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Editor’s Note

Is there an ideal enrollment management structural template? Stan Henderson, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champlain, argues that enrollment management must be refocused through the academic lens of the institution as articulated by the president in order to develop an ethos-driven template that will engage all members of the community.

Enrollment managers play an integral role in determining financial aid policy at all levels, starting with their own institutions. Thomas C. Green, Seton Hall University, examines the role that federal, state, and institutional policies have played in shaping access for students based on race and income levels.

The United States Supreme Court has had a significant role in the exploration and definition of affirmative action in this country. Jerome C. Weber, The University of Oklahoma, Myron L. Pope, The University of Central Oklahoma, and Michael W. Simpson, University of Wisconsin Law School, explore the historical role of the U.S. Supreme Court, examine the decisions made in affirmative action-related cases, and provide some recommendations that professionals in higher education should consider in attempting to respect the recent decisions of the Court.

The Web has increasingly replaced the catalog and other print materials among both prospective and enrolled students as the preferred medium for obtaining information about colleges and universities. Michael Poock, East Carolina University, conducts focus groups with current and prospective graduate students to revisit the subject of Web site usability and content.

Dick Whiteside, Tulane University, is a marvelous storyteller and a SEM celebrity who is always featured as a keynote speaker, workshop presenter, or session leader. He is also the author of Student Marketing for Colleges and Universities, published by AACRAO. Kathy Winarski, Boston College, interviewed him at the SEM conference where he shared his background, career development, leadership style, and vision of the future.

In the Forum section, Travis Reindl of AASCU presents two policy analyses: one on homeschooling and the other on Colorado’s higher education voucher initiative.

Jerome C. Weber, The University of Oklahoma, asks why colleges and universities can’t be run more like businesses.

Michael Duggan and Rebecca Mathews, Suffolk University, have written a research-in-brief article to describe their use of IPEDS for comparing tuition discount rates among peer institutions.

Another research-in-brief by David James, Oakland Community College, discusses the value of group work and its effect on student learning.

Allen Ezell, former FBI agent, brings to light the growing threat of diploma mills and fraudulent documents, and what you can do to protect your institution.

Book reviews include College Unranked: Affirming Educational Values in College Admissions reviewed by Robert Massa, Dickinson College and The Future of Higher Education reviewed by Tom Johnson, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
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Give your research and experience a voice by writing for the “Feature” section, or address best practices, how-tos, new technologies, the latest books, and other pertinent topics in “The Forum” section. With a substantial circulation base, C&U is an excellent vehicle for shaping the profession and gaining recognition.
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Refocusing Enrollment Management
Losing Structure and Finding the Academic Context

Enrollment management has come to be defined in structural terms when what is needed is an understanding of institutional academic context. Concentrating on which offices should be brought together to do enrollment work can lead to being stuck on structure, forcing the institution to reflect enrollment management rather than ensuring that enrollment management reflects the institution. Enrollment management needs to use an academic lens to define an EM Ethos—the underlying fundamental character and spirit of an institution’s culture. This EM Ethos makes structure the servant rather than the master of enrollment policy and strategy. This refocusing of enrollment management on academic context can provide at last a template for institutions developing their enrollment management approach. It is a template based on vertical communication that articulates a strategic vision, horizontal communication that opens dialogue and completes feedback loops, and structure consistent with the institution’s academic mission. Enrollment managers who speak the language of the academic context—with data and research—will eventually be heard more convincingly than those who speak the language of structure. Enrollment structure follows academic understanding, and therein lies the future of enrollment management.

By Stanley E. Henderson

Structuralism: The Historical EM
Throughout my career in enrollment management I have been an unabashed structuralist. I left one institution when a senior administrator suggested that significant enrollment offices reported to the enrollment manager “for convenience.” At the University of Cincinnati we paid the ultimate homage to structuralism and built a building to house the structure, bringing ten different offices from five different buildings into one facility designed to enhance a blending of responsibilities. One might say we made a structure for structure. To this day, I obsess about the units included in the enrollment management organization.

In some respects, such an obsession is understandable. Many of the earliest proponents of enrollment management (EM) concentrated on the offices that needed to come together to accomplish a more purposeful approach to EM. Jack Maguire, the father of EM, called it a “grand design” (1976) that “was developed to bring about a synergy among functions such as admissions, financial aid, and retention, which too often were viewed as independent and working at cross purposes” (Britz 1998). How else could institutions change this silo culture but with a structure that brought the disparate units together?

Certainly, the structural approach to EM took a permanent place in the literature when Kemeter, Baldridge, and Green introduced what has been called “the quintessential enrollment management structural forms” (Henderson 2001). Their seminal 1982 book suggested that EM was organized in increasingly complex structures: the “marching millions” committee, the “let’s-give-the-admissions-director-something-more-to-do” coordinator, the “conflict avoidance” matrix model, and the “now-we’re-serious” division. Here was a recipe for EM that took into account how difficult organizational change might be in a given campus culture. The committee might be a good way to begin the EM process while a coordinator might take advantage of existing mid-management staff to develop collaboration by dint of personality. A matrix model raised EM to the senior levels of campus administration without realigning offices in different administrative areas. Only the division was able to effect the most transformational change by bringing all appropriate areas together under a cabinet-level officer.

Hossler (1986) added change models to the structural mix by suggesting that EM organizations developed based on the urgency of the need for change. Stable enrollments could, at best, yield incremental change, probably best achieved through a committee; a crisis brought on by plummeting enrollment would require more draconian change, often the creation of a new division. Structure was still at the heart of the EM efforts.

When Dolence popularized the concept of Strategic enrollment management (SEM), he, in effect, threw down a challenge to the structuralists that many would ignore at their peril. He explained SEM as a “comprehensive process designed to help an institution achieve and maintain the optimum recruitment, retention, and graduation rates of students, where ‘optimum’ is defined in the academic context of the institution” (1993, emphasis added). The academic context in Dolence’s mind was an umbrella concept that made structure important only to the extent that it facilitated the involvement of the academic enterprise in enrollment management. Nothing else was so important in EM as keeping it in the academic context.
Stuck in Structure

When I went to the University of Cincinnati in 1995 as associate vice president for enrollment management, I took on the assignment of implementing an enrollment management program that included an elaborate structure. A steering committee of high-level administrators voted up or down proposals sent from a planning group of mid-level staff that developed ideas from working groups in marketing, retention, processes and procedures, and academic issues. I was soon touting this complex structure as the ideal way to achieve the comprehensive nature of EM in the academic context that Hossler and Dolence had described (Henderson 1996, 1997, 1998).

However, in spite of that lip service to the primacy of academic context, it was easier to concentrate on structure than on the really hard work of identifying and staying in touch with the academic context. Dolence signaled the potential pitfalls of too much emphasis on structure when he outlined his continuum of “SEMCON levels” (a take on the DEFCON levels of national security in those days before the yellow, orange, and red alerts of Homeland Security) at an AACRAO SEM conference in Orlando. Dolence identified structure as the second of four levels of EM. The first, or Nominal, level was the “aha” stage, as in “Aha, we have a problem,” where institutions were just beginning to identify issues and talk about possible solutions. Usually those solutions centered on marketing or tweaking the admissions office. The second stage, the Structural Level, focused the campus on effectiveness and efficiency. There would be integration of recruitment and retention through some kind of structural development, and the campus would be looking at processes and procedures to improve and streamline service to students. In discussing this phase, Dolence suggested that it is easy for an institution to get “stuck” in the Structural Level and not move on to the Tactical and Strategic levels. More importantly, he noted that in the Structural Level, EM “holds academics at arms length” (1997).

Five years later at the University of Cincinnati, this note would come back in graphic form in one of the first formal evaluations of an EM initiative nationally. A major complaint from the institution’s academic deans voiced in the evaluation process was that EM at Cincinnati was a Student Affairs program not sufficiently responsive to academics. Those of us in the SEM organization were stunned. Yes, the EM offices were a part of the Division of Student Affairs, and student affairs administrators chaired the lead SEM groups. But we had so carefully structured the SEM governing groups to include the provost, vice president for research, president of the faculty senate, chair of the council of deans, etc., as members of the various SEM groups and committees. How could the campus see SEM as just a Student Affairs operation?

A dean serving on the evaluation committee answered, “A member of a steering team or committee won’t feel as compelled to be accountable, to take the lead, as the chair would. We need to find ways for academic administrators and faculty to feel responsible for EM.” The result was a recommendation for shared governance where the vice president for student affairs and the provost would co-chair the Steering Committee, and the associate vice president for enrollment management and the vice provost for academic planning would chair a work group to include associate vice presidential representation from each cabinet-level division (Henderson and Frank 2001; McDonough and Henderson 2002). Interestingly, although the membership really did not change, the perceived ownership allowed for more engagement of the academic side of the house in enrollment programs and issues. Exercising that sense of ownership, the provost began to take more of a leadership role in setting enrollment policy. Operationally, enrollment target meetings with the deans were much more effective with the associate vice president for enrollment management’s data coupled with the approval of the vice provost.

Rediscovering the Academic Context

Some would argue that this story emphasizes the need for the SEM structure to reside in academic affairs instead of student affairs. I remember a leading EM specialist who said, “I would never work at an institution where EM was in student affairs.” Such arguments are a result of the rise of the division as the preeminent EM structure and illustrate how easy it is to become “stuck” on structure outside the academic context of one’s institution.

The division that Kemerer, Baldridge and Green envisioned in 1982 was clearly organized around a vice presidential position with a seat at the cabinet table and direct access to the president. The evolution of the EM division in universities has certainly emphasized bringing together offices that directly affect enrollments—typically admissions, financial aid, registrar, orientation, some type of retention unit, and, less often, career services, advising, or other related offices. In private institutions this kind of division has most often led to a vice president for enrollment management. However, in public universities, rather than representing a vice presidential portfolio, these divisions most often have an associate vice president or an associate provost as their senior officer. It is rare to see a vice president for enrollment management at a public university (for example, Don Hossler is the only Big Ten vice presidential-level enrollment manager, although each of the others has an enrollment manager at the associate provost or associate vice presidential level).

