees granted by institutions recognized by their respective governments. The degrees must have required a minimum of four years of study. Similar to the prior example, a student who earns an undergraduate degree in one country is able to pursue post-graduate work in another member nation. Again, the country that receives a student from another member nation is expected to assist that student in adapting to the educational system he or she enters. The Mercosur nations also established a system of higher education collaboration especially in exchanging scientific and technological knowledge and developing common criteria to evaluate graduate programs. The agreement especially encourages collaboration to increase the number of doctoral graduates. And, it encourages the development of courses that are of strategic importance to all member nations. It also calls for the member nations to financially support collaboration, including attempting to obtain funding from international organizations. In order to implement the above policies, the countries agreed to establish another commission.

Belarus Identifies Value of International Education. Within the Republic of Belarus, many of its 42 higher education institutions (15 of which are nonstate institutions) have begun to see the need for the internationalization of higher education.[lxxiv] Many institutions have responded by creating international relations departments. Such departments are an attempt to "develop international linkages for the university by assisting faculty members to participate in international educational and scientific exchanges and educational programs, by supporting foreign faculty and students at the university, and by seeking out opportunities for international cooperation." Students in Belarus are required to study a foreign language for three years, and many fields require two foreign languages. Likewise many educational services are being provided to attract foreign students who provide both "additional income" and "international contacts and links for the university." Several problems such as poor Internet access, financial constraints, and a credit system that is presently incompatible with Western schools have created obstacles to the process of internationalization. The steps Belarus policymakers are taking to bring their country's education system into the global arena will be of interest to follow.

Japan's New Test Opens Their System to Foreign Students. In an effort to attract more foreign students to its universities, Japan plans to offer a standardized test that can be taken from an applicant's own country.[lxxv] The new aptitude test is expected to make the process for foreign applicants "speedier, more consistent, and easier to understand." The desire for more foreign students is seen by the Education Ministry as a way to bring "foreign talent, skills and diversity to its universities." More foreign students will also help to increase enrollments affected by Japan's declining birth rate. Japan also plans to offer better student loan packages and to simplify the visa-application process. This standardized test offers an example of a concrete measure that promotes a more global higher education system.

Involving the Private Sector in Educational Policy: Mexico. Beginning in 1989, the Mexican government made a conscious effort to involve the private sector in developing educational policy.[lxxvi] It did so by creating a private sector commission on education under the direction of its national education department. The task of the commission is to develop concrete, educational policies at the national and regional level and propose them to the national education department. In order to accomplish this task, the commission has personnel that have an educational and business background. The personnel are responsible for updating the commission on the activities of the national education department, for conducting research in order to assist the commission in developing policies, and for promoting the policies that the commission agrees to advocate. Also, in order to accomplish their duty, the commission meets on a monthly basis. As a complement to its main responsibility, the commission may also participate in other programs and meetings of the national education department.

As of 1998 it is difficult to precisely ascertain the results and the impact that the commission has had on educational policies because no evaluation has been conducted. However, its greatest accomplishment has been in changing the perception that the Mexican government and the Mexican society had towards the business sector, which was a negative one, in terms of its role in education. The fact that the commission has signed agreements with the national education department has gone a long way in changing the perception. In sum, the business sector has been able to influence the shape of educational policy in Mexico, which is important given the role that education plays in the economy.

Policies Designed to Assure, Assess and Report Quality

- The higher education system operates on an assumption of prestige equaling quality. The flaws inherent in the system, especially the low quality of some programs (such as large freshmen courses and introductory courses in math) and institutions, and a limited understanding of what, and how, students are really learning, are not discussed because of that assumption. As the system moves toward more competition, those flaws will be exposed.

- The conditions of student learning have changed as more and more students take courses, or even entire degree programs, virtually, attend multiple institutions, and return to higher education to pursue and renew skills throughout their lives. These changed conditions of learning and patterns of attendance are forcing attention to the quality of the learning experience for a variety of reasons, such as the students' need for transferability of credentials and skills; employers' rigorous attention to skills gained from reimbursable training; and the students' freedom to choose courses and programs from virtually anywhere in the world.

- The globalization of companies and the professions, and the corresponding movement of professionals and hiring practices that cross borders, have made the need to measure learner outcomes even more important as students seek to relocate, travel or telecommute with a proven, transportable, measurable skill set.

- The new focus on quality afforded by the entry of market forces begs some fundamental questions:
    - What is meant by "quality?"
    - How has quality traditionally been measured, and has that measurement been effective?
    - What are some important areas, such as learner outcomes, that have not traditionally been measured, and how can the pressures of market forces be directed at forcing institutions to dedicate resources to those areas?
    - What policies can we find from around the world that encourage innovative, effective quality assurance programs?

- Develop brief descriptions, with examples, of the following:
    - Learner outcomes (some ideas to explore: benefits of computerized assessment; accreditors'(with help of CHEA) move toward learner outcomes; certification which circumvents the higher ed system globally);
    - Information for consumers;
    - Academic audit.

Learner Outcomes

Colleges and universities have traditionally been assessed by accreditors on criteria that many in academe describe as "inputs rather than results," and believe do not accurately describe the learning environment an institution offers.[lxxvii] Furthermore, assessing and reporting on the development of students based on their entire experience at an institution is not standard practice. There has been a recent shift toward assessing learner outcomes, fueled in part by the public accountability movement in all of education and in part by the heightened degree to which institutions are crossing borders and being monitored by new regulators. SHEEO states, "It is not enough that a course is offered; student outcomes in that course must be evaluated."[lxxviii]

Thomas A. Angelo offered the following description of what it means to assess learner outcomes:

> Assessment is an ongoing process aimed at understanding and improving student learning. It involves making expectations of achievement explicit and public; setting appropriate criteria and high standards for learning quality; systematically gathering, analyzing, and interpreting evidence to determine how well performance matches those expectations and standards; and using the resulting information to document, explain, and improve performance. When it is embedded effectively within larger institutional systems, assessment can help us focus our collective attention, examine our assumptions, and create a shared academic culture dedicated to assuring and improving the quality of higher education.[lxxix]

The For-Profit University of Phoenix Tracks Student Performance. The University of Phoenix, a for-profit university that enrolls almost 75,000 students, is the largest private institution of higher education in the US. Phoenix's remarkable growth and for-profit nature have generated much publicity. In fact, Phoenix is probably one of the most highly scrutinized institutions in the country. This scrutiny has fueled Phoenix's conscientious tracking of solid data about the performance of its students.

The University of Phoenix has designed a comprehensive assessment system, called the Adult Learning Outcomes Assessment (ALOA), that assesses the "achievement of the desired learning outcomes in students; and second, they evaluate the degree to which [the University has] influenced their affective development—a measurable and positive impact on their personal and professional lives."[lxxx] The ALOA has two principal purposes. The first is "to provide adult students with useful information about their current education skills and abilities (i.e., cognitive, affective, communication, and critical thinking) at entrance into their academic program and at graduation." The second is "to provide the University with useful information about the currency and effectiveness of all academic programs so that if and when changes need to be made the appropriate changes are made."

The ALOA comprises five areas that create a "portfolio assessment package" for each student:

> Comprehensive Outcomes of Cognitive Assessment (COCA)
>
> A three-hour assessment is required of all students at entrance and graduation from an academic program. Students receive results from these tests with useful information that document their strengths and areas for improvement. The interpretations and recommendation in the post-assessment report focus on lifelong learning, including

self-guided learning, learning in the workplace and the value of cooperative learning. The results provide academic decision-makers with information useful in program evaluation and curriculum revision.

Professional and Educational and Values Assessments (Affective)

All students receive a pre- and post-professional and educational values assessment. This assessment is concerned primarily with the values students place on newly acquired professional knowledge and skills. Assessed are commitment to teamwork and cooperation; self-confidence; preferred learning style; a sense of competence; educational goals; professional values; and, career success factors. The comprehensive value assessment contains empirically validated, scaled, and ranked questions.

Communication Skills Inventory

Development of communication skills is a major curricular element in the University's education programs. Upon entrance into a program, students self-assess their communication skills (i.e., written, oral and group). At graduation, a faculty member assesses the student's communication skills and so does the student. Comparison of student and faculty evaluations of communication skills abilities and measurement of improvement are provided.

Critical Thinking Assessment

The ability to think critically is another world of work requirement. An internal assessment of critical thinking skills occurs within a course at the beginning of the student's program and within a capstone course at graduation. The purpose is to measure the student's ability to problem solve using critical skill of inquiry, analysis and communication.

External Validation

Cognitive and critical thinking assessments are externally validated through random sampling using nationally normed tests (i.e., ETS major field tests, GMAT, etc.).[lxxxi]

Alverno College is Committed to Assessment. Alverno College has a long tradition of assessment, starting in the early 1970s. The institution has developed an ability-based curriculum centered around eight specific abilities. These abilities are: Communication, Analysis, Problem Solving, Valuing in Decision Making, Social Interaction, Global Perspectives, Effective Citizenship and Aesthetic Responsiveness.[lxxxii] Alverno's assessment culture includes the belief that outcomes must be both explicit and public, a goal for assessments within a course to be cumulative and varied, and weekly faculty meetings to ensure an ongoing commitment to assessment.[lxxxiii]

The assessments are not uniform across disciplines, or even within disciplines. The assessment from a Nursing course offers one example, where the students were asked to "accurately record objective data that includes observations and appropriate measurements of the client's health stats; accurately record primarily subjective data (using direct quotes); and use an adaptive nursing framework accurately in clustering the data." It is interesting to note that these specific criteria emerged after students were given less-explicit criteria for the same assignment and were not performing well. The instructors assessed their own practice, which revealed insufficient information for students to complete the task well. Thus the criteria were revamped.[lxxxiv]

Alverno College has also made a very strong commitment to self-assessment. The faculty at Alverno realizes that in order for assessment to be valid, the students must be fully engaged in the assessment process. The first self-assessment occurs in the summer before the first semester. This provides a way for students to get accustomed with the process as well as allow them to evaluate their current strengths and weaknesses before entering Alverno College. For many students it is the first time that they have had to evaluate themselves honestly.[lxxxv] Over the course of their time at Alverno, students engage in many such assessments, responding to prompts like "Choose one of the course goals and explain how you feel you have achieved it, using at least one concrete example."[lxxxvi]

CSU Rolls Out Assessment Across its Campuses. In 1997, California State University started a program to first decide what CSU students should know at the end of their time in the system, and then to assess how well they know these things.[lxxxvii] The outcomes themselves were classified into either outcomes of degree programs or majors, or outcomes of general education. Surveys, standardized tests, interviews and focus groups are all employed to measure these outcomes. CSU has enjoyed the most success in creating an assessment culture and reliable assessment tools in degree-granting programs geared for specific professions, such as nursing and education, where requirements for licensing and accreditation have already been strictly imposed.

CSU Sacramento's Ethnic Studies department divides assessment goals into four broad categories: acquisition and development of critical thinking, communication and research skills; mastery of foundation and content; community based service learning experiences; and self-development.[lxxxviii] Within each of those categories, specific goals are listed. "Familiarity with data bases in ethnic studies" is a goal for research skills, and "understanding of both past and present processes of de jure and de facto segregation" is listed as a goal for content mastery.[lxxxix] The assessment program is relatively new, but interviews, surveys and coursework in critical courses have all been used as initial assessment tools. It is interesting to note that they are also changing course offerings to better suit the professions chosen by most recent Ethnic studies graduates, and are considering the development of a capstone course "as a curricular stratagem for allowing students to demonstrate their command of the department's learning expectations."[xc]

NCA Designs Alternative Approach. The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) created an alternative accrediting process known as the Academic Quality Improvement Project (AQIP), which they believe will be more challenging than current accreditation processes.[xci] The project is on a three-year timeline, with plans to run through June 2002 with support from the Pew Charitable Trusts. At that time, the NCA hopes to have 1/3 of its member institutions participating in the process voluntarily. This process allows an institution to establish its own goals and ways of measuring progress toward them with the help of the Association and representatives from peer institutions. Schools are no longer bound to absolute minimum standards set by members of the accrediting association. The NCA believes this new approach will involve faculty in the process more, provide enhanced feedback, be better tailored to the unique needs of individual campuses, and result in better information for the consumer. Despite the increased cost of this system, these are costs that most universities and colleges would invest in planning and self-study in order to remain competitive. AQIP is based on the model of the U.S. Commerce Department's Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award Program, which rewards positive behavior instead of punishing inadequacies.[xcii]

Information Technology Certification Adds to Emphasis on Outcomes. Until recently, most information technology and computer training took place in traditional post-secondary institutions (e.g., community colleges, polytechnics, technical institutes, etc.). In the last decade, the certification of information technology workers has developed as an industry alongside the higher education system. The major software companies (e.g., Microsoft, Novell, and Cisco) have created programs to train the personnel needed to operate their systems, contracting with postsecondary institutions and other vendors—such as corporate universities, public agencies and IT vendors—to conduct the training. According to a report by Clifford Adelman of the U.S. Department of Education, there are nearly 300 certificate-granting institutions offering certificates in over 350 areas.[xciii] Adelman estimates that, by early 2000, 1.6 million people had been awarded 2.4 million certificates,[xciv] nearly half of these outside of the United States, and it is entirely likely that this headcount represents only two-thirds of the total number.[xcv] In 1999, the primary exam-givers administered 3 million exams in 25 languages and 140 countries.[xcvi]

Tek.Xam Assesses Technology Skills of Liberal Arts Grads. Prompted by the dramatic growth of the technical certification industry, a new on-line certification exam has been developed to help identify liberal arts graduates with bankable technology skills.[xcvii] Created by the Virginia Foundation for Independent Colleges and venture capitalist Mark Warner, Tek.Xam has been conceived as a bar exam of sorts for college graduates with degrees in such non-technology fields as literature and history. The exam's design reflects a growing need for information-technology workers with a specific set of valuable skills. Specifically, Tek.Xam addresses three major skill areas: the operation of technology, the retrieval, interpretation and presentation of information, and the analysis of legal and ethical issues associated with information technology.

While a passing grade on Tek.Xam is not designed to turn a philosophy major into a software whiz, it could provide a crucial leg up in a competitive job industry in which computer literacy and desktop publishing skills are increasingly coveted, even in fields unrelated to technology fields. The test's designers have made it rigorous enough so that just 30% of test-takers pass, a measure designed to ensure the exam's credibility when potential employers see it on an application. The computer-based exam, which is delivered to students via the Internet, has already been endorsed by four professional associations and nearly thirty major corporations, including Bell Atlantic-Virginia and EDS Communications. In spite of the program's industry support, it's long-term success will depend on both student and employer demand. So far, student demand seems high; 1,700 students in 24 states have already rushed to sign up for the test, which usually costs less than $100 to take.[xcviii]

Brazilian Evaluation in the 1990's. The 1990's marked Brazil's higher education with a revamping of its evaluation system. However, two major historical events set the tone for drastic educational reform. The first was in 1985 when a military regime was replaced by a civilian government. The second was the enactment of a new constitution in 1988 that made education free for students and gave universities full autonomy in academic, financial, and administrative functions (www.10minutos.com.br/simon/vught.htm). The higher education evaluation changes began in 1993, when the PAIUB program (Brazilian Universities' Institutional Evaluation Program) was established to evaluate public universities at an institutional level. In 1995, a structure for evaluation was developed (http://prg.ufpb.br/cspa/paiub/2000.htm). Part of that structure created the National Institute of Educational Studies and Research (INEP), an independent agency responsible for collecting and evaluating educational data for the entire educational system. For example, the INEP conducts a higher education census. The INEP is also responsible for "large scale" evaluations of the education system (www.cibec.ineop.gov.br/noticias/english/News_01.htm). In 1996, the National Education Law required the periodic evaluation of institutions and their course programs with the risk of losing accreditation. Also, as a way of demonstrating support for public universities, the 1996 law required that universities have at least 30% of its faculty be on a full-time basis and the same percent must have at least a master's degree (www.10minutos.com.br/simon/stakeholders.htm). Since then, national legislation has brought about several reforms including national exiting exams for undergraduate students, graduate program evaluations, accreditation of distance education programs, an integrated system of educational information, and PAIUB 2000 (http://prg.ufpb.br/cspa/paiub_2000htm).

The national exiting exam for undergraduates, the "Provao," began in 1996 (www.10minutos.com.br/simon/stakeholders.htm). In the year 2000, the exam will test graduates from 18 different degrees (www.cibec.ineop.gov.br/noticias/english/News_01.htm). The exam must be taken in order for these degrees to be recognized by the national government. However, the exam is intended to evaluate the performance of the institutions from which the students graduate, so the individual students' grades are not revealed (www.10minutos.com.br/simon/fmoves.htm). Besides the "Provao," undergraduate education is evaluated by a "complex set of indicators" including results from the higher education census conducted by INEP. In addition, the SESU evaluates undergraduate programs on site, rating their academic organization, faculty, and physical conditions. The results of these evaluation mechanisms are used to validate courses and accredit institutions (www.cibec.ineop.gov.br/noticias/english/News_01.htm). Graduate education on the other hand is evaluated by the CAPES agency that evaluates graduate programs through an "elaborate system of data gathering and peer review" and ranks them. The rankings are reported to the programs and are used to determine the number of fellowships per program and for additional financial support (www.10minutos.com.br/simon/vught.htm).

Brazil's latest evaluation initiative is PAIUB 2000 that requires institutions to report on their community relations, knowledge production, and action strategies as part of the required evaluations. PAIUB 2000 also requires the combination of an external and internal evaluation into a final written report that is submitted to PAIUB's supervisory committee. The external evaluation must include site visits and interviews with faculty, administrators, and students. The final written report is used to rate the institution (http://prg.ufpb.br/cspa/paiub_2000htm.)

According to Professor Francisco de Assis Palharini, a member of PAIUB's supervisory committee, Brazil's evaluation system is distinguished by its comprehensiveness. The breadth of the evaluation system is demonstrated by addressing a university's teaching, research, public service, and administrative functions. The goals of this evaluation system are to continually improve higher education, show public accountability, and serve as a planning tool for each institution. Another distinction is that the evaluation system has combined the ability to compare between institutions while maintaining institutional individuality intact. Comparability has been possible through minimum systemic standards that all institutions are measured against. Institutional uniqueness is sustained through the inclusion of pedagogical and institutional designs along with institutional development plans. Despite the international recognition that Brazil has received for its in-depth evaluation system, Brazil is now compelled to respond to the increasing different types of institutions that are rising due to market and public demands (http://prg.ufpb.br/cspa/paiub_2000htm).

Results of Reform

A noted Brazilian expert in higher education, Dr. Simon Schwartzman, has stated the following about Brazil's higher education evaluation system:

- The "Provao" has forced public and private institutions to work towards earning good ratings (www.10minutos.com.br/simon/fmoves.htm).
- Other agencies and the public use the rankings by CAPES to evaluate the graduate programs (www.10minutos.com.br/simon/vught.htm).
- Public universities have had inconsistent quality and no incentives to improve quality (www.10minutos.com.br/simon/stakeholders.htm).

However, in a report to the "Education For All" countries, (EFA-9: Bangladesh, China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Nigeria, and Pakistan), the Brazilian government pointed only to the following positive effects (www.cibec.ineop.gov.br/noticias/english/News_01.htm):

- The implementation of a modern information system as one of their educational improvements in the last 10 years.
- The diversification and international recognition of Brazil's graduate education.
- The use of educational information for educational policies.

Information for Consumers

Each year, top news and financial magazines compose rankings of colleges, universities and graduate schools based on such factors as selectivity, reputation and endowment. Building on the popularity of pioneer *U.S. News & World Report's* posting of leading undergraduate programs in colleges and universities, more magazines (including *Money*, *Businessweek*, *Newsweek* and *Time*) have come up with their own lists in recent years. The popularity of these rankings, and the price consumers are willing to pay for them, are indicative of potential students' and parents' appetite for information about colleges and universities. However, those inside academe have long held that these rankings are based on criteria—such as reputation, yield and endowment—that do not tell students and parents much about quality. Policies and initiatives that aim to assess institutions on true quality measures, and put that information into the hands of consumers, would push institutions to improve performance and better equip students to make important educational choices.