However, the placement of the EM organization on a campus is not as important as how it connects with academics. The debate over where EM should be misses the point that it cannot succeed unless it is part of the academic fabric of the institution. At Cincinnati we looked in our evaluation for evidence that SEM existed outside of the structure in the thinking of the institution, that it was something taken into account as a kind of second nature. We didn’t get it quite right, though. We were looking for whether the institution was reflecting enrollment management when we should have
been looking to ensure that enrollment management reflected the institution.

When I moved to the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 2003 to take a new position in enrollment management, I quickly realized that the campus did not understand the language or structure of EM. Strangely, however, while what we might think of as standard language did not enter into the equation of optimal enrollment work, there was an EM mindset, an intuitive understanding among academic administrators and faculty of enrollment issues, problems, and solutions that touched the academic mission.

Structure was, to a great extent, superfluous to achieving enrollment goals when those goals followed from the academic mission of the institution. For example, if diversity and excellence were twin pillars of faculty values, then there would be a natural emphasis on enrolling students of color, students from other states and countries, and students from rural Illinois counties. The institutional commitment to research made deans and department heads open to data that explained why there were challenges in reaching enrollment goals.

To be sure, there were instances where an individual office might not share the campus academic perspective. In such circumstances, structural change could have helped. However, the campus was more inclined to look for alternative options and paths that were more amenable to reaching an academic enrollment goal rather than immediately looking at structural change. Faculty see themselves as able to effect change in the academic realm through consensus building and collaboration without causing the angst often associated with structural change that might disturb longstanding administrative arrangements. If another way of accomplishing a goal can be found, why make structural change? Reaching the goal is the key, not the structure.

How many of us have been seduced by the structural siren and thereby missed the channel through to successful EM? I was even drawn to second-guess David Kalsbeek, whose EM organization at DePaul might be called the epitome of the structuralist approach to EM. His vice presidential division encompasses the cradle to endowment approach in ways that other institutions may only have dreamed. Pre-college programs lead into the traditional enrollment units of admissions and financial aid and then flow to internships, career services, and alumni affairs while marketing strategies inform and are informed by all of these. But is there too much emphasis on structure and not enough on academics?

Kalsbeek’s response to the question was telling: “I think our faculty would suggest that the structure grew out of the academic needs and context of the institution. Our planning started with the academic mission and went from there.” For Kalsbeek to view EM at DePaul as academic rather than structural runs counter to the traditional view. Here is a structure over which enrollment managers salivate. Yet, in fact, before we look so longingly at the structure, we must consider the foundation behind it.

**Through the Academic Lens**

What is needed is an adjustment in the lens with which enrollment professionals view EM. Using an academic lens rather than a structural one, EM programs take on a different cast. The result gives a renewed view of EM as a quintessentially academic enterprise. Consider these successful EM programs and their academic connections.

- West Shore Community College’s move to a culture of student success used a deliberate strategy to obtain faculty buy-in for a student-centered approach to learning by identifying, responding to, and incorporating faculty issues and ideas. The result was “a paradigm shift as the college moves from an institution that provides instruction to an institution that exists to produce learning” (Pollock 2004).

- The University of Missouri at Kansas City sought “all the right people who could make [enrollment management] happen—not only the chancellor and the provost, but also the deans, faculty, and staff.” Having all the people with clear interests involved led to a shared revenue incentive plan that would return funds to those units realizing enrollment growth while also supporting those with capped enrollments (Tyler and Hamilton 2004).

- In its ten-year journey through the levels of enrollment management, Oregon State University found that “building support for enrollment management requires the development of enrollment targets and reports tailored to an institution’s many constituencies, ranging from internal colleges and departments, to communities of color, to legislators” (Bontrager 2004).

- When the academic deans at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro voted to support financially a new enrollment plan, it was because, “intellectually, they had reached the point where they fervently believed that without the full implementation of the enrollment management plan they would not achieve the [academic] ambitions they had for their school” (Black 2004).

- Dickinson College identified the tools its Enrollment Management Division needed with a campus-wide process of strategic planning. “Once the community agreed upon the college’s identity and its purpose for being, once it was able to identify its distinctive elements of the liberal arts, once it understood its mission clearly, then it was able to embark on an integrated marketing campaign that sought to attract the students for whom the college was the right fit, to provide them with the experience they expected when they enrolled, and to keep them connected as alumni to help the college in the future by sharing its vision” (Massa 2004).

What emerges through the academic lens at these institutions is an EM Ethos—the underlying fundamental character and spirit of a higher education institution’s culture. It puts the EM emphasis back on institutional (read academic) culture and makes structure the servant rather than the master.
of enrollment policy and strategy. This EM Ethos gives new import to Dolence’s definition of “optimum” as “defined in the academic context of the institution.” In an academic institution, looking at enrollments through an academic lens, it is clear that EM will “touch every aspect of institutional function and culture.” The academic ethos of EM will set the tone for a comprehensive approach. The academic enterprise will, by definition, by its underlying assumptions and values, encompass all components of the institution.

**Guiding Principles for the EM Ethos**
The academic lens not only confirms the comprehensive nature of EM, it reshapes every fundamental element that gives EM its identity. To rethink these EM principles in the academic context ensures that the EM Ethos on any campus will be consistent with the institution’s academic being.

- **EM is shared responsibility.** If one thinks of EM as a reflection of the institutional academic ethos, then EM obviously and comfortably becomes an institution-wide strategy with shared responsibility. If EM reflects the ethos of the institution, then no one individual or even office is responsible for the enrollment strategy or outcomes. Each member of the community takes on the responsibility for nurturing the ethos and the enrollment planning that comes out of it.

- **EM is integrated institutional planning.** Seen as an academic entity, EM can be more naturally integrated with other institutional planning functions. In fact, it is mandatory that EM be a part of institutional strategic planning. EM in the academic context should be a defining part of how the institution approaches the positioning of all its key strategies. Strategic planning is essential in that process: If EM doesn’t fit into the strategic planning model, institutional functioning deteriorates.

- **EM is focus on service.** Within the concept of an EM Ethos, procedures and processes—the essence of EM as service—are more important than structure. The institution’s academic foundations dictate what the business practices should be. Many criticisms of student systems are misplaced: the system is not necessarily as much the problem as the business practices. In an academic system the business practices need to be aligned with the academic mission. Institutions should want to test students’ talents in the classroom rather than test their patience in navigating university business practices.

  Students do not see enrollment as a railroad track with a number of stations where they must stop. They do not want to get off the train at the admissions station, get back on, then get off at the financial aid station, get back on, then get off at the registration station. Students see enrollment as a seamless process, non-stop rather than stop and go. It’s a big tent view of their expectations. Everything that touches enrollment is a part of the whole, yet the student wants to customize access, eliminating those unneeded services.

Institutions need to look at service as intuitive. Does what we’re doing make sense to the students? Does it meet their expectations? In its service mode, EM has to come from the perspective of the student. And here we build back in the idea of academics. Why is the student in the university? One could argue that, depending on the institution, he/she is there to find a mate, have a good time, join a fraternity, play sports, prepare for a job, or—just possibly—to get an education. However, the only way that the student stays in school is if he/she is there for some kind of academic reason. Retention is tied to academic success with the emphasis on academic as well as success. Processes and procedures—the business part of EM—should enhance that academic success.

- **EM is Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).** How many new enrollment managers have failed to address the KPIs, those indices of institutional health that are so important, and so misunderstood? Only when the EM Ethos is set can enrollment managers fully understand how to develop the KPIs. Getting at those is tantamount to identifying what’s important to the institution. KPIs are placeholders for institutional values. If the driving force for EM is “get the bodies, not the fit,” the process is out of synch with the academic values of the institution. We have in too many institutions put the emphasis on how many students rather than which students. Therein lies the reason why so many have difficulty in setting KPI: they approach KPIs not from the academic context but from other approaches outside the institution’s academic foundation. If the enrollment manager has an academic understanding of the institution, then the KPIs virtually set themselves.

- **EM is research and evaluation.** EM cannot succeed in an academic context without a research/evaluation plan. The people who go into the traditional enrollment management units are not always predisposed to research and evaluation. “If we had wanted to do research,” they sometimes say, “we would have become a faculty member.” EM staff tend to be “people people.” They are more interested in interaction with students and their families than doing research on student choice or evaluating recruitment programs. However, the industry standard is more and more based on data, surveys, research—all the tools of the academic enterprise. Without a data-driven approach to practice and process, the logical outgrowth of a major dip in enrollment is disappointment, recrimination, and finger-pointing. EM units cannot continue to do “feel-good” programs where the evaluations say everybody thought it was a great program, and staff felt so positively about how things went. If it didn’t make a difference in reaching the institution’s academic goals, then it wasn’t successful, no matter how positively everyone felt about it.

- **EM is for the long haul.** Finally, EM is long-term and never finished. The academic underpinnings of the institution are fluid: they change with the development of new knowledge. Faculty and students grow in an ongoing, eternal
process renewed with each new class, each new addition to the knowledge base of the collective disciplines of the campus. We must remember that in the current world there is a whole different approach to enrollment. It is helpful, if not necessary, to think of the similarities between the academic context of the institution and the enrollment planning that reflects that context. Academic disciplines change over time with new research, new paradigms, new pedagogy. The changes are not instantaneous. No academician would expect to develop a new paradigm in April for publication in May. Why then would any institution expect its EM team to find 300 more freshmen in April for fall enrollment? An EM Ethos aligned with the academics of the institution cannot change on a dime any more than the academic discipline of any department can. There needs to be a run up to the take-off point. To be successful, EM must follow the deliberative path of the long-term academic, not the quick fix of the repairman.

The EM Blueprint: Refocusing EM

The refocusing of EM through the academic lens suggests a blueprint that every novice enrollment manager wants: the template for developing an institution’s EM program. Virtually every EM theoretician and practitioner will say the template does not exist: there is no one-size-fits-all approach to EM. However, to say one must develop an EM program unique to the individual institution is not always helpful to the new enrollment manager or even the seasoned provost or dean who looks at EM as offices and strategies. In fact, the notion of an EM Ethos provides a blueprint that is in a sense, at least, a template. It is a template based on vertical communication that articulates a strategic vision, horizontal communication that opens dialogue and completes feedback loops, and structure consistent with the institution’s academic mission.