NSSE Seeks Better Information. The National Survey of Student Engagement (http://www.indiana.edu/~nsse/) is a project supported by a grant from the Pew Charitable Trusts and cosponsored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Pew Forum on Undergraduate Learning.[xcix] The NSSE project produces the *College Student Report*, a survey administered to colleges and universities in order to assess the quality of the undergraduate educational experience.

The survey intends to offer an alternative to the established methods for assessing collegiate quality, without creating yet another published ranking of colleges. It is believed by NSSE that the former methods offer few "external incentives" for improving undergraduate education specifically. The established criteria for assessing "quality," according to NSSE, have centered on "the wrong things" such as student selectivity, faculty credentials, and other "reputational measures." NSSE evaluates institutions with a different set of criteria concerning the undergraduate experience inside and outside the classroom. Questions on the *College Student Report* fall into the following categories: "level of academic challenge," "active and collaborative learning," "student interactions with faculty members," "enriching educational experiences," and "supportive campus environment."[c] It is expected that shifting the criteria for assessing quality "away from resources and inputs and towards outcomes" will provide a more useful collection of data concerning the educational experience.

NSSE administered the survey on a pilot basis in 1999, with results compiled and released to the participating colleges and universities. Two hundred and seventy-six schools (using 63,000 randomly sampled students)[ci] participated in the spring 2000 survey, and NSSE released its first annual report in fall of 2000 (most of the data remains confidential). For spring of 2001, nearly 275 schools are expected to participate. Participating institutions gain powerful information allowing them to identify their strengths and weaknesses.[cii] NSSE feels the project will provide valuable information to the media, "external stakeholders of higher education" (e.g., accrediting or state agencies), and to the students and institutions themselves. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* suggests that "other colleges and universities aspiring to engage their students at high levels could turn to these institutions for ideas" about how to improve their universities.[ciii]

Two other projects with support from the Pew Charitable Trusts are also aimed at better assessing the experiences and outcomes of college students. John Gardner, Executive Director of the Policy Center on the First Year of College at Brevard College, has piloted the "Your First College Year Survey" to assess the development of freshmen.[civ] Robert Zemsky, Director of the Institute for Research on Higher Education at the University of Pennsylvania, is conducting the "Postsecondary Education Outcomes Survey" to determine the career paths and educational outcomes for alumni.[cv]

Information from the Sloan Foundation. Sponsored by the Alfred Sloan Foundation, the Asynchronous Learning Network (ALN) is a distance-learning initiative that has fostered the development of numerous online education programs by awarding several millions of dollars in grants annually since 1993. These grants are designed to create online degree and certification programs and to expand the size and scope of existing programs. While the ALN has traditionally focused on the financing of new programs, ALN leader A. Frank Mayadas announced in June 2000 that the organization will now emphasize the promotion of existing distance-learning opportunities.[cvi] Though the ALN will continue to supply funds to colleges that want to start or expand programs, it will concentrate on creating an online Sloan ALN Consortium Catalog (http://www.sloan-c.org/catalog) where students can discover and explore existing programs.

The purpose of the Sloan ALN Consortium Catalog is to supply students with information on distance education courses that have been reviewed and approved by Sloan. The consortium will include course offerings from colleges that meet one of two criteria: either they have passed a rigorous peer review process or they have received Sloan grant support. Due to the proliferation of distance-learning programs, the ALN has set up explicit membership criteria to ensure the quality of its online course offerings. All courses must be instructor-led, they should not require student presence on-campus, and no special equipment should be necessary for participation (a simple computer and telephone should suffice). In addition, all programs must culminate in the awarding of some sort of degree or certificate at the conclusion of the course.[cvii]

Academic Audit

Academic Audit in Hong Kong. As higher education systems worldwide are forced to compete in a more market-oriented environment, there has been increasing interest in creating organizations to identify and ensure quality of programs and credentials. The notion of "academic audit," first developed in the United Kingdom, is now operating in many countries including Sweden, New Zealand, and Hong Kong. The Academic Audit Project, based at the University of North Caroline at Chapel Hill, states the following:

> An academic audit is a form of external quality assurance that has the following characteristics:
>
> 1. It presumes an institutional corporate responsibility for academic standards and quality assurance.
> 2. It utilizes external, process-oriented quality reviews.
> 3. It focuses on student learning.
> 4. It is oriented toward improvement and institutional capacity building.[cviii]

Hong Kong's Teaching and Learning Quality Process Review (TLQPR) was initiated in 1995. The goals of TLQPR are "(a) to focus attention on teaching and learning as the primary mission of Hong Kong's tertiary institutions; (b) to assist institutions in their efforts to improve the quality of teaching and learning; and (c) to enable the University Grants Committee and the institutions to discharge their obligation to maintain accountability for the quality of teaching and learning." The TLQPR Panel is made up of eighteen people, including a member from each institution. The institutions are free to define their own quality improvement and assurance programs, with the Panel serving to review whether the processes are in fact in operation and are being followed. The Panel begins the process with a site visit followed by each institution creating a 20-page report on its quality improvement and assurance processes. The report is then reviewed and commented on by the Panel, resulting in reports that are made public and include the steps an institution plans to take to make the suggested improvements. There are five "sub-processes" that each institution is asked to use to organize their reports. Those sub-processes are curriculum design, pedagogical design, implementation quality, outcomes assessment, and resource provision.[cix]

Policies that Address Societal Concerns

- Market forces bring with them a push for competition, efficiency, accountability and profits. However, they do not always address societal concerns. We have seen from other examples, such as health care, that while market forces serve the "market" well, inherent in the term "market" is the ability to pay. Those who cannot afford to shop in the market are effectively barred from taking part. In healthcare, 44.3 million people, or 16.3% of the U.S. population, was left without coverage in 1998.[cx]

- Several key attributes of higher education are at risk in this new environment, such as concern for the less advantaged, the socialization of students to the role of citizenship, or the role of the university as the home of unfettered research and open debate of critical issues in society.[cxi]

- Over the years, policies that deal with these attributes have been built into the system, such as protections of academic freedom and student access via financial aid. For the system to continue and enhance its commitment to these attributes, we need to develop thoughtful policies that consciously address them in the context of a highly competitive, global market of higher education.

- Develop brief descriptions, with examples, of the following:
    - Financial aid;
    - Preparation, alignment, and attainment (outreach, P-16 partnerships, remediation);
    - Service learning.

Financial Aid

Historically, access to higher education has been limited for students from low-income backgrounds. At precisely the time when higher education is becoming more important than ever for full participation in society, tuition is skyrocketing[cxii] and many state aid programs are shifting their focus to non-need based aid. This combination will likely result in fewer opportunities for low-income students. For now let's look at what we know:

- 61% of financial aid received by students in AY 1996-97 was in the form of loans.[cxiii]
- In 1997-98, the portion of state aid dedicated to undergraduate need-based programs fell 5.5%, increasing non-need based aid by that same amount.[cxiv]
- In FY 1996-97, 6.6% of state funds appropriated for higher education were used for student grant programs.[cxv]
- While the number of need grants grew the fastest from AY 1989/90 to AY 1995/96, the size of non-need based grants grew the fastest in the same period.[cxvi]
- 33 states offer some form of non-need based aid.[cxvii]
- Non-need programs have been on the rise since their emergence in 1993 with Georgia's Hope Scholarship.

- "Adding merit-based scholarships to other college affordability programs results in 'layered' benefits for the same group: the middle class."[cxviii]
- "Many new generation aid programs may not increase college affordability enough for those who face the greatest affordability challenges."[cxix]

Two trends in student aid in particular are threatening access for low-income students and concentrating benefits with the middle class: merit aid and tax credits. "Most Georgia students who receive a Hope Scholarship lose the scholarship within two years of starting college. After 4 years of college, less than one quarter of the initial Hope recipients from the entering classes 1993 through 1995 retained their scholarship and persisted in college."[cxx] How do these numbers compare for minority students who traditionally have less access than their white counterparts? "As of the fall of 1997, only 27% of black freshman maintained Hope scholarships into their sophomore year, compared with 55% of white students."[cxxi] When looking at tax credit or tax deduction programs it is easy to see that they benefit middle class and upper-middle class the most. "At the federal level, families with incomes between $40,000 and $90,000 have been the largest beneficiaries of the HOPE Scholarship Tax Credit Program."[cxxii]

In order for low-income students to gain access and opportunity, when looking just at state aid, states must have at minimum a balance between need-based and non-need based grants. At best, states should offer comprehensive need-based programs that give all students the opportunity for a post-secondary education and with that the opportunity for greater participation in society. The following cases outline some state aid packages that could serve as models.

State Need-Based Merit Model:

Cal Grants[cxxiii]. "California's action has won praise from national financial aid experts, who have watched with some dismay as state after state has adopted merit scholarship programs, while shortchanging grants that are based on financial need."[cxxiv] California's programs offer a variety of grants:

Entitlement Awards—*Guaranteed to those who meet the requirements*

Cal Grant A:	"Covers full tuition and fees at the nine-campus University of California or the 22-campus California state University, and a grant of up to $9,708 to attend a private college or university."[cxxv] Students must demonstrate financial need and graduate high school with a 3.0 grade point average.
Cal Grant B:	Awards $1,151 for the first year to cover transportation and book costs at community colleges. In the second year the grant would also pay for tuition. Recipients must have financial need and a 2.0 grade point average.

California Community College Transfer Grant	If students meet the financial and academic requirements, and attend community college directly after high school, they can transfer from community colleges to qualifying California institutions offering baccalaureate degree programs. This grant begins in 2002-2003.