It is a template that says, first and foremost, the institution’s leadership must set an academic tone for EM. What are the defining academic values giving substance to the Ethos that characterizes the institution? How the academic leadership of the institution applies that characterization to enrollment will determine the institution’s approach to EM. Having the leadership active in articulating the academic character of the institution brings each member of the community to the enrollment table with a sense of ownership and contribution. If the leadership’s voice is absent or lacking, EM will not be successful.

More importantly, however, what we’re talking about here is the significance of academic leadership. If a president says, “Enrollment is paramount,” and fails to say, “to the academic mission of the institution,” then we can’t make the leap to successful EM. In fact, this top down communication from the academic leadership articulates strategic educational aspirations, goals, needs, and strategies of the institution’s faculty and students. All members of the institutional community need to understand that the academic well-being of the institution is tied inextricably to enrollment health. If that academic voice is articulated clearly, the template is ready.

Articulation of the symbiotic relationship between academic well-being and enrollment health also embeds the concept of lateral communication in the EM template. Enrollment management needs lateral communication to ensure adherence to the institutional academic ethos. The tentacles of the communication octopus need to spread throughout the campus from college to enrollment units as well as from enrollment units to college. The president has to bless, even demand, this; but just dictating from the top won’t work. Communication within the institution has to become a part of the ethos, the culture of the place. It has to express the ethos of the place.

Finally, this ethos-driven template will provide a blueprint for ways in which faculty, staff, and students can make a contribution to enrollment issues—in short, a structure for enrollment management. Only from the vantage point of its academic roots can an institution safely turn to designing a structure for enrollment management. In this refocusing of EM the institutional academic ethos will set the structure. The structure itself cannot be more important than what the cultural underpinnings of the institution are.

With this understanding of the role of structure, it becomes obvious why so many of us have preached against a one-size-fits-all structure: Structure grows out the core of the individual institution; it cannot be picked up and transplanted from what worked at another campus. A particular community college, for example, may have a campus-wide structure; but the research-extensive university may have multiple structures based in individual academic units. The wise enrollment manager will first understand what the academic grounding of the institution is and seek a structure based on that foundation.

The Enrollment Professional in the Refocused EM

What is the role of the enrollment professional in the refocused EM? Is he or she a passive vessel ready to receive the wishes of the faculty? Does the primacy of the academic context dictate that enrollment managers must be faculty? Can an enrollment manager in Student Affairs ever be successful?

Enrollment managers have enormous potential to be leaders in their institutions, whether they are of the faculty or a career administrator, whether they are sited in Academic Affairs or Student Affairs. The enrollment professional armed with a refocused commitment to enrollment management in the academic context of the institution is in a powerful position. Adopting the tools of the academy, the enrollment manager is in a position to articulate the EM Ethos more clearly than anyone else on campus. Enrollment managers who speak the language of the academic—with data and research—will eventually be heard more convincingly than those who speak the language of structure. The successful enrollment manager will move more slowly—but more surely—if the academic foundation requires more collaboration and consensus building than dramatic and rapid change. Enrollment problems will be solved more effectively if they are seen in the academic mirror of the institution.
The enrollment manager’s chief allies will be the academic leadership of the campus, those who understand best the academic character of the institution. The first step in applying the EM Ethos Template is mining the academic nature of a place and arming oneself with an understanding of what makes the place tick academically. Enrollment structure follows academic understanding, and therein lies the future of enrollment management.
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As we acknowledge the fiftieth anniversary of the landmark case *Brown, et. al., v. Board of Education, et. al.*, which ended “separate but equal” as a method for keeping separate children of different races in our schools (Bernstein 1963), it is appropriate and important to examine the events and progress made in the time since this decision. To more sharply focus the lens of this large and sweeping issue, let us examine the role that financial aid policy has played in shaping access for students. How have federal, state, and institutional policies improved or diminished access for students based on race and income levels?

As enrollment managers, these issues cut across admission, financial aid, and retention lines of strategic enrollment management (SEM). Awareness of the facts surrounding issues of access allow us to examine our recruitment and admission practices. Understanding the critical role financial aid plays in SEM helps us to inform discussions on our campuses regarding the roles of need-based and merit-based aid in the recruitment and retention of students. If access has been the common theme of higher education since the 1960s, then perhaps attainment will replace it in the new century. As a greater number and proportion of students enter college, the focus may shift to degree completion.

In his book *A Theory of Justice*, John Rawls (1971) introduced the concept of the “social contract.” Rawls’s work stems from philosophical ideas put forth by Rousseau in the 1800s, aligning with the French motto and themes of Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité (liberty, equality, and fraternity). Inherent in this motto is an adoption of a social contract, in which certain goods and services are produced for the betterment of the entire society. For example, when students who otherwise could not afford to attend college are provided the means to do so, this may be referred to as our “social contract” with higher education.

Rawls’s theory is not without controversy and disagreement, however. French sociologist Raymond Boudon notes that this redistribution of wealth has its limits. If those citizens providing the funding for these benefits perceive that they are excessive, a “social envy” sets in and they resent those citizens who are receiving the benefits. He contends that, instead, it is a mechanism for personal advancement, based on the individual’s ability to choose or not choose college attendance after completion of secondary education (Boudon 1976, pp. 105–107).

**Establishing the Social Contract**

The first half of the twentieth century for American higher education was filled with educational inequities. Even though historically black institutions had been founded in several states and funded by such institutions as the Carnegie Foundation, the General Education Board, the Phelps-Stokes Foundation, the Laura Spellman Rockefeller Memorial Fund and others, a report by Thomas Jesse Jones in 1917 cited that only two of these institutions were capable of delivering a college-level education (Anderson 1989). W.E.B. DuBois called for the education of African Americans in a classical liberal culture, a view supported by many others involved with the development and administration of historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs). However, funding agencies and foundations favored the technical education model of Booker T. Washington and the Tuskegee Institute.

By the 1930s, in the United States, elite American colleges and universities were the domain of White, Anglo-Saxon young men of means. Notably excluded from admission were students of Jewish descent, women, and students of color (Levine 1989). These restrictions, coupled with a national economic depression, meant that college students were “in short supply” during the period of 1930–1945 (Freeland 1989). The end of World War II brought about substantial changes to the number and mix of students seeking admission to America’s colleges and universities fueled by massive funding.
through the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944 (the “GI Bill”).

President Harry S. Truman appointed a Commission on Higher Education for Democracy, headed by the president of the American Council on Education, George Zook. Surveying the state of higher education at the end of World War II, they found that “for the great majority of our boys and girls, the kind and amount of education they may hope to attain depends, not on their own abilities, but on the family or community into which they happened to be born or, worse still, on the color of their skin or the religion of their parents” (Zook 1947). The report found that economic, curricular, and racial/religious barriers existed for the general population. It recommended that tuition at public colleges be lowered and that scholarships be established to help students who could not afford the costs of college.

Two subsequent presidential commissions, appointed by Dwight Eisenhower and John Kennedy, reinforced these initial findings. The Josephs and Hovde commissions, respectively, determined that there was insufficient access to America’s institutions of higher education (Kerr 1989). The scope of the Josephs Commission also included a specific recommendation on the creation of community colleges (and generally improving college and university facilities) and increasing the number of qualified teachers, scientists, and others who could respond to a changing technological society (Kerr 1989, p.633). From this recommendation sprang the National Defense Student Loan program (now the Federal Perkins Loan program), the first national student loan program, and graduate fellowships. The Hovde Commission sifted through more than 60 preceding commission reports in order to make quick recommendations to newly-elected Kennedy prior to his first Congressional address (Kerr 1989, p.636). The commission called for an expansion of the loan and fellowship programs established by the Eisenhower National Defense Education Act and Kennedy himself called for the inclusion of student scholarships. Although Congress did not adopt these initial recommendations at that time, Kennedy was able to gain passage of an “omnibus bill” in 1963 that expanded graduate fellowships and provided for a national guaranteed student loan program (Kerr 1989, p.640).

The issue of racial equality and access had not been effectively addressed in legislation passed up until this point, nor had undergraduate grants and scholarships been approved or funded. Two pieces of legislation were to change this in the 1960s: the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 provided the legislative mandates for non-discrimination that would allow for many of the most controversial and important lawsuits in the years to follow. The Higher Education Act of 1965 pro-
vided the framework for federal financial aid today: grants, work-study, and loans.

The reauthorization of the HEA in 1972 established the Basic Education Opportunity Grant (known as the Federal Pell Grant today), which targets grants on a sliding scale to the poorest college students in the United States (Gladieux 1995). It also mandated needs testing for receipt of aid, such that a formula of income and assets, among other factors, could be used to determine the ability of a student and, when dependent, parents to pay the costs of a college education. Also included in this legislation were State Student Incentive Grants (SSIGs) as an encouragement for states to begin need-based grant programs for their citizens (United States Congress 1965; Heller 2002; National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators 2003). This infusion of aid made directly to students rather than institutions, a precedent set by the GI Bill, also set into motion market forces that would greatly affect higher education. With portable grants and an expanded student loan program, students now had increased financial means to shop for their educational institutions. The expansion of the community college system, proposed through four presidential commissions and funded by the U.S. Congress, state legislatures, and local municipalities increased opportunities for students, combined with state support for public four-year institutions.

**Shifting Priorities**

To this point in the history of American higher education, it would appear that our social contract with higher education was focused on equality and access for under-represented students: economically, racially, and religiously. Legislation that mandated equal opportunity and funding for poorer students had been set in place at the federal and state levels. These events would support the social justice theory of Rawls and its provision of benefits for those in the “original position” of unequal resources and opportunity in society. It also allowed greater institutional choice for students, as federal aid was portable between institutions and a greater share of the costs was defrayed by financial aid support.

The time frame in which this theory was tested in the United States was quite brief. From the inception of Pell Grants and state aid programs (inspired by SSIGs) in 1972, the high priority placed on grant spending for higher education only lasted about four years. It was at this time, in 1976, when veterans’ benefits were terminated following the end of the Vietnam War and the draft (Veteran’s Benefits 2002). Further erosion of total educational grants occurred when the Social Security Survivor Benefits Program (another of Johnson’s Great Society programs) was eliminated in the early 1980s. Even though spending on Pell Grants increased during the late 1970s and early 1980s, total federal educational grants declined (St. John 2003).