In addition to the above guaranteed grants, California also offers Competitive Cal grants. These grants are for the same purposes as the above grants but are offered on a competitive basis to anyone who did not receive an entitlement award. There will be a total of 22,500 new Competitive Cal Grants A and B issued each year.

Competitive Awards—*Limited in number and offered on a competitive basis*

Competitive Grant A:	Intended for students from low and middle income families. Awards help pay tuition and fees for residents of California at qualifying institutions.
Competitive Grant B:	Intended for students from disadvantaged and low income families. Grants provide access costs (transportation, living expenses, supplies, and books)—not to exceed \$1,551. As with Cal Grant B, in the second year the grant will pay tuition fees.
Cal Grant C:	Grants are for students from low and middle-income families who are interested in seeking vocational or occupational training. Grants assist with tuition/fees and training costs. Recipients must demonstrate financial need and vocational ability. The grants can last from four months to two years. 7,761 awards will be issued each year.

The final grant under the new Cal Grant program is:

Cal Grant T Award:	Grants are for teacher credential candidates who have an undergraduate degree and plan on attending a teacher credential program. Awards cover tuition and fees for a maximum of one-year full time attendance. A minimum of 3,000 new Cal Grant T Awards will be issued each year. For each \$2,000 awarded the recipient must teach for one year at a low-performing school (maximum obligation of four years). In addition, any recipient who does not meet the teaching obligation will be required to repay the award.

For the academic year 2000-2001 California is offering 57,254 new grants. It is estimated that in the academic year 2006-2007 there will be 144,000 new grants. The total cost for the 2000-

2001 grants is $503.6 million and it is estimated that in 2006-2007 the total cost for the Cal Grants will be $1.2 billion.

State Need-Based Policy Examples:

Monetary Award Program (MAP) Illinois. MAP provides grants for undergraduate students who demonstrate financial need. No grades or test scores are used. The individual must be a US citizen or eligible non-citizen; a resident of Illinois; demonstrate financial need; be enrolled at least half-time at a MAP approved Illinois institution in a degree or certificate program; comply with federal selective service registration requirements; maintain satisfactory academic progress as determined by the college or university; not be in default on any student loan nor owe a refund on any state or federal grant; not have received the equivalent of 10 semester or 15 quarters of fulltime MAP program payments; and have not received a bachelor's degree.

The dollar amount of the award depends on the calculation of financial need and the cost of tuition and mandatory fees at the school of choice. The amount will not exceed $4,530.[cxxvi]

New York Regents Professional Opportunity Scholarship and Regents Healthcare Scholarship. Both of these scholarship programs are designed for New York State residents who are economically disadvantaged. Applicants for either program must qualify in one of the following priorities:

> **"Priority One:** An economically disadvantaged member of a minority group historically underrepresented. (For purposes of this scholarship, underrepresented minorities include residents who are Black, Hispanic, Native American or Alaskan Native.) **OR**
>
> **Priority Two:** A member of a minority group historically underrepresented. **OR**
>
> **Priority Three:** A student enrolled in or a graduate of one of the State sponsored opportunity programs. **AND**
>
> Be a legal resident of New York State for at least one year prior to September first of the award year."[cxxvii]

The Professional Opportunity Scholarship offers 220 awards and winners receive up to $5000 per year for a maximum of 4 years. Recipients must work in New York State in their chosen field for each year an award was given.

The Health Care Scholarship awards 100 scholarships in the amount of $10,000 per year for a maximum of 4 years. Upon completion of professional training, recipients must practice in a designated shortage area of New York State for each year an award was given.

Pennsylvania State Grant Program. Grants are available to residents of Pennsylvania who are in financial need. The grant is for a Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Authority (PHEAA) approved post-secondary school. Recipients must meet the financial need criteria; be enrolled at least half-time in an approved undergraduate program; graduate high school or have a GED; demonstrate academic progress for continued aid; and be a resident of Pennsylvania.

"Those who applied in 2000-01 received up to $3,200 as full time students at a Pennsylvania school and $600 at a school located outside Pennsylvania. Students enrolled on a half-time basis (at least 6 credits or its equivalent) received up to $1600 at a Pennsylvania school and $300 at a school located outside Pennsylvania."[cxxviii]

Improving Preparation, Attainment and Alignment: Outreach, P-16 Partnerships, and Remediation

Higher education has become more important than ever. Respondents to a Public Agenda survey rated a college education the most important factor contributing to success today, and 62% of parents of high school students believe a college education is "absolutely necessary" for their children.[cxxix] However, not every American has an equal opportunity to receive a quality college education, and many high school graduates enter college unprepared for college-level work. Outreach, P-16 partnerships, and remediation programs are three policy alternatives designed to increase access to higher education for students coming from educationally disadvantaged backgrounds, and to raise the overall quality of the US education system and its graduates.

College Enrollments by Race and Income. While 45.3 percent of white high school graduates, 18 to 24, were enrolled in college in 1996-7, of African-American high school graduates in the same age group, 39.8 percent went on to college, and of Hispanic high school graduates, only 36 percent continued on to higher education.[cxxx] In 1995, while 83 percent of high school graduates ages 16-24 from families with high incomes were enrolled in college the October following graduation, 56 percent of students from middle-income families and 34 percent of students from low-income families were enrolled.[cxxxi]

College Attainment by Race and Income. In 1996, of all high school graduates ages 25 to 29, only 31 percent had received their bachelor's degree or higher. While 34 percent of whites received their bachelor's degrees, 17 percent of African Americans and 16 percent of Hispanics had done so.[cxxxii] As of 1994, 47 percent of low-income students who began their studies in 1989-90 had received a degree, compared to 51% of middle- and upper-income students.[cxxxiii]

Outreach

Outreach programs are a common approach to filling the gap in preparation between secondary and postsecondary institutions. Traditionally for disadvantaged and minority students, the programs are most often intended to encourage students to attend and complete college or to raise high school completion rates.[cxxxiv] The programs are made up of a variety of components, including tutoring and workshops on college life and academics.[cxxxv] These programs have the potential to fortify the bridges between schools, and help students make the transition to postsecondary studies. While research has found that minority achievement gaps initially become evident in the early years of education, most outreach programs are aimed at older students.[cxxxvi] In fact, 34 percent of programs work with juniors and seniors in high school, 30 percent with freshmen and sophomores, 24 percent with middle and junior high school students, and only 6 percent with elementary school students.[cxxxvii] On average, students stay in the outreach program for 2.9 years[cxxxviii] and one third of all students who start an outreach program complete it.[cxxxix] When properly run and coordinated with other programs or community groups, outreach programs have the potential to accomplish their goal of increasing minority and disadvantaged graduation rates from both high school and college.

Xavier has Success with Project SOAR (Stress on Analytical Reasoning).[cxl] Project SOAR is an outreach program sponsored by Xavier University in New Orleans, Louisiana, a Historically Black University. The program, which was begun in 1977, is intended to increase the number of minorities who obtain careers in the sciences through an intensive, four-week skill building program. Although initially the program was unified, it has since grown, both in size and in scope, and is now divided into three branches—SOAR 1 that targets biomedical science students, SOAR 2 that targets physics, math, and engineering students, and SOAR 3 that targets students of computer science. All three programs are aimed at high school students who are in between their junior and senior years and who are members of underrepresented minority groups and all three are problem-solving and analytically-based, rather than content-based.

SOAR 1 is the program that most closely mirrors the original focus of Project SOAR (biomedical sciences). It consists of seven components: (1) three-hour labs to address general problem-solving ability, (2) verbal reasoning and critical reading development, (3) quantitative reasoning development, (4) vocabulary enhancement, (5) group competitions, (6) tours of professional/graduate schools and lectures by minority professionals, and (7) frequent feedback to parents. Program leaders are a combination of Xavier University students and faculty, with the majority of the work being done by current Xavier students. SOAR 1 participants are divided into groups of about twenty and are matched with a minority student who is a successful science major at Xavier. These groups enable participants to develop a peer support system that is based on academics and give them the opportunity to work closely with and get to know a successful student of color in the sciences.

While the group structure is certainly innovative and seems effective, there are some areas of concern regarding the SOAR 1 program. First, there is the issue of program cost. A program that targets underrepresented minority students would likely have a broader reach if it were low in cost or free of charge. SOAR 1, however, costs $620 for four weeks tuition and an additional $680 for housing, if the participant is not from the New Orleans area. While there are some scholarships available if applicants can demonstrate “obvious need” or exceptional academic ability, it is troubling that a program designed to reach students who may not have many opportunities would so limit prospective participants by the high cost of the program. Another area of concern is the demographic statistics for the program. Participation has been declining over the years from a high of 171 participants in 1989 to 122 participants in 1998, and applications have declined from a high of 754 in 1994 to 487 in 1998. Further, over 83% of these participants are female, thereby limiting the program's impact on the gap in college participation between African American females and African American males.

Despite these troubling statistics, the program has undoubtedly been successful. Students with low scores on the SAT saw their scores increase by an average of 120 points after completing SOAR 1 and students' vocabulary and reading skills levels increased by an average of two and a half years. 90 percent of SOAR participants felt that the program helped them in college and the majority of participants went on to attend college. Of the 75% of SOAR 1 participants who went on to enroll in Xavier University (a total of 1621 students), 71% have obtained degrees and over 15% have gained entry into medical school. So, while the program is currently facing some troubling issues, SOAR 1 has undoubtedly been successful in realizing its goal of increasing underrepresented minority degree completion and attainment of careers in the sciences.

University of Washington Creates the Early Scholars Outreach Program.[cxli] University of Washington's Office of Educational Opportunity forged a partnership with nine Washington State middle schools with large minority populations. The Early Scholars Outreach Program (ESOP) was created in 1987 to address the under representation of students of color and other disadvantaged students in higher education by increasing the numbers of these students enrolled in college preparatory classes by the beginning of high school. High-performing university students serve as mentors and tutors. The middle-schoolers are also given a chance to experience life on a college campus, with visits, overnight stays, and faculty presentations. A variety of workshops are held for the Early Scholars and their parents on such subjects as study skills and promoting a home environment that values academic excellence. There is also a six-week summer program for incoming ninth-graders. Since the beginning of the program, 2,855 students have taken part in ESOP.

A University study has shown the program to be quite successful. Between 1992 and 1995, ESOP participants had a mean GPA of 2.90, while non-participants held only a 2.26 GPA. Ninety-seven percent of the ESOP students graduated high school and 77 percent of those tracked went on to a 2- or 4- year college.

P-16 Partnerships

P-16 partnerships are growing in popularity as a means of creating a fluid education system that offers more educational options to students, improves teacher education, and raises and aligns quality standards in both K-12 and postsecondary education. A P-16 approach to education creates a system which integrates educational efforts from pre-school through higher education, assuring that all students are adequately prepared to achieve at high levels throughout their educational career. Efforts to achieve this goal include work to eliminate remediation and boost attainment by increasing alignment between elementary/secondary and university standards and assessments. Additionally, partnerships between P-12 institutions and teacher education programs work to align what is taught in teacher education classrooms with what teachers will need in their own classrooms.

Assessment Alignments in Oregon. The Oregon University System recently introduced a new admissions requirements system in the form of the Proficiency-based Admissions Standards System (PASS). These standards inform secondary school teachers and students as to what knowledge and skills are needed for acceptance into Oregon's public universities. The standards for the six proficiencies of English, Math, Social Sciences, Visual and Performing Arts, Sciences and Second Languages are being phased in as admissions options beginning in Fall 2001 and all six will be expected by Fall 2005. Proficiency in these areas can be determined by teacher verification or by state and national assessments. Five ratings are possible in each content area, ranging from N- not meeting proficiency to E- exemplary. Ratings showing skills that exceed proficiency requirements may make students eligible for scholarship consideration, advanced class placement, and college-credit opportunities. PASS works with teachers as well, offering training to ensure their understanding of the standards, and that these standards closely approximate the work these teachers already do in their classrooms.[cxlii]

Teacher Education Partnerships in Maryland. The State of Maryland began a teacher education reform initiative in 1991with the establishment of the Blue Ribbon Task Force, which was asked to create recommendations for a new approach to teacher education. The suggestions they put forward then have grown into a policy structure that puts Maryland at the forefront of teacher-education reform. Reforms are centered around such interlinking initiatives as improved teacher retention and professional development school experience.

One focus of the Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning K-16 (PTL), which coordinates all K-16 interaction efforts, is teacher recruitment and retention. The creation of an exemplary "passing cut" on tests that would give teachers portable salary credits and pensions, and a special listing in recruitment databanks has been discussed.[cxliii] PTL also focuses on higher education's role in professional development, supporting collaboration efforts with universities such as the University of Maryland. The importance of teacher induction programs led Maryland to pursue yearly performance assessments in combination with mentoring and peer coaching efforts. Additionally, Maryland has sponsored seventeen Professional Development School sites, representing the partnership efforts of thirteen higher education institutions, two community colleges, and fourteen local school districts. Positions jointly funded by colleges and school districts are planned to strengthen the interaction between the two at the PDS sites.[cxliv]

Remediation

Nationally, 29 percent of freshmen entering higher education institutions are enrolled in some sort of remedial class. Public two-year institutions have the highest rates of remedial enrollment with 41 percent of the student body taking at least one remedial class, compared to 22 percent at public four-year institutions. Private schools are less likely to have students in remedial classes but the numbers are still high, with 26 percent of students in private two-year institutions and 13 percent of students in private four-year institutions taking remedial classes.[cxlv]

Robert McCabe, a researcher focused on remedial education, defines the need for remediation as "deficiencies in reading, writing and math." According to McCabe, "remediation is the most productive education program we have." McCabe points to the fact that the average student taking remedial classes takes approximately 7 semester credits of remediation, and only one percent of the higher education budget is used for remediation. McCabe's research demonstrates a success rate of approximately 40-50% for students beginning in community colleges, leading McCabe to assert that, "With just one percent of the budget, it salvages the lives of a half million people, and enables them to become positive, contributing individuals in our society."[cxlvi] McCabe advocates the following policy initiatives: 1) mandatory assessment and placement; 2) a continuum of assessment, beginning in K-12; 3) higher public investment in remediation; 4) pedagogy that recognizes different learning styles.[cxlvii]

CSU Lowers Remediation. California State University has taken responsibility for lowering its remediation rates by working with 223 high schools in the area that send the most students in need of remediation. Using $9-million from the state legislature, CSU will provide training workshops for secondary teachers, increase the number of college students who tutor in the schools, and give university-placement tests earlier on in order to identify student weaknesses.[cxlviii]

(Next step: Research examples of good remediation programs.)

Service Learning

Service learning focuses on preparing students for practical, hands-on community-based problem solving. Service learning combines the knowledge and skills gained in the classroom with service in the community. The goal is for the student, guided by the professor, to explore and make connections between the knowledge learned in the classroom and the everyday needs of a community—seeing where his/her voice, skills, and participation matter and make a difference. "Service-learning is inherently linked to a civic purpose reinforcing the skills of critical thinking, public discourse, collective activity, and community building."[cxlix]

Making the connection between service and civic responsibility is essential. According to a nationwide poll of 15-24 year olds conducted by the National Association of Secretaries of State in 1996 only 32% of 18-24 year olds voted, while in 1998 voter turnout among this group was projected to have been around 20%, the lowest in the nation's history. Youth priorities are a close-knit family (61%), gaining education and skills (60%) and success in career (50%). Low priorities are being a good American (27%) and being involved in democracy & voting (26%). While this data indicates that 15-24 years are not civic minded, it should be noted that the same poll indicated that 53% of 15-24 year olds have volunteered in non-political organizations.[cl] Students understand the importance of service, yet they are not making the connection to civic participation. Moreover, Public Allies found that 46% of young people today believe that schools and colleges are the organizations best able to solve our social problems. They place more faith in educational institutions than in local groups, political leaders, nonprofits, religious groups, and government/business partnerships.[cli]

Given the above, service-learning programs are needed more than ever. It is within the academic setting of a service-learning program that students will have the opportunity to be prepared for life long citizenry and not just for their desired occupation. Results from The Learn and Service America, Higher Education (LSAHE) program indicate, "a strong correlation between student participation in a service-learning course and increased civic responsibility."[clii]

Tufts University College of Citizenship and Public Service (UCCPS).[cliii] "We have developed the new University College of Citizenship and Public Service to support a core belief we hold at Tufts: that citizens' participation is an essential element of freedom and democracy."[cliv]

The UCCPS is different from other university service efforts in three ways:

1. Commitment to involving all disciplines and influencing the education of all graduates;
2. Focus on education in values and skills of active citizenship;
3. University-wide scope.

UCCPS has three goals:

1. To provide students with the abilities to be active citizens and community members;
2. To actively contribute to the improvement of the communities; and
3. To develop and share knowledge about citizenship and public service.

UCCPS focuses on four areas to accomplish these goals:

Curriculum Development and Faculty Support: Through various faculty and curriculum workshops faculty members are given the opportunity to look at community issues in relation to their work and express the connections they find in the classroom and research work. It is the expectation that faculty development will enhance the curriculum thereby exposing students in all disciplines to the "values of active citizenship."

Student Development: Tufts offers all its students the opportunity through various activities to explore their views, engage in service and community building experiences, and take on "active and effective roles in public life." The University engages with and supports all student organizations and service efforts, leadership development and skill building initiatives. Resources are provided to support "innovative" service learning projects and for the sharing of the outcomes and experiences over time with the community at large.

Community Engagement and Partnerships: Support for new and existing partnerships between community organizations and citizens. The University sponsors forums to bring community members to campus to share their experiences and skills. The desired outcome is to make the resources of the campus community available and accessible to the larger community.

Research and Knowledge Development: Review of partnerships past and present, service-learning programs, and support for faculty and student projects. In addition there is an evaluation of activities sponsored and supported by UCCPS.

Examples of projects UCCPS initiated in its first year:

- Omidyar Citizenship and Pubic Service Scholars. 24 undergraduates, representing a wide range of disciplines and experiences will organize and lead activities that set an example of citizenship for the University Community.
- Summer faculty institutes to assist faculty in addressing the issues of citizenship and public service. For all departments, additional support for curriculum development and integration of service learning approaches is being offered.
- UCCPS Seed Capital Fund provides support to members of the Tufts Community for innovative efforts that encourage "active citizenship" and "address community issues."

Policies Concerning Uses of Technology

- Introduction.

- Develop brief descriptions, with examples, of the following:
    - Expanding access via technology;
    - Using technology to lower costs;
    - Technology's impact on pedagogy.

Expanding Access via Technology

R.M.I.T. of Australia Opens Web-Based Branch in Vietnam. Australia's Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (R.M.I.T.) recently became the first foreign-owned institution to be approved in Vietnam.[clv] The new university, which will be called the R.M.I.T. International University Vietnam, plans to open in 2003. A campus will be built in Ho Chi Minh City, however the university plans to focus extensively on online technology. R.M.I.T.'s Vice Chancellor, David Beanland says that the Vietnam campus will be built, "specifically for the cyber-generation" and will combine new technology with the "campus experience." R.M.I.T's Vietnam campus will offer undergraduate's, master's, and Ph.D. programs to an expected enrollment of 10,000 students within a decade.

India's Distance Education Opens Access and Lays Groundwork for Online Instruction. With a rising population and too few colleges to meet the need, universities in India have relied on distance education to help lessen the "huge gap between supply and demand."[clvi] Out of over 200 universities in India "63 now have a distance-learning component." Aside from the pressure of a rising population, the needs of a number of sections of the population - including Muslim women, prisoners, and working students -have not been met by the current higher education system. The "education shortage" has attracted foreign companies and universities looking to capture portions of the population who are seeking degrees but have remained outside the system.