In the short period of funding in the early 1970s, achievements were made in the participation rates of both Blacks and Hispanics. However, once total federal grants began their decline, these gains started to erode (St. John 2003, p.87). In 1978, passage of the Middle Income Student Assistance Act (MISA) expanded educational benefits to students outside the high-need category targeted by the HEA in 1965 and 1972 (Gladieux 1995).

The greatest impact of the MISA was to allow any student, regardless of need, to utilize federal loans to pay college expenses. Since its passage, federal spending on loans has far outpaced spending on need-based grants and the purchasing power of the Pell Grant has declined since its high point in 1975 (Heller 2002). King (2003b) reports that in 1976–77, grants represented 46 percent of all federal student aid. In 2001–2002, that percentage had fallen to just 19 percent, with student loans comprising 75 percent of the total federal aid budget (King 2003a).

Assistance also came to middle-income students in the 1990s in the form of tax credits. In 1997, Congress passed the Taxpayer Relief Act, enacting the HOPE and Lifetime Learning Tax Credits as well as tax exemption for working students who receive tuition benefits from their employers (National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators 2003). Today, the income caps for these credits are $51,000 for a single filer and $103,000 for joint filers. These tax credits reduce the amount of income available to the United States Treasury for expenses in any area. While the tax incentive to attend college may appear a worthwhile expense, students from these income groups have historically participated in higher education at higher rates (Gladieux 1996).

**The Rise of State Merit Programs**

Middle-income assistance also came from state merit aid programs. In 1993, the state of Georgia introduced a new program for state financial aid that utilized a vastly different philosophy, eligibility test, and funding mechanism. This new program, the Georgia HOPE scholarship program, was introduced with the express purpose of increasing the number of students who would remain in the state of Georgia for higher education (Cornwell and Mustard 2002). Unlike previous state grant programs, the criteria for eligibility were not based on financial need. Rather, merit requirements were used, namely a “B” average in high school coursework. The program was funded using proceeds from the Georgia state lottery, which at that time was a relatively new source of income for the state.

Since its inception, the Georgia Student Finance Commission, the state agency which administers HOPE scholarships and grants, has awarded more than two billion dollars to state resident students (Georgia Student Finance Commission 2004). Beyond this financial impact within the state, it has also served as a model for state merit scholarship programs in twelve other states (Heller 2002; Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation 2004). In all instances, criteria are based on merit and the programs have no eligibility criteria based on financial need. The academic requirements vary and many states also require some minimum score on a
Institutions where there is adequate financial aid to meet the demonstrated need of students and to target merit aid in a manner that shapes the size and characteristics of the incoming class, tension between these two methodologies does not exist. However, most institutions lack this level of resources and must prioritize the available aid in order to meet enrollment targets, and most institutions discount tuition in order to increase the amount of financial aid available for discretionary (merit and/or need) spending (Davis 2003, p.5). Between 1990 and 1996, the level of institutional aid spending for all institutions in the United States rose by 105 percent in public institutions and 98 percent in private institutions (Heller 2000).

Concerns over the use of limited financial aid resources for merit rather than need are centered on the choices made when institutional aid is limited. Between 1995 and 1999, the most rapid increases in institutional aid were made to dependent students whose annual family income was above $60,000, with the largest percentage increases made to those in the $100,000 and above income category (Davis 2003, p.7). In Heller’s study of institutional aid and its effects on race and gender, he found that the number of institutional merit aid awards increased for African-American and Hispanic students overall, but that the amounts of these awards were the smallest of all ethnic categories. Similarly, the number of need-based institutional grants to African-American students increased at a greater rate than any other ethnic group, but the amount of these grants increased at the lowest rate of all groups (Heller 2000, p.8).

There are many factors involved in a student’s decision to attend or not attend college. Financial aid is just one of many reasons students may decide that college is attainable. St. John’s “balanced access model” theorizes that both the expectation and actual availability of aid affect student and family decisions about college attendance (St. John 2003, pp.133–155). In short, the perceived lack of financial aid opportunity may help to create a self-fulfilling prophecy that college is not affordable among low-income students, whether or not those students may actually qualify for substantial federal, state, and/or institutional financial aid.

It is important to acknowledge that gains in the enrollment of African-American and Hispanic students have been made in American higher education. Since 1972, when national data became available by race, African Americans have increased their share of the total national enrollment from just 10.7 percent to 14.9 percent in 2001. Similarly, Hispanic share of enrollment has risen from 3.4 percent to 9.5 percent in the same time period. These gains in access were mitigated, however, by stagnation in rates of degree attainment. Longitudinal studies of students who began postsecondary education in 1989 and 1995 reveal that the percentage of students failing to complete any degree in these two ethnic groups has actually fallen (Wirt, Choy, et al. 2004).
The Emerging SEM Agenda

As we reflect on the fifty years since the Brown v. Board of Education decision in 1954, it is important for us to inspect the role of financial aid and the social contract created by its practical applications. In examining the federal, state, and institutional uses of financial aid over the past five decades, we see evidence of a shift in America’s social contract for higher education. Greater use of merit aid at the federal, state, and institutional levels and the increasing proportion of aid available to middle and upper income groups at all levels has widened the original uses of financial aid for low-income and largely minority populations at the beginning of this time period.

The linkage of these issues to strategic enrollment management is direct and critical. Using data to drive our decisions, we match our institution’s mission to enrollment goals. Clarifying the priorities for enrollment (excellence versus access, for example) in an environment of limited resources is a tremendous challenge for enrollment managers. While this paper provides information on national, state, and institutional trends, measurement in individual environments is equally important to informed decision-making.

What evidence can you find at your own institution and in your own state of how financial aid impacts the access and attainment of higher education for those who have least experienced it, historically? Have the goals of integration, equal access, and attainment put forth by the historic Brown decision been met? Where do these goals rank in the priorities and mission of your institution? As enrollment managers, we play an integral role in shaping financial aid policy at all levels, starting at our institutions. While being responsive to our institutions, students, and the public, we also contribute significantly to the terms of America’s social contract with financial aid.
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In the more than 200-year history of the United States, no issue has been more contentious, more emotional, more divisive, and more resistant to resolution than the issue of race. Indeed, this nation fought a Civil War based on the question of whether persons could be held as property. In the more recent past, we have seen continuing evidence that race continues to occupy a place in the center stage of American life, affecting our politics, our economics, our education, and the emotions of our personal and national lives. Whether the issue is fraternity black-face parties, or the continued use of the Confederate flag, it is obvious to even the most casual observer that American society has not evolved to the point where we are, in any real sense, “color-blind.” While there has certainly been progress in this area, in both legal and personal terms, it is the authors’ contention that we are, unfortunately, far from having fully addressed the issues associated with race, much less resolving them.

Beginning with the passage of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments, which respectively eliminated slavery, guaranteed equal protection under the law, and forbade racial discrimination in voting access, the federal government has attempted to take steps designed to address the many legal issues associated with this most intractable of problems. In addition, many other governmental agencies—at state, county, and municipal levels—have acted to address some of the more egregious and obvious inequities of society associated with race. Included in these efforts was the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VI, 1964), which was implemented to eliminate discrimination on the grounds of race, color, or national origin in connection with programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance. Many refer to these efforts as affirmative action. However, as an actual policy, affirmative action originated through President Lyndon Johnson’s 1965 Executive Order 11246, which required that federal contractors “take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin” (as referenced in Sykes, n.d.).

In education, as in other aspects of society, affirmative action was initiated as a policy solution designed to address these aforementioned inequities. Initially seen by many as a potentially effective solution, and with positive emotional resonance in both the majority and minority communities, affirmative action has come to be seen by some as having outlived its mandate, and as having created a sense of entitlement that was never intended in the initiating legislation. To some observers, affirmative action has come to symbolize an unwarranted sense of victimhood that has created continued dependence for those it was originally designed to help. To others, it has become an excuse to explain a lack of achievement by minority persons who have been admitted to the highly-selective institution of their choice. Finally, affirmative action in some eyes has come to cast a shadow over the achievements of minority persons who are seen as having been given an unfair advantage in any of a wide range of competitive circumstances.

Affirmative action in higher education has been emotionally-charged since the U.S. Supreme Court’s decision in the Bakke case (Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 1978). In order to come to a reasonable understanding of the recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions involving affirmative action, both of which involved the University of Michigan as the defendant, it is necessary to understand the historical events and forces that preceded and produced those decisions from the perspective of cases heard by this court. Please bear in mind that it is not the purpose of this outline to provide a full historical record of affirmative action, but simply to recount the U.S. Supreme Court proceedings that are related to this issue in order to place recent events in context. Based on these highlights and the authors’ perceptions of these
events, suggestions for future higher education affirmative action strategies will be analyzed.

**The Past**

**DRED SCOTT**

In *Scott v. Sanford* (1856), the Supreme Court ruled that a slave was not a citizen and could not bring suit for his freedom. As such, Dred Scott, despite living in the free states of Illinois and Wisconsin prior to his return to Missouri, a slave state, was considered mere personal property and not granted his freedom. The ruling also stated that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional and that the federal government had no right to prohibit slavery in the new territories, thus sanctioning slavery under the Constitution. Partially as a result of this decision, the Republican Party, which had been founded in part to oppose slavery, renewed its fight to gain control of Congress and the courts, and won the presidential election of 1860 with Abraham Lincoln as its candidate. The inevitable consequence of these historical events was the Civil War.

This case set a standard for how African Americans were perceived—as less than human—for many years. Despite the acceptance of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments after the Civil War, which provided this population with inalienable rights, future instances of discrimination continued to occur through Jim Crow Laws, which reinstated discriminatory laws throughout the South after Reconstruction and lasted until the 1960s.

**PLESSY V. FERGUSON**

Following the Civil War and the emancipation of the slave population, the southern states initiated Jim Crow Laws, which were intended to maintain segregation of the races and ensure the continued dominance, socially and economically, of Whites. In Louisiana, a case was brought concerning a state statute providing for separate railway cars for “White and colored races.” In 1896, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the individual states had the right to enforce segregation as long as the law did not make facilities for Blacks inferior to those of Whites (*Plessy v. Ferguson*, 1896). Although in the ruling the term “separate but equal” is never used, this case was the foundation upon which school segregation was established.

In a famous dissent from the majority opinion of the court, Justice Harlan wrote:

*If evils will result from the commingling of the two races upon public highways established for the benefit of all, they will be infinitely less than those that will surely come from state legislation regarding the enjoyment of civil rights upon the basis of race. We boast of the freedom enjoyed by our people above all other peoples. But it is difficult to reconcile that boast with a state of the law which, practically, puts the brand of servitude and degradation upon a large class of our fellow citizens, our equals before the law* (1896, p.562).

**BROWN V. TOPEKA BOARD OF EDUCATION**

This is perhaps the most famous of all civil rights cases related to education. Linda Brown, a 3rd grader in Topeka, had to walk approximately one mile to her racially-segregated Black elementary school, although a White school was only a few blocks away. Her father made an attempt to enroll her at the White school but was refused. He then went to the Topeka National Association for the Advancement of Colored Peoples (NAACP) and, with other Black parents, sued the Topeka Board of Education asking for an injunction forbidding the segregation of Topeka’s public schools. The U.S. District Court heard the case in 1951. The NAACP argued that segregated schools sent the message to Black children that they were inferior to Whites and were thus inherently unequal. One witness argued that:

…if the colored children are denied the experience of associating with White children, who represent 90% percent of our national society in which these colored children must live, then the colored child’s curriculum is being greatly curtailed. The Topeka curriculum or any school curriculum cannot be equal under segregation.

While persuaded by the experts that “segregation of White and colored children has a detrimental effect upon the colored children,” the legal precedent of the *Plessy v. Ferguson* case resulted in the court being “compelled” to rule in favor of the Topeka Board of Education.

The case was then appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court and was combined with other cases also challenging school segregation in South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware. In *Brown v. Board of Education* (Brown I, 1954) an unanimous Supreme Court declared:

*We come then to the question presented. Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other ‘tangible’ factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe that it does* (p.493).

*We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of ‘separate but equal’ has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal* (p.495).

The Supreme Court then ordered the desegregation of public schools to proceed with all deliberate speed (Brown II, 1955). That was almost a half-century ago, and the reader is left to judge if this goal has yet been accomplished. Note that this case was not specific to higher education, but was clearly the basis for the dismantling of “separate but equal” systems of higher education in those states in which they existed.

Many in higher education complain of court intrusion but hail the Brown case. “One profound legacy of *Brown v. Board of Education* has been a close, continuing relationship between courtrooms and classroom” (Reed 2001, p. xiii). The continuing lack of educational opportunity despite all of the subsequent litigation caused many to question the ability of courts to achieve social justice. Rosenberg (1991) believes that little
was achieved by the courts until the Civil Rights Act of 1964 put the force of the other branches behind integration. Halpern (1995) questions the impact of Title VI in achieving social justice and points to the limits of framing important social issues in terms of law and rights. A recent study indicates that Brown did exert significant impact on federal district courts no matter where located, with little influence on state courts (Romero and Romero 2003). Despite some doubts, Brown “is surely of great importance” (Kairys 1998, p. 10), a “major moral victory,” a “legitimizing force,” and one of the few Supreme Court decisions to “hold social and cultural relevance for nearly half a century” (Reed 2001, pp. 15, 37).

REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA V. BAKKE

The Bakke (1978) case was, until the University of Michigan cases, generally regarded as the most important case related to the matter of race in higher education. In this case Allan Bakke, a White plaintiff who had been denied admission to medical school at the University of California at Davis, sued in federal court claiming that he had been the victim of “reverse discrimination.” Essentially, Bakke claimed that other applicants whose grades and scores on the Medical College Admissions Test (MCAT)—the equivalent for medical schools to the ACT or SAT utilized in many undergraduate admissions processes—were lower than his, had been admitted solely because they were members of minority groups. It is important to understand that a publicly-financed medical school such as UC-Davis has a societal obligation to train physicians who are likely to deliver health care to all the state’s citizens, and it seems clear that minority physicians are more likely to practice in minority areas and serve minority patients than are non-minorities. Thus, there is an important public policy issue involved in the desire to see that not all physicians look alike. It should also be remembered that there are usually many more applicants for admission to medical school than there are places, so the competition for admission is generally quite intense.

In an effort to ensure minority representation in the entering medical school class, the UC-Davis Medical School organized two admissions programs—a regular program and a special admissions program. The regular admissions program operated in the usual fashion, considering grades, MCAT scores, recommendations, personal interviews, etc. The special admissions program was operated largely by minority persons and allowed applicants to indicate that they wished to be considered as “economically and/or educationally disadvantaged” or as “members of a minority group” (Black, Chicano, Asian, and American Indian). Those who chose to do so were not ranked against the students in the regular admissions process. Alan Bakke had applied and been rejected in 1973 and 1974 and knew that applicants with significantly lower scores than his had been admitted through the special admissions process. He then filed suit in state court asking that UC-Davis be compelled to admit him claiming that both California and federal law prohibited him from being excluded from the special admissions process, particularly under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that provided that no person shall on the grounds of race or color be excluded from any program receiving federal funds.

The trial court found that UC-Davis operated the special admissions program as a quota system because minority candidates were rated only against each other and 16 places in a class of 100 were held for them. In legal parlance, the finding was that there was a violation of the Equal Protection Clause. The case was appealed and eventually went to the U.S. Supreme Court where Allan Bakke’s suit was upheld in 1978 on the basis that a quota system was too intrusive a mechanism to be used even in cases where the intended goal—achieving racial diversity—was generally accepted as desirable. Allan Bakke was admitted to the medical school and graduated in 1992.

What is important about the Bakke case is that it produced three major findings. First, the ruling supported the contention that racial diversity was an appropriate goal for an institution of higher education to pursue. Second, the ruling made clear that a quota system was unacceptable and that seats in a class could not be held for any specific group of applicants. In other words, there could not be what are generally termed “set-asides.” Finally, the ruling also held that an institution could consider race as one of a number of factors in determining which applicants were to be admitted. Thus, race, ethnicity, gender, geography, legacy status, special talents, and other factors were all items that might be considered, as long as each applicant was judged against the entire pool of applicants. These were the tenets upon which almost all American colleges and universities based their affirmative action programs, and that allowed them to consider race as one of many factors in admissions decisions. As a final observation, the reader should be aware of the fact that this type of “competitive” admission process is typically important only in circumstances in which there are more applicants than places in a class. This generally translates into two categories: one is graduate and professional schools such as medical and law schools, and the second is a small number (approximately 100) of highly-selective undergraduate institutions.

The language of the finding is also interesting. Justice Powell, the most-quoted justice in this case, stated:

Racial and ethnic classifications of any sort are inherently suspect and call for the most exacting judicial scrutiny. While the goal of achieving a diverse student body is sufficiently compelling to justify consideration of race in admissions decisions under some circumstances, petitioner’s special admissions program, which forecloses consideration of persons like respondent, is unnecessary to the achievement of this compelling goal, and therefore invalid under the Equal Protection Clause (p. 267).

An interesting perspective about Justice Powell’s phrase “persons like respondent” is provided by Delgado and Stefanie (2001) in their book Critical Race Theory.
When social conditions call for a genuine concession, such as affirmative action, the costs of that concession are always placed on minorities—in the form of stigma—or on working-class whites, like Alan Bakke, who sought admission to the University of California at Davis Medical School… (p.31).

The findings of the Bakke case provided the basis for the affirmative action policies that were followed in American higher education. This standard was unchallenged for almost two decades.

HOPWOOD V. TEXAS
Affirmative action was standard policy in American higher education and was generally unchallenged until a lawsuit was brought in the 5th Federal District Court by a group of students who had been denied admission to law school at the University of Texas, a highly-selective school. In this suit the plaintiffs (Hopwood et. al.), all of whom were White, alleged that the law school’s admissions procedures discriminated against them because the law school unfairly favored less-qualified African-American and Mexican-American applicants. In other words, the plaintiffs’ claim was that affirmative action policy, as defined under the terms of the Bakke case, was inherently unfair. The implications were obviously far-reaching. The District Court found in 1994 that the procedures used by the University of Texas School of Law did not violate the plaintiffs’ rights and that the admissions standards—that is, considering race as part of the admissions process—were perfectly acceptable in lieu of the history of past discriminatory policies at the University of Texas. The plaintiffs then appealed this finding to the Circuit Court which ruled that the University had violated the plaintiffs’ Fourteenth Amendment right of equal protection under the law, as well as Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In the ruling, the court stated that the diversity of a student population is not a compelling state interest and that diversity is not necessarily determined by race. As might be predicted, the defendant (University of Texas Law School) appealed this finding to the U.S. Supreme Court, but the Supreme Court refused to hear the case, effectively leaving in place the finding to the U.S. Supreme Court, but the Supreme Court refused to hear the case, effectively leaving in place the finding of the Circuit Court.

Thus, sixteen years after the Bakke case held that race could be considered in admissions decisions, and that diversity is a compelling interest, the Hopwood case essentially vitiated both those findings. To determine the impact of the Hopwood finding, it must be remembered that the law relies largely upon precedent, and that precedent is applicable across the nation only when there is a ruling from the U.S. Supreme Court, which supersedes all other courts in its jurisdiction. The fact that the Supreme Court refused to hear the appeal in the Hopwood case meant that it was applicable within the 5th District, but not necessarily in other districts. As such, institutions across the country were forced to consider whether they would change their affirmative action policies in light of Hopwood or wait until there was a more definitive case.

In a separate action designed to change long-established affirmative action policy, the Regents of the University of California acted, largely for political reasons, to eliminate affirmative action on all of its campuses. While the action of the UC Regents applied only to those nine schools in the University of California system, it should be remembered that in 1996, California, by means of the voter referendum mechanism, passed a state-wide referendum ending affirmative action in all state agencies (Jung, n.d.). Thus, the action of the University of California became moot since it had been supplanted by the state’s action. Following this, other states such as Washington also made the decision to end affirmative action in state agencies, thus removing race, ethnicity, and gender from being considered in admissions and hiring decisions (Municipal Research and Services Center of Washington 2004). Thus, the U. S. Supreme Court’s decision not to hear the case and the subsequent contests around the country set the stage for future challenges to affirmative action policies.