In 1981, the state of Andhra Pradesh created Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Open Univeristy, and was soon followed by eight other states. Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Open Univeristy now has 130 undergraduate centers across the state offering lectures, video-taped lectures and discussions, and eventually plans to incorporate an online component. While the open universities were initially seen as second-chance or second-rate in India, many now view the courses as a convenient option for the working population. Demand within the state of Andhra Pradesh, and the rest of India has recently shifted toward information technology and computers. A program offering a master's of science in information technology will be taught "in conjunction with Carnegie Mellon University." Carnegie Mellon will help adapt the local colleges to the course initially providing CD's and professors for assistance. With its well-developed distance education infrastructure and use of English, India is only a few steps away from a sharp increase in online instruction.

The African Virtual University: 25 Sites and Lots of Potential. The African Virtual University was launched in 1997 by the World Bank as a pilot project in using modern information and communication technologies to bring high-quality academic faculty and learning resources to sub-Saharan Africa. AVU now has 25 sites on the African continent and has had over 9,000 students participate in courses. Lectures are transmitted via satellite—due to the low Internet connectivity in Africa—from over thirty content providers across the globe.

The World Bank is now stepping back and turning management of the project over to the individual sites in Africa. Its new headquarters is in Nairobi. Consequently, the project has experienced a dip in momentum, according to AVU Project Coordinator Stefan Quenneville. But AVU's goals for the future remain unchanged. Its ultimate goal is to bridge the digital divide by training world class scientists, engineers, technicians, and other professionals within Africa using the cost-effective tools technology now makes available. The project intends to gradually increase the number of African content providers.

Washington State Higher Education 2000 Master Plan. To address access issues for underserved populations and in recognition of growing enrollment pressures and a need for skilled workers, the Washington State Higher Education 2000 Master Plan calls for expanded use of technology to meet enrollment needs, a proposal that has been strongly supported by the Governor (http://www.hecb.wa.gov/policy/masterplan/mpindex.htm). *(Expand this.)*

Using Technology to Lower Costs

While many have argued that technology can be used to reduce the costs associated with labor-intensive higher education, the Pew Grant Program in Course Redesign has recently demonstrated the veracity of this assertion. Pew analyzed two rounds of projects in which high-cost, less efficient instruction styles were replaced with information technology alternatives. They found an average cost-per-student decrease in both the first and second rounds of approximately 40 percent.[clvii] Colleges and universities are able to serve a greater number of students by lowering costs through a reduction of the amount of time professors spend with students.

Virginia Tech Houses the Math Emporium. Virginia Tech is currently in the process of redesigning its introductory linear algebra course to make it more efficient and more effective.[clviii] The old format consisted of 2000 students annually, ten tenure-track faculty members, thirteen instructors, and fifteen graduate teaching assistants in thirty-eight sections that met twice a week for fifty minutes each. The University found many problems with this format. It did not take into account students' different academic backgrounds, many students dropped the course or stopped attending midway through, and there was remarkable variation among learner outcomes, with many upper level professors complaining that students were unprepared for their classes.

The new course format attempts to control for these problems. The new format eliminates all class meetings, replacing them with Internet-based units that include tutorials, an electronic textbook, and practice exercises. At the end of each unit, students take a quiz that is graded electronically, and students are expected to finish one to two units per week. Faculty, graduate teaching assistants, and peer tutors are available at the "Math Emporium," which houses 500 computer work stations and is open 24 hours a day. Virginia Tech expects the new course to require only two staff members in addition to the graduate teaching assistants, one tenure-track faculty member who will be in charge of the majority of planning and preparation and one instructor who will handle the day-to-day activities in course delivery. This decrease in required staff has enabled Virginia Tech to make the course far more cost efficient. The average cost per student for this course dropped from $77 to $24 and annual savings for all sections of the linear algebra course are expected to be $97,400.

In addition to analyzing cost savings, Virginia Tech will also evaluate the course format by examining final exam grades, the ratio of initial number of students enrolled to number of students who complete the course, and the ratio of the number of people who do not show up for the final exam to the number of students still enrolled in the course. The Math Emporium has shown tremendous success already. Scores in mathematics have increased by 17.4 percent and the failure rate has declined 39 percent. While the new format has shown promise thus far, Virginia Tech will continue to evaluate and redesign the course format each semester until it has been perfected.

Technology's Impact on Pedagogy

(Next step: Research examples from the Futures Project's paper on technology.)

---

[i] Newman, Frank. "Saving Higher Education's Soul." Change 33.5 (September/October 2000): 16-23. Released by the Futures Project: Policy for Higher Education in a Changing World <www.futuresproject.org>.
[ii] "Unplugged." Economist 21 Dec. 2000. <3 Jan. 2001 <www.economist.com>.
[iii] U.S. Census Bureau. "Health Insurance Coverage: 1998." Current Population Reports. By Campbell, Jennifer A. October 1999. 5 Jan. 2001 <http://www.census.gov/prod/99pubs/p60-208.pdf>.
[iv] New Zealand Ministry of Education. "Tertiary Education in New Zealand: Policy Directions for the 21st Century." White Paper (November, 1998): 1. Oct. 2000 <http://www.minedu.govt.nz/Tertiary/Review/wp/chap>.
[v] New Zealand's Vice-Chancellor's Commission. "The Priorities: Funding, Student Financial Support, Differentiation and Research." NZVCC Newsletter (February 2000). Oct. 2000 <http://www.nzvcc.ac.nz/pubs/newsletter55/text>. Also, conversation September 2000, Paris, France, between Frank Newman and John Webster, President of UNITEC in Auckland.
[vi] Hebel, Sara. "Movement to Create Charter Colleges Gathers Supporters--and Critics." Chronicle of Higher Education 3 November 2000: A31.
[vii] Berdahl, Robert O. and MacTaggart, Terrence J. "Charter Colleges: Balancing Freedom and Accountability." White Paper No. 10. Boston, MA: Pioneer Institute for Public Policy Research, 2000: 3.
[viii] Hebel, Sara. "Movement to Create Charter Colleges Gathers Supporters--and Critics." Chronicle of Higher Education 3 November 2000: A34.
[ix] MacTaggart, Terrence J. & Associates. Seeking Excellence Through Independence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1998: 9.

[x] Peterson, Marvin W. and Michael K. McLendon. “Achieving Independence Through Conflict and Compromise: Michigan.” In MacTaggart, Terrence J. & Associates Seeking Excellence Through Independence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1998: 170.
[xi] MacTaggart, Terrence J. & Associates. Seeking Excellence Through Independence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1998: 11.
[xii] MacTaggart, Terrence J. & Associates. Seeking Excellence Through Independence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1998: 11.
[xiii] Annie E. Casey Foundation. “Success in School” Education Ideas that Count.” 10 November 2000 <www.aecf.org/publications/success/decent.htm>.
[xiv] McMahon, Eleanor M. “Progress Report: Institutional Autonomy & Public Accountability.” Connection 16.3 (1999): 37-38.
[xv]Greer, Darryl G. “Defining the Scope and Limits of Autonomy: New Jersey.” NACUBO: Accountability and Regulation in Public Higher Education. 20 June 2000 <http://nacubo.rd/net/website/accountable/nj2.html>.
[xvi] Greer.
[xvii] Hillgartner, Gunnar P. and G. Brent Hall. “The Process of Education Decentralization and Planning in the Zona Norte of Santiago, Chile: Developing a Spatial Decision Support System for Inter-municipal Problem Resolution.” School of Urban and Regional Planning, Faculty of Environmental Studies, University of Waterloo. 10 November 2000 <www.odyssey.maine.edu/gisweb/spatdb/egis/eg94161.html>.
[xviii] Greer.
[xix] Greer.
[xx] Healy, Patrick. “Report Calls for Strong State Coordination of Public Colleges.” Chronicle of Higher Education 27 June 1997: page #.
[xxi] Healy, Patrick. “Report Calls for Strong State Coordination of Public Colleges.” Chronicle of Higher Education 27 June 1997: page #.
[xxii] Greer.
[xxiii] Greer, 1.
[xxiv] McMahon, Eleanor M. “Institutional Independence and Public Oversight: The New Jersey and Maine Experiments.” Connection vol. XII, no. 1 (Spring 1997): 43.
[xxv] State Higher Education Executive Officers. “Needed: A New Tool Box,” 7.
[xxvi] Clark, Burton R. Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation. New York: IAU Press, Pergamon, 1998.
[xxvii] Kertesz, Louise. “Oregon Academic Medical Center Breaks State Tie.” Modern Healthcare 30 January 1995: 20.
[xxviii] Oregon Revised Statutes. Chapter 353. 1999 Edition. Oregon Health Sciences University. 29 November 2000 <http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/353.html>. ORS §353.450.
[xxix] Oregon Revised Statutes, ORS §353.070.
[xxx] Oregon Revised Statutes, ORS §353.108.
[xxxi] Oregon Revised Statutes, ORS §353.140.
[xxxii] Oregon Revised Statutes, 1997 Edition, ORS §353.010.
[xxxiii] Hebel, Sara. "Movement to Create Charter Colleges Gathers Supporters--and Critics." Chronicle of Higher Education 3 November 2000: A31.
[xxxiv] Berdahl, Robert O. and MacTaggart, Terrence J. "Charter Colleges: Balancing Freedom and Accountability." White Paper No. 10. Boston, MA: Pioneer Institute for Public Policy Research, 2000: iv.
[xxxv] Berdahl, Robert O. and MacTaggart, Terrence J. "Charter Colleges: Balancing Freedom and Accountability." White Paper No. 10. Boston, MA: Pioneer Institute for Public Policy Research, 2000: 1.
[xxxvi] Berdahl, Robert O. and MacTaggart, Terrence J. "Charter Colleges: Balancing Freedom and Accountability." White Paper No. 10. Boston, MA: Pioneer Institute for Public Policy Research, 2000: 8. And Hebel, Sara. "Movement to Create Charter Colleges Gathers Supporters--and Critics." Chronicle of Higher Education 3 November 2000: A31.
[xxxvii] Berdahl, Robert O. and MacTaggart, Terrence J. "Charter Colleges: Balancing Freedom and Accountability." White Paper No. 10. Boston, MA: Pioneer Institute for Public Policy Research, 2000: 8-9. And Hebel, Sara. "Movement to Create Charter Colleges Gathers Supporters--and Critics." Chronicle of Higher Education 3 November 2000: A31.