The Present

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN CASES
In the mid-1990s, affirmative action was no longer a uniformly-applicable policy in American higher education. It was eliminated in states such as Texas, Louisiana, and Mississippi, which were bound by the precedent set in the 5th District by the Hopwood case, and was also eliminated in states that had chosen to eliminate affirmative action on a statewide basis. However, in other states, affirmative action policy continued as it had since Bakke. This was the setting for the two University of Michigan cases that would ultimately reach the U.S. Supreme Court. Gratz v. Bolinger was a case brought by a White student who was denied admission to the undergraduate College of Literature, Science and the Arts, and Grutter v. Bollinger was a case brought by a White student who was denied admission to the law school (2003). Both cases were financed and supported by the Center for Equal Opportunity and in both instances the plaintiffs claimed that they had been denied equal protection under the law as a result of the two schools’ admissions policies. This meant that since both schools used race as a factor in their admissions policies, the plaintiffs could claim that they had been denied equal protection in violation of their civil rights. Again, the complaint was that the plaintiffs had suffered “reverse discrimination.” In the filings, the defendant in both cases was University of Michigan President Lee Bollinger.

Both cases were initially heard in the 6th District Court, but the entire higher education community anticipated that these might be the cases that would finally be heard by the U.S. Supreme Court, thus providing a national legal precedent that would guide the application of affirmative action policy in American higher education. The two cases were
interesting in that the College of Literature, Science and the Arts and the Law School both operated at the same institution, but were quite different with regards to their admissions policies. Also, the University of Michigan, as one of America’s leading public institutions, had both the resources and the will to fight as vigorously as possible in defending its affirmative action stance. It should be noted that there were more “friend of the court” (amicus curiae) briefs filed in this case than any other in the history of the U.S. Supreme Court, the great majority of which were in support of the University of Michigan. For example, the United Auto Workers and General Motors each filed a brief stating that a competitive position in the worldwide automobile industry depended on an educated, diverse workforce. A number of retired military personnel filed a brief stating that without affirmative action the military could eventually be in danger of dividing into a mostly White officer corps and an enlisted corps consisting largely of persons of color, something that would be antithetical to a vision of democracy, as well as difficult from a management perspective. The White House, acting through the Justice Department, filed a brief on behalf of the plaintiffs basically supporting the position that race should be irrelevant. In other words, they were arguing for a “color-blind” society. Public policy that is, in fact, color-blind certainly seems appropriate within the context of a society that is color-blind, and the reader must determine if s/he sees that as a current reality. Thus, if one sees the playing field in education as level for all races, it would follow logically that race and other such considerations are extraneous as applied to college admissions. On the other hand, if one does not see the playing field as level for all races, due to any of a variety of sources of inequity such as financial disparity between the races, it would follow logically that race and other such considerations are not, at least not yet, extraneous.

It was within this context of great emotion, and with this historical background, that the two Michigan cases were initiated. In both cases the first trials were at the level of the District Court, then the Court of Appeals, and then finally to the U.S. Supreme Court. The findings of the Supreme Court in the two cases were different, with the Court holding for the defendant—the University of Michigan—in the law school case while finding for the plaintiff—Gratz—in the undergraduate case.

Most analysts have initially concluded that the findings were a significant victory for affirmative action in that the most basic principles established in the Bakke case were upheld. Indeed, many supporters of affirmative action, while predicting a narrow decision, feared that the Supreme Court might follow Hopwood and hold that the use of race was inappropriate and that diversity was not a compelling interest, thus effectively eliminating affirmative action policy as it had been widely practiced in higher education. The reader must remember that these findings were handed down in the summer of 2003, and their eventual impact remains to be determined.

A number of statements from the Court’s proceedings and findings are relevant to understanding the distinction made between the two outcomes. First was the issue of whether or not diversity would be seen as a desirable educational goal. If the Court held that it was not, it would inexorably follow that an admissions policy designed to achieve diversity was inappropriate and illegal. If the desirability of diversity in the educational setting could be upheld, then the Court would be able to move to the narrower issue of determining if the policies of the two schools were appropriate and tailored narrowly enough to achieve this purpose without violating the Equal Protection Clause. In its remarks, the Law School set out the issue of diversity in the following way:

Seeking to admit a group of students who individually and collectively are among the most capable,…the Law School seeks a mix of students with varying backgrounds and experiences who will respect and learn from each other…the Law School seeks students with diverse interests and backgrounds to enhance classroom discussion and the educational experience both inside and outside the classroom (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003, citing brief of Law School).

These remarks are examples of the arguments used by the University of Michigan, and they carried the day in convincing the majority of the justices that diversity was an educationally-defensible and appropriate goal. Essentially, the Court upheld Justice Powell’s statement in the Bakke case that “…the goal of achieving a diverse student body is sufficiently compelling to justify consideration of race in admissions decisions under some circumstances…” The Court specifically stated that “The Court endorses Justice Powell’s view that student body diversity is a compelling state interest.”

Having addressed this matter, the Court then turned specifically to the means used in the two cases to achieve this goal. As indicated earlier, the policies of the two schools were different. In the case of the Law School, each candidate was considered on an individual basis and could receive some additional points for any of a variety of reasons, including, but not limited to, race. In the case of the College of Literature, Science and the Arts, each minority candidate was automatically given 20 points—a considerable number—given that a total of 100 points was effectively a guarantee of admission. In other words, the Law School’s system was narrowly tailored and individually-applied, while the College of Literature, Science and the Arts used a much broader and categorically-applied system. The Court’s findings were differentiated on this basis as reflected in the following language regarding the Law School case:

In summary, the Equal Protection Clause does not prohibit the Law School’s narrowly tailored use of race in admissions decisions to further a compelling interest in obtaining the educational benefits that flow from a diverse student body. Consequently, petitioner’s statutory claims based on Title VI and 42 U.S.C. §1981 also fail….We find that the Law
School’s admissions program bears the hallmarks of a narrowly tailored plan. As Justice Powell made clear in Bakke, truly individualized consideration demands that race be used in a flexible, nonmechanical way...To be narrowly tailored, a race-conscious admissions program cannot use a quota system—it cannot "insulat[e] each category of applicants with certain desired qualifications from competition with all other applicants (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003).

The language of the Court in the case of the College of Literature, Science and the Arts reflects its view that the system in use was too broad, as demonstrated in the following statement:

We conclude, therefore, that because the University’s use of race in its current freshman admissions policy is not narrowly tailored to achieve respondents’ asserted compelling interest in diversity, the admissions policy violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. We further find that the admissions policy also violates Title VI and 42 U.S.C. § 1981…We find that the University’s policy, which automatically distributes 20 points, or one-fifth of the points needed to guarantee admission, to every single "underrepresented minority" applicant solely because of race, is not narrowly tailored to achieve the interest in educational diversity that respondents claim justifies their program (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003).

The Future

“We expect that 25 years from now, the use of racial preferences will no longer be necessary to further the interest approved today” (Grutter v. Bollinger, 2003). Affirmative action policy in American higher education now appears to have been vindicated within the legal system, leaving institutions free to continue the policies initiated under Bakke, within the context of the constraints of the Gratz decision. The matter appears far from totally settled. States still have the right to eliminate affirmative action within state agencies such as public colleges and universities. This raises issues which conflict with federal laws. Federal laws are supreme and often the state provisions eliminating affirmative action have “federal funds exception” clauses. It is also important to remember that in public education, affirmative action is permitted by federal law and not required by federal law (Jung, n.d.). The Supreme Court noted, with seeming approval, experimentation by states and especially those where state law prohibits racial preferences in admissions (Grutter, 2003). The eventual goal is to achieve diversity without race-conscious policies because the core purpose of the Fourteenth Amendment is to do away with all government-imposed discrimination (Grutter citing Palmore v. Sidoti, 1984).

The higher education community has paid a great deal of attention to the matter of how best to achieve the twin goals of achieving diversity at all levels within higher education and ensuring equal opportunity for all persons. In California, Florida, and Texas, institutions have moved to percentage plans that guarantee admission to the state’s most selective institutions to those who score at a certain percentile within their high school graduating class. In Texas this means admission to any campus, while in California it means admission to the University of California, but not necessarily any campus of the student’s choice. Also, the percentages differ from state to state, with some being far more restrictive. While there has been limited experience with these systems, the data thus far do not appear encouraging. Most critics are concerned that the disparity in preparation between students from affluent school districts and those from poor school districts may result in a situation in which some students who have been admitted to a state’s premier university are unprepared for the academic competition and rigors they will face. The result may well be the "revolving door" that admits students who have relatively little likelihood of graduating.

When one considers this possibility, and the additional fact that such a student might have attended a less selective institution at which s/he might have been more successful academically, the problems associated with this approach become even more discouraging. It seems clear that this problem is not one that has any simple or universally-supported solution. What colleges deal with as they admit students are all of the experiences that twelve years of school have produced within individual applicants, both good and bad. Simply admitting a student with little or no thought for that student’s eventual academic success is a cruel hoax for the student and an inefficient system for the institution. However, organizing a higher education system in which students are largely segregated—with the more affluent, mostly White students from better-financed high schools attending more-selective institutions, while poorer students of color attend less-selective institutions—is not a system likely to produce the diverse work force needed for the future, or maintain even the pretense of equal opportunity and a merit-based system. The United States Commission on Civil Rights (2000) stated that the most positive aspect of the percentage proposals is that the light is now shining on the failure of the states to ensure equal opportunity to learn in poor K–12 schools. What states have not been able to accomplish by race, they have accomplished by finance.

The University of Michigan cases stress the need for individualized admissions assessment. Percentage plans may not meet this standard if applied in a formalistic method. The United States Commission on Civil Rights, Office of Civil Rights Evaluation stressed the need for more holistic admissions standards that allow for consideration of students with unrealized potential (2002, p. xiv). They also called for less use of ACT and SAT scores at a time when many institutions are raising the scores to new heights. Mere percentage plans are not seen as a way to achieve diversity. The commission recommends outreach innovations as in California, school choice as in Texas, and K–12 improvements as in Florida (p. 118).

One of the more provocative issues surrounding affirmative action was presented in a Chronicle of Higher Education...
article, “Class Rules: The Fiction of Egalitarianism in Higher Education,” by Peter Sacks (2003). While Sacks gives initial lip service to the idea that education is the engine of social mobility, he also states that, “For higher education, one’s class background—measured by parents’ education, income levels, and occupational status—is fundamental to one’s chances of even considering college.” He states unequivocally, “At America’s selective institutions, class rules.” Of course, class is something we as Americans choose generally to ignore, but Sack’s concerns seem worthy of consideration. Consider the following quote:

“Our system of higher education, nominally egalitarian, its riches purportedly available to all with sufficient motivation and talent, is in danger of becoming an economically and socially segregated system. The main fault lines of that system divide those at intellectually elite academic centers, who are part and parcel of the fabric of American leadership establishment, from those on the other side of the divide trained at public institutions to serve the interests of a leadership class. Which side of this growing divide a young person inhabits can mean he or she is exposed to quite disparate notions about what it means to be ‘educated,’ and how knowledge is defined, and whose knowledge even matters (Sacks 2003).

Among the many concerns that have been expressed by opponents of affirmative action, one of the most telling is that the benefits that have been gained by minorities have been largely to the advantage of middle- and upper-class students of color, as opposed to those of lower socioeconomic status. If this is true, it lends credence to Sack’s basic premise. The dichotomy of class and race may itself be problematic. Consider the words of a student interviewed by Jonathan Kozol (1991) when he asked whether it was race or money that caused the student not to be able to attend the school of her choice: “The two things, race and money, go so close together—what’s the difference?…They don’t want me in their school.” Another concern that has been expressed is that most of the gains that have resulted from affirmative action programs have gone not to ethnic and racial minorities, but to women. Women have outnumbered men in graduate schools since 1984 and represent 36 percent of all college attendees (National Center for Education Statistics, n.d.). Women enroll at a higher percentage than any other group directly from high school. Since 1972, Hispanic immediate college attendance rates from have increased from 45 percent to 52 percent, and Blacks’ immediate college attendance has increased from 45 percent to 55 percent. These figures are lower than both male and female rates for the White population (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002, Enrollment). In addition, the percentage of degrees conferred upon persons of color is lower than one should expect representationally (NCES, n.d., Degrees Conferred). Again, this raises more questions than it answers, but it addresses the question of what affirmative action programs were originally designed to achieve, and whether they have been successful. Of course, how to provide quantitative information related to such questions is inherently difficult. However, a somewhat different perspective is provided by Robert Shireman of the Aspen Institute’s Program on Education in a Changing Society in a recent issue of The Chronicle of Higher Education (2003).

Shireman believes that diversity is not an easy concept to describe or to measure. However, he poses ten questions that he believes colleges should consider as a means of addressing this matter. These guidelines, in addition to our thoughts, are as follows:

- **How do we define diversity?** This question encourages a broad definition that makes sense for a particular institution, and suggests using both race and class indicators such as family income and educational background of parents in considering the issue of diversity.

- **Why do we have this particular array of students?** Each individual institution needs to look at its outreach policies and the level of success it has had in attracting the students who have been targeted.

- **Who gets financial aid?** If an institution is buying good students to improve its academic reputation, it is poor practice. Shireman compares this to paying ringers to play on a Little League team. It’s purchasing greatness instead of coaching to greatness. Financial aid should be used to improve educational quality and access.

- **How successful are our students?** Students in leadership positions should be reflective of the diversity of the campus. In addition, students seeking support from campus services, particularly academic support services, should reflect those who need support, not only those who feel comfortable on the campus.

- **What multicultural education are students receiving?** This should not be measured in numbers of courses but should be focused on the diversity-related content and developmental advances considered important on the campus, and how these are measured. Different students may require different approaches.

- **What does it feel like to be a student here?** A student expressed this with the question, “When will this be my campus, instead of someone else’s campus that is trying to be a welcoming place for me?” The most critical aspect of this takes place in the classroom, not during special events highlighting diversity.

- **Who are our faculty leaders?** The obvious importance of faculty role models for students cannot be overstated or otherwise substituted.

- **What are our relationships with nearby communities?** This is an issue that has to be expressed not only in numbers of hours students and faculty members spend in the community, but how the community views the institution. Does the community feel an equal partner, or a subordinate?

- **Who is thinking about these issues on our campus?** Achieving diversity in a meaningful way cannot be the
sole province of an individual office or a special person; it has to be woven into the fabric of the institution.

Do what we want to change, and how will we know that we have changed? The emphasis needs to be on the assessment of student needs, monitoring of progress, and adjusting strategies when that is indicated.

Conclusion
The struggle for equality in society, and more specifically higher education, has been a long, hard-fought battle. Strides have been made to assure that “affirmative practices and policies” are in place to ensure that this equality exists in society, but as a policy, “affirmative action” has been attacked almost from its inception due to various societal interpretations of the policy. In this turbulent progression of history, the United States Supreme Court has been instrumental in establishing the direction that the country advances in providing equity in access for all citizens. Despite the efforts of this level of the judiciary, there still remain many questions about what the country’s perspective is on this topic. This paper attempted to provide a historical sense of where the country and higher education have been in terms of affirmative action, specifically as it has been defined by the Supreme Court. Additionally, it attempted to provide a perspective of what higher education should consider in addressing affirmative action based upon these historical decisions. Whether the reader agrees that these are the most critical questions to be addressed, what seems clear is that now that affirmative action remains possible within higher education, it is important to think carefully about what it means, what it is intended to achieve, and how to measure progress. In addition, it also seems reasonable that there is not a “one size fits all” response that will work for all institutions. After all, if at least a meaningful percentage of the strength of American higher education is a result of its great diversity, it is incumbent upon us to respect and preserve that diversity as we attempt to deal with the continuing need to provide equal opportunity.
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The use of the World Wide Web has been well documented in higher education. As prior research indicates, the Web has a variety of uses including admission (Poock 1999), registration (Wang 2002), and the college selection process (Pope and Fermin 2003). Perhaps the greatest impact of the Web has been seen in the college search and selection process, as most students use this technology to make their decisions (Christiansen et al. 2003).

While much of this research focuses on undergraduate students (e.g., Pope and Fermin 2003), there is growing attention on graduate students. For example, Hans (2001) assessed graduate student recruitment by examining Web sites at numerous academic departments. The author found that Web pages varied greatly in their effectiveness. Hoeflich (2002), in studying the program choice of graduate students, found the Web to be instrumental in that process while brochures and related publications were relatively unimportant. Additionally, Poock and Lefond (2003) examined the characteristics of effective graduate school Web sites. The authors identified a variety of variables that impact the recruitment of graduate students.

This current study is a related follow-up to the study conducted by Poock and Lefond, with the focus on graduate school Web appearance, information desired by prospective students, and—the inclusion of the needs of currently enrolled students.

Methodology
The investigation began over a two-day period during the Fall of 2003 at a major research university in the Southeast. Twenty-five newly-enrolled graduate students were divided into three focus groups. Of the participants, fourteen were doctoral students and eleven were in master’s programs. There were eighteen female students and seven males, and the racial composition included sixteen Whites, six Asian/Pacific Islanders, two African Americans, and one undisclosed. The participants received a complimentary snack in exchange for their time.

Respondents were asked to complete four tasks:
- Listing what they expected to find on graduate schools Web sites when they were applying to their programs.
- Identifying all the information they would like to see on a graduate school Web site as a matriculated student.
- Evaluating what they found useful on the Web sites of two major research universities through a focus group format recommended by Krueger (1994).
- Locating specific information including the graduate schools’ tuition and fees, the registrar’s calendar, graduate student housing, and the office hours for counseling and psychological services.

These searches began on the graduate school home page and the respondents’ retrieval times were recorded.

Results
What Students Expected to Find on Graduate Schools’ Web Sites When Applying
As Table 1 indicates, when the participants reflected on their experiences selecting graduate schools, most looked for admissions information, faculty research interests, financial aid, program information, and departmental contacts. They were not interested in the institution’s location, housing information, or the university’s mission. Several wanted to know the amount of time it took to graduate and the graduate school’s placement rate. Only three of the twenty-five viewed the ranking and/or reputation of the graduate school or the program as important.
THE INFORMATION MATRICULATED STUDENTS WOULD LIKE TO SEE ON A GRADUATE SCHOOL WEB SITE

The researchers then examined what the participants sought once they moved from prospective to matriculated status. As Table 2 indicates, participants wanted to find important deadlines and forms (e.g., application for graduation), and they were not as interested in non-academic issues such as student organizations and student services.

FOCUS GROUP RESULTS

During guided discussions, participants expressed a preference for Web pages with a simple, clean appearance, no required scrolling, limited text in an easy-to-read font, and just the information they needed without pictures, graphics, or anything unrelated to their search. They also preferred the use of rollovers so that they could know the content of links without clicking on them.

In their judgment, links for prospective students should go to program and degree information, the application process, financial aid/assistantships, and departmental faculty and staff contacts. Current student links should go to registration dates, the online registration system, the course offerings for the term, required forms (leave of absence, application for graduation, etc.), and a list of their student services.

Current students did not want to see what they perceived as irrelevant, such as prospective student financial aid information. Most found that financial aid Web sites were generally structured as one page for both prospective and current students. Given its complexity, they preferred just seeing their own financial aid information and forms.

Most notably, the focus groups identified an information gap for students who have been admitted but not yet enrolled. As new admits, the respondents felt that they did not fit into either the prospective or current student categories. They suggested links for new students that included information about parking, opening an e-mail account, obtaining an ID card, etc. All agreed that a new student link was missing from most of the graduate school Web sites they explored during the application process, and it would have been most helpful once they decided to attend a particular institution.

LOCATING SPECIFIC INFORMATION

Participants were asked to locate information on two research universities’ Web sites; their response times were noted. Of the information, tuition and fees were clearly the easiest to locate. Participants found them in an average of eight seconds; however, that link was clearly located on the graduate school homepage.

When searching for the registrar’s calendar, the respondents averaged one minute and forty-seven seconds. Since it often lists critical deadlines, students would be expected to find that calendar within a reasonable time period.

Graduate housing and counseling and psychological services were much more difficult to locate. One student accessed the housing link in just over one minute, but the rest could not find it after three minutes, when the exercise was stopped. Two respondents found counseling and psychological services in less than three minutes, but the others could not find them within the allotted time.