[xxxviii] Berdahl, Robert O. "Balancing Self-Interest and Accountability: St. Mary's College of Maryland." In MacTaggart, Terrence J. & Associates Seeking Excellence Through Independence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1998: 59-83.
[xxxix] Berdahl 59.
[xl] Berdahl 65.
[xli] Berdahl 71.
[xlii] Berdahl 70-77.
[xliii] Berdahl, Robert O. and MacTaggart, Terrence J. "Charter Colleges: Balancing Freedom and Accountability." White Paper No. 10. Boston, MA: Pioneer Institute for Public Policy Research, 2000: 14.
[xliv] Berdahl 82.
[xlv] California State University, Los Angeles Charter School of Education. "About the Charter School of Education." 29 November 2000 <http://www.calstatela.edu/academic/ccoe/aboucsoe/index.htm>.
[xlvi] Berdahl, Robert O. and MacTaggart, Terrence J. "Charter Colleges: Balancing Freedom and Accountability." White Paper No. 10. Boston, MA: Pioneer Institute for Public Policy Research, 2000.
[xlvii] California State University, Los Angeles Charter School of Education. "External Evaluation Report." February 2000: 2. 29 November 2000 <http://www.calstatela.edu/academic/ccoe/whatsnew/evalrpt.htm>.
[xlviii] California State University, Los Angeles Charter School of Education. "External Evaluation Report." February 2000. 29 November 2000 <http://www.calstatela.edu/academic/ccoe/whatsnew/evalrpt.htm>.
[xlix] State Higher Education Executive Officers. "Needed: A New Tool Box," 16.
[l] Wilson (1989) in MacTaggart.
[li] Torres, Gerver and Sarita Mathur. "The Third Wave of Privatization: Privatization of Social Sectors in Developing Countries" September 1, 1995. 3 August 2000 <www.worldbank.org/education/economicsed/private/publications/thirdwave.htm>.
[lii] Citizens' Commission on the Future of Oklahoma Higher Education. Final Report and Recommendations. Oklahoma: October 1997. 11 July 2000 <http://www.okhighered.org/planfutr.html>.
[liii] California Postsecondary Education Commission. Challenge of the Century. 10 July 2000 <http://www.cpec.ca.gov/CompleteReports/Challenge/ChallengeIndex.asp>.
[liv] Doyle, 39.
[lv] Faraq, Iman. "Higher Education in Eqypt: The Realpolitik of Privatization." International Higher Education. The Boston College Center for International Higher Education, No. 18 (Winter 2000): 16+
[lvi] Rostagno, Carlos A. R. and Couture, P. L. "Educacion Superior Uruguaya: Del Monopolio a la Consolidacion del Sistema." 1 August 2000 <www.preal.cl/seminario/ronlan.htm>.
[lvii] Goldstein, Michael B. "NACUBO: Creating For-Profit Subsidiaries. New Models for New Directions." Presentation delivered to National Association of College and University Business Officers. Dow, Lohnes & Albertson, pllc: 2000, 3.
[lviii] Goldstein, Michael B. "NACUBO: Creating For-Profit Subsidiaries. New Models for New Directions." Presentation delivered to National Association of College and University Business Officers. Dow, Lohnes & Albertson, pllc: 2000, 7.
[lix] "University of Maryland University College Announces Approval of New For-Profit Company." 3 December 1999. 22 November 2000 <http://www.umuc.edu/events/press/newcompany.html>. Also see "Frequently Asked Questions About UMUC OnLine.com." 22 November 2000 <http://www.umuc.edu/events/press/faq.html>.
[lx] Carr, Sarah. "Cornell Creates a For-Profit Subsidiary to Market Distance-Education Programs." Chronicle of Higher Education 24 March 2000: A47.
[lxi] "Trustees' Executive Committee Authorizes the Creation of 'eCornell'" 14 Sept. 2000. 1 Dec. 2000 <http://www.news.cornell.edu/Chronicles/9.14.00/eCornell.html>.
[lxii] "Cornell Trustees Approve Resolution to Create e-Cornell" 10 March 2000. 1 Dec. 2000 <http://www.news.cornell.edu/releases/March00/trustees.ecornell.2.html>.
[lxiii] NYUonline. "NYUonline and McGraw-Hill Announce Strategic Partnership For Corporate Learning." About Us—Press. 29 November 2000 <http://www.nyuonline.com/NYU_McGraw.html>.
[lxiv] NYUonline. "Course Catalog." 28 November 2000 <http://www.nyuonline.com/coursedirectory.html>.
[lxv] NYUonline. "Corporate Education." 28 November 2000 <http://www.nyuonline.com/target.html>.
[lxvi] NYUonline. "Corporate Education." 28 November 2000 <http://www.nyuonline.com/target.html>.
[lxvii] Hebel, Sarah et al. "The Outlook for Higher Education This Year in the 50 State Legislatures." Chronicle of Higher Education 7 January 2000. And Carnevale, Anthony P. et al. "Performance-based Appropriations: Fad or Wave of the Future?" Chronicle of Higher Education 10 April 1998.

[lxviii] Carnevale, Anthony P. et al. “Performance-based Appropriations: Fad or Wave of the Future?” Chronicle of Higher Education 10 April 1998. See Also Schmidt, Peter. “A State Transforms Colleges with ‘Performance Funding.’” Chronicle of Higher Education 2 July 1999.
[lxix] Schmidt.
[lxx] Colorado Commission on Higher Education. Interim Master Plan. 30 October 1999. 11 July 2000 <http://www.state.co.us/cche/novvbat.html>.
[lxxi] Citizens' Commission on the Future of Oklahoma Higher Education. Final Report and Recommendations. Oklahoma: October 1997. 11 July 2000 <http://www.okhighered.org/planfutr.html>.
[lxxii] ANUIES (Asociacion Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educacion Superior). La Educacion Superior en el Siglo XXI: Lineas estrategicas de desarrollo. Mexico, D. F., 2000 <http://web.anuies.mx/21/entrada.html>.
[lxxiii] “Apruebase el protocolo de integracion educativa para la formacion de recursos humans a nivel de post-grado entre los paises miembros del Mercosur, suscripto con las Republicas Federativa del Brasil, Paraguay, y Oriental del Uruguay” Ley 25.044 26 November 1998. 08 August 2000 <http://infoleg.mecon.gov.ar/txtnorma/54640.htm>. See Also “Apruebase el protocolo de integracion educativa y revalida de diplomas, certificados, titulos y reconocimientos de estudios de nivel medio tecnico suscripto con la Republica del Paraguay” Ley 24.839 11 July 1997. 08 August 2000 <http://infoleg.mecon.gov.ar/txtnorma/44536.htm>. See Also “Protocolo de integracion educativa” Mercosur.com 08 August 2000 <www.mercosur.com/htmldocs/info/protocolo_integracion_educativa.jsp>. See Also “Protocolos de integracion educativa en el Mercosur” Centro de IntegraVao do Mercosul Home page 09 August 2000 <www.ufpel.tche.br/~mercosul/protocol.htm>.
[lxxiv] Klimanovich, O.V. and I.I. Gancheryonok. “Internationalization in Belarus: The Post Soviet Era.” International Higher Education. The Boston College Center for International Higher Education. 20 (Summer 2000): 14.
[lxxv] Chan, Michael. “Japan Plans Aptitude Test to Ease Enrollment Process for Foreign Students.” Chronicle of Higher Education 11 September 2000 <http://chronicle.com>.
[lxxvi] Lever, Lorenza V. “La Comision de Educacion del Consejo Coordinador Empresarial (CESE).” Socios para el Progreso: La educacion y el sector privado en America Latina y el Caribe (Segunda Edicion). Puryear, Jeffrey M. (ed.). (Junio 1998). 16 August 2000 <www.laspau.harvard.edu/iad/cese.htm>. See also Puryear, Jeffrey M. “Comentarios y conclusions.” Socios para el Progreso: La educacion y el sector privado en America Latina y el Caribe (Segunda edicion). Puryear, Jeffrey M. (ed.). (Junio 1998). 16 August 2000 <www.laspua.harvard.edu/iad/conclusp.htm>.
[lxxvii] Wellman, Jane V. “Accreditors Have to See Past ‘Learning Outcomes.’” Chronicle of Higher Education 22 September 2000: B20.
[lxxviii] State Higher Education Executive Officers. “Needed: A New Tool Box,” 3.
[lxxix] Angelo, Thomas A. AAHE Bulletin November 1995: 7.
[lxxx] Swenson, Craig. Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Phoenix. “Re: Futures Project.” E-mail to Jamie Scurry. 23 October 2000.
[lxxxi] Swenson, Craig. Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Phoenix. “Re: Futures Project.” E-mail to Jamie Scurry. 23 October 2000.
[lxxxii] Alverno College. “Ability Based Curriculum.” November 2000 <http://www.alverno.edu/educators/e_curriculum.shtml>.
[lxxxiii] Alverno College Faculty. Student Assessment-as-Learning at Alverno College. Alverno College, 1994: 20-24.
[lxxxiv] Alverno College Faculty, 40.
[lxxxv] Alverno College Faculty, 58.
[lxxxvi] Alverno College Faculty, 89.
[lxxxvii] California State University. “Student Learning Outcomes in the CSU. Introduction.” November 2000 <http://www.co.calstate.edu/aa/sloa/intro.html>.
[lxxxviii] CSU Sacramento. “Assessing Learning Expectations for Majors in Ethnic Studies.” November 2000 <http://www.csus.edu/acaf/EthnicStudies.pdf>.
[lxxxix] CSU Sacramento, 3-4.
[xc] CSU Sacramento, 6.
[xci] North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. “Academic Quality Improvement Project.” 1 December 1999. 27 November 2000 <http://www.AQIP.org/instinfo.htm>.

[xcii] Biemiller, Lawrence. "Accrediting Group Changes Standards to Allow Colleges to Set Their Own Goals." Chronicle of Higher Education 21 April 2000: A43.
[xciii] Adelman, Clifford. Office of Educational Research and Improvement. U.S. Department of Education. A Parallel Postsecondary Universe: The Certification System in Information Technology. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2000: 8.
[xciv] Adelman, v.
[xcv] Adelman, 9.
[xcvi] Adelman, 3.
[xcvii] Virginia Foundation for Independent Colleges. "Tek.Xam: An Information Technology Certification Examination for Liberal Arts Graduates" 1999.
[xcviii] Weiner, Rebecca S. "Certifying Liberal Arts Majors for a High-Tech World." New York Times on the Web. May 3, 2000 <http://www.nytimes.com>.
[xcix] National Survey of Student Engagement. "The College Student Report." 28 June 2000 <http://www.indiana.edu/~nsse/>.
[c] National Survey of Student Engagement "The NSSE 2000 Report: National Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice" 17 November 2000 <http://www.indiana.edu/~nsse/>.
[ci] National Survey of Student Engagement "The NSSE 2000 Report: National Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice" 17 November 2000 <http://www.indiana.edu/~nsse/>.
[cii] Reisberg, Leo. "Are Students Actually Learning?" Chronicle of Higher Education 17 November 2000: A67.
[ciii] Reisberg.
[civ] Policy Center on the First Year of College. "Your First College Year Survey." Brevard College. 29 November 2000 <http://www.brevard.edu/fyc/Survey/YFYCStart.htm>.
[cv] Institute for Research on Higher Education. "Postsecondary Education Outcomes Survey." University of Pennsylvania. 29 November 2000 <http://www.irhe.upenn.edu/research/research-main.html#outcomes>.
[cvi] Carr, Sarah. "Sloan Foundation Turns Its Attention From Creating Programs to Promoting Them." Chronicle of Higher Education 2 June 2000: A49.
[cvii] Dawant, Martine, ed. Sloan-C Catalog of Online Educational Programming. Tennessee: ALN Center, Vanderbilt University, 2000. 30 June 2000 <http://www.sloan-c.org/catalog>.
[cviii] The Academic Audit Project. "The Academic Audit Project: Project Goals and Objectives." University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. 27 November 2000 <http://www.unc.edu/depts/pubpol/>.
[cix] The Academic Audit Project. "Sample Teaching Learning Quality Process Review (TLQPR), Hong Kong." University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. 27 November 2000 <http://www.unc.edu/depts/pubpol/>.
[cx] U.S. Census Bureau. "Current Population Reports: Health Insurance Coverage 1998." By Campbell, Jennifer. October 1999. 30 October 2000 <http://www.census.gov/prod/99pubs/p60-208.pdf.>.
[cxi] Newman, Frank. "Saving Higher Education's Soul." Change 33.5 (September/October 2000): 16-23. Released by the Futures Project: Policy for Higher Education in a Changing World <www.futuresproject.org>.
[cxii] College Board. Trends in College Pricing. Washington, D.C., 1999.
[cxiii] Postsecondary Education OPPORTUNITY. Student Financial Aid by State, 1996-97. October 1998.
[cxiv] American Association of State Colleges and Universities. State Student Financial Aid: Tough Choices and Trade-Offs for a New Generation. Washington, D.C., 2000.
[cxv] Postsecondary Education OPPORTUNITY. Student Financial Aid by State, 1996-97. October 1998.
[cxvi] Heller, Donald E. NACUBO Forum on Tuition Discounting. Merit and Need-Based Aid: Recent Changes in State, Federal, and Institutional Policy and the Impact on College Affordability, Dallas, 2000.
[cxvii] American Association of State Colleges and Universities. State Student Financial Aid: Tough Choices and Trade-Offs for a New Generation. Washington, D.C., 2000.
[cxviii] American Association of State Colleges and Universities. State Student Financial Aid: Tough Choices and Trade-Offs for a New Generation. Washington, D.C., 2000.
[cxix] American Association of State Colleges and Universities. State Student Financial Aid: Tough Choices and Trade-Offs for a New Generation. Washington, D.C., 2000.
[cxx] American Association of State Colleges and Universities. State Student Financial Aid: Tough Choices and Trade-Offs for a New Generation. Washington, D.C., 2000.
[cxxi] American Association of State Colleges and Universities. State Student Financial Aid: Tough Choices and Trade-Offs for a New Generation. Washington, D.C., 2000.

[cxxii] American Association of State Colleges and Universities. State Student Financial Aid: Tough Choices and Trade-Offs for a New Generation. Washington, D.C., 2000.
[cxxiii] California Student Aid Commission. "Student aid Commission Set to Implement Historic Cal Grant Entitlement Program." News Release. September 11, 2000. < http://www.csac.ca.gov/doc.asp?id=566>
[cxxiv] Trombley, William. "California's Improved Financial Aid Program." National CrossTalk 8.4 (Fall 2000): 1.
[cxxv] Trombley, William. "California's Improved Financial Aid Program." National CrossTalk 8.4 (Fall 2000): 8.
[cxxvi] Illinois Aid Programs. Specialized Grants. Monetary Award Program. 2000 November <http://www.isac1.org/ilaid/map.html>.
[cxxvii] New York Sate Education Department. "The Regents Professional Opportunity Scholarship." 2000 November <http:www.highered.nysed.gov/kiap/scholarships/pos.htm>.
[cxxviii] Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Authority. "Pennsylvania State Grant Program." 2000 November <www.pheaa.org:80/students/sg1.shtml>.
[cxxix] Immerwahr, John, and Tony Foleno. *Great Expectations: How the Public and Parents – White, African American and Hispanic – View Higher Education*. Public Agenda. May 2000.
[cxxx] American Council on Education. *Minorities in Higher Education 1999-2000*. By Deborah D. Wilds. Washington DC: ACE, 2000.
[cxxxi] U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics *Findings from the Condition of Education 1997: Postsecondary Persistence and Attainment*. NCES 97-984. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997b, 3.
[cxxxii] U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. *The Condition of Education 1997*. NCES 97-388. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997, 94.
[cxxxiii] U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. *How Low Income Undergraduates Financed Postsecondary Education: 1992-93*. NCES 96-191. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996, 71.
[cxxxiv] U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. *Programs at Higher Education Institutions for Disadvantaged Students*. NCES 96-230. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995b: 19.
[cxxxv] U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. *Programs at Higher Education Institutions for Disadvantaged Students*. NCES 96-230. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995b: 43.
[cxxxvi] The College Board. *Reaching the Top: A Report of the National Task Force on Minority High Achievement*. New York: College Board, 1999: 3.
[cxxxvii] U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. *Programs at Higher Education Institutions for Disadvantaged Students*. NCES 96-230. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995b: 41.
[cxxxviii] U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. *Programs at Higher Education Institutions for Disadvantaged Students*. NCES 96-230. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995b: 26.
[cxxxix] Blair, Julie. "Minorities Need Path to Top Schools, Report Finds." *Education Week* 19.19 (Jan 19 2000): 6-7.
[cxl] Xavier University of Louisiana. "SOAR1: A Summer Bootcamp to Prepare for College Math/Science Project" 2 October 2000. 29 November 2000 <http://www.xupremed.com/a.SSA/soar.html>.
[cxli] U.S. Department of Education. "Examples of Mentoring and Early College Awareness Programs." GEAR-UP website. 14 August 2000 <www.ed.gov/gearup/guexamp.html>.
[cxlii] Oregon University System Online. *Introduction to the Proficiency-based Admission Standards System*. 28 Sept. 2000. <http://www.ous.edu/pass/info/intro/contents.html>.
[cxliii] K-16 Leadership Council. Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning K-16. Detailed Description of Public Institution's (sic) Efforts to Promote K-16 Concept. 2 Feb. 1999.
[cxliv] Hinkle, Dennis et al. Shaping Education Policy in Maryland: Teaching Education Reform and Beyond. ERIC 418 073. 15 March 1998.
[cxlv] U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. *Remedial Education at Higher Education Institutions 1995*. NCES 97-584. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996, 10.
[cxlvi] Callan, Patrick M. "An Interview with Robert McCabe." National CrossTalk 8.4 (Fall 2000): 2.
[cxlvii] Callan, Patrick M. "An Interview with Robert McCabe." National CrossTalk 8.4 (Fall 2000): 3.

[cxlviii] Selingo, Jeffrey. “Cal State Puts Remediation on an ‘Or Else’ Basis.” Chronicle of Higher Education 4 August 2000: A27.
[cxlix] Campus Compact. “Introduction to Service-Learning. Toolkit.” DRAFT. 1999.
[cl] National Association of Secretaries of State. “The New Millennium Project: American Youth Attitudes on Politics, Citizenship, Government, and Voting.” Washington, DC: 1999.
[cli] Peter D. Hart Research Associates for Public Allies. “New Leaders for a New Century.” Washington, D.C.: 1999.
[clii] Gray, Maryann J., Elizabeth H. Ondaatje, and Laura Zakaras. “Combing Service and Learning in Higher Education: Summary Report.” Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1999.
[cliii] “Tufts University College of Citizenship and Public Service Summary Description.” February 2000. 3 December 2000 <http://uccps.tufts.edu/01_about/01-UCCPS_Description.html>.
[cliv] DiBiaggio, John. “Tufts University College of Citizenship and Public Service Summary Description.” February 2000. 3 December 2000 <http://uccps.tufts.edu/01_about/01-UCCPS_Description.html>.
[clv] Maslen, Geoffrey. “Australian University in Vietnam Will Focus on Online Instruction.” Chronicle of Higher Education 16 June 2000: A39.
[clvi] Overland, Martha Ann. “India Uses Distance Education to Meet Huge Demand for Degrees.” Chronicle of Higher Education 14 July 2000: A48.
[clvii] Twigg, Carol. “What Happens to the Savings?” The Learning Marketplace (a monthly email newsletter) 1 November 2000.
[clviii] The Pew Grant Program in Course Redesign. “Virginia Tech Project Abstract.” 4 December 2000 <http://www.center.rpi.edu/pewgrant/RD1award/vaab.html>.