Although these tasks were chosen arbitrarily, two problems clearly emerged from the exercise. First, information relevant to graduate students was not easy to locate. Second,
most of the respondents (except for those seeking tuition and fees) would have stopped searching after three or four clicks. They expected to find what they needed easily and faulted the Web designers for making the Web site difficult to navigate. Several students expressed frustration with pages that had graphics and/or pictures that impeded their search.

Discussion
The content of this study closely parallels that of Poock and Lefond (2003). Information sought by prospective students, in both studies, tend to be (in descending order of frequency) application criteria, deadlines, and procedures; faculty research interests; financial aid information; description of programs; and access to the application. Somewhat surprisingly, in both studies prospective students did not generally seek graduate school/program rankings and reputation. While program reputation is a likely point of interest for prospective students, graduate school reputation may not be. As such, the reputation of the graduate school and the program should have been delineated, which may have resulted in different findings.

In the presentation of the graduate school Web sites, respondents in both studies indicated a preference for succinct information with little emphasis on graphics or pictures. They value the use of rollovers, and a simple, clean appearance. Respondents in this current study liked Web pages that were, in the words of Poock and Lefond, “visually intuitive.” Prospective students clearly seek information and desire it quickly; elements on a Web page that are not directly related to such information are simply a distraction.

The time it took respondents to locate information is also similar to the findings of Poock and Lefond. In the timed task, obtaining information ranged from immediate to over three minutes. And, again, consistent with Poock and Lefond, students who could not locate information within three minutes—or three or four clicks—were likely to abandon their search. The importance of this finding is quite significant. It is not enough for graduate school Web pages to contain the information that prospective students seek; such information must be readily available and easy to find. Web sites that contain desired information, but placed in a difficult location to find, appear to be as ineffective as Web sites that do not contain that information.

Unlike Poock and Lefond, this study found that the graduate school constituency should include new as well as prospective and current students. Those respondents, who had accepted an admission offer and were waiting to enroll, did not know where to go since they were neither prospective nor current students. A new student link with relevant topics was recommended for graduate student Web sites.
Poock and Lefond also did not address the Web needs of currently enrolled students, who according to this study, only wanted to see important dates and deadlines and the forms they needed for their academic program (such as leave of absence, application for graduation). Relatively few wanted graduate school contact information, student services, and social events. The least sought after was institutional review board information and procedures related to research involving human subjects. Since many graduate students will likely work with human subjects, and given the penalties involved for violating human subject protocols, one would expect a greater emphasis on this topic. However, respondents may not have been interested because they were just starting their programs. More experienced graduate students could have different views.

**Limitations of this Study**

As with all studies, there are limitations here that must be acknowledged. First, this study utilized focus groups with relatively few students. Additionally, these students were self-selected, providing their time and efforts in exchange for food. Second, only two graduate school Web sites were explored in this study. Time constraints limited the exploration to just two sites, but clearly the use of a greater number of sites would provide more generalizable results. Finally, the timed tasks in this study were randomly selected by the author. It is possible that other information may be more readily obtainable and that the items contained herein do not represent a valid conclusion to the importance of timed tasks.

**Conclusion**

This study confirms the original findings of Poock and Lefond and extends their application to new and current students. Further, it recommends that administrators and faculty involved in enrollment management issues track what all graduate students—prospective, new, and current—want and provide them with relevant information on easy-to-find and easy-to-read Web pages.
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Interview with Dick Whiteside
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After thirty years in the business of higher education, Dick Whiteside talks about his past, the experiences that help shaped his career, and the urgent need for leaders who will adopt and not adapt to the changing faces of higher education.

Kathy Winarski

Do the Right Things and Do Them Right!

On a sunny November afternoon during the 2004 Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) Conference in Orlando, I talked to Dick Whiteside about his life, career, and the future of SEM. After a few minutes with him, I discovered a man who is down to earth, full of energy, with a gritty sense of humor and a personal as well as a professional commitment to the institution and people he serves.

Part One: Roots in the Northeast

Where did you grow up?
I was born and raised and did my high school work in Pawtucket, Rhode Island, just outside of Providence. I left Rhode Island to go off to college and never really went back.

What did you like to do when you were a kid?
My favorite pastimes were baseball and building models of any kind. Any kind of miniature was something I was really interested in.

Boats?
I built boats, planes, trains. Anything that came in a kit was my passion as a young kid. That and chemistry. I once made a bomb that blew up my family’s kitchen. They were not too happy.

Sports?
I played ice hockey, football—team sports. I never mastered any of the social sports like golf or tennis. As a young man, growing up in Rhode Island, competitive team sports seemed to dominate life. So I played those. I played hockey through college. I took off the skates maybe two years after that, and I don’t think I’ve really played since. It was one of these sports that was very inconvenient to play as an adult. You always had ice times at two or three o’clock in the morning. When I got married, it was not a popular idea to leave home at two o’clock in the morning to go play hockey!

I was also a musician. I started as a first grader in Catholic elementary school taking clarinet lessons. I played all the way through college. As a college student, I had a scholarship, half of which was valued for playing ice hockey and the other half for playing in the symphony orchestra. It was a strange combination.

So you like sports, music, and putting things together?
I do. I think there’s a certain kind of relaxation involved in doing things with one’s hands, rather than thinking through things. As professionals, we deal with so many situations beyond our control. We can try to plan for them, anticipate them, but ultimately, things occur that are beyond our control. So, it’s nice to have some miniature world, some small piece of reality that I can control. I continue to do things like household projects, and I’m still a train buff. Exclusively trains now.

Do you keep them?
Are they in your house annoying your wife?
She’s willing to live with them. We have, since the children moved out, a relatively big house, so I have a train room. It keeps them all in one area and out of everyone’s way.

Different periods?
The steam period from the early 1900s to the late 1950s is the one I like the best.

Are you a history buff?
Not really. I do enjoy it, but I wouldn’t classify myself as a history buff. I read a lot of military history. Stories that have
to do with World War II or the Civil War are of particular interest to me.

**Do you think there’s a reason for that?**
No, I don't think so. Growing up in a home without a single book, I got a library card for the Pawtucket Library, which had virtually nothing in the children's collection. Against library policy, I found my way into the adult section. “Adult” sounds wrong. The “non-children's” section. One of the first books I stumbled across was called *Thirty Seconds over Tokyo*. It had to do with the Doolittle raid in the Second World War. That was the first book I can ever remember reading.

**How old were you?**
Oh…twelve maybe. (It was fascinating to me that people wrote about being in foreign countries.) I grew up in a very parochial kind of existence, and this was an eye-opener.

**Did you have any role models as a boy?**
I think probably professional athletes, the typical role models who everybody emulated. When I was younger—a Boy Scout—the man who was my scout master for a number of years was a particularly influential person in my life.

**What about him?**
He really placed a premium on learning. Boy Scouts progress through ranks. When you get to a certain level, you start working on merit badges. They all look like individual courses with, for example, a focus on government or a focus on swimming. He created situations, so you could pursue something. As a kid, wanting to learn about government, you didn't know where to go. He would bring in people to work with us, was very good at structuring learning opportunities, and very challenging! He pushed us. He never let us stop, which was good. At that point in my life, I would have stopped really easily.

I think he realized that we were a high risk population. As young kids, we grew up in a neighborhood that was not all that affluent. We had lots of choices, most of them bad. The idea that he could funnel young interests into things that were productive was what probably motivated him and why I remember him. He was a giving kind of guy. He would always spend a lot of time with us.

**He sounds like a great guy!**
He's still a great guy! He's probably 75 now, but I run into him when I go back to visit my family in Rhode Island. Plus his wife was my dance instructor in high school.

**You took dance in high school? What kind?**
Ballroom dancing. I remember, as a high school freshman, I got invited to a dance one time by a young lady. I was such a klutz. I decided that I would never be that embarrassed again. I took a couple years of ballroom dancing. I never got very good at it, but good enough not to embarrass myself.

**Did you have a mentor as you got older?**
The first person who mentored me professionally was the registrar at Johns Hopkins, a fellow named Bob Cyphers. He has since retired. Actually, he was at one time president of AACRAO. Bob took me under his wing when I was associate registrar there, and he created the monster that I am today. He came to me one day and said that we were going to have a meeting on campus of the Maryland registrars, and he wanted me to talk a little bit about the information system that we were using at the time.

I said that I didn't want to do that. He asked me why not? I mentioned that I was not comfortable speaking in public. He looked at me and said, “Here's the deal. From now on, you will do two public speaking engagements a year or else you won't get your salary increase.”

So, Bob sent me down this road. I've done hundreds in the last 30 years, and I still dislike speaking in public. I am very nervous before I do it. I can remember the same feeling as a musical performer. Up until the first note, I was an absolute wreck. As soon as the playing began, I became more at ease. But the anticipation, that kind of pre-performance anxiety has never left me. After Hopkins, I continued to do a few every year, and recently, many more than that.

Whatever presentation style I possess at this point was probably evolutionary. When I first started, I was unsure. Over the years I developed some of those things that I saw resonated well with audiences. Whenever I hear a question that's more of a statement than a question, I always have to keep myself from responding as if it were a challenge. There was a time in my career when I would have gotten defensive, or sidetracked, or off pace, but I've come to understand there is no right or wrong in so many of these things. There are matters of style and matters of passion, and I ought to take seriously someone's passion. While we might not see the situation the same, they are, nonetheless, as passionate about their position as I am about mine. Since there are no rights or wrongs, only things which work in one environment and not in another, it's better to let the opinions flow.

**Did you ever seek out some person or literature about leadership?**
The works of Warren Bennis were always important to me. In graduate school—I started grad school long after I finished my undergrad program—I ran across a faculty member named Donald Kline. His particular area of expertise was community change. Don came out of the hippie movement in the ‘60s, and I encountered him in the late ‘70s. He was very distinctive among the faculty members on campus.

Don was instrumental in getting me to read a lot of the literature on change and the approaches to change. I learned a tremendous amount from him about how to change others to behave the way you want them to and how to change yourself to behave the way you would like to behave. He gave me the opportunity to look at the qualities and different styles of leadership.
I still run my life on the model of situational leadership, which means you need to exhibit the appropriate level of concern for task and for people. What the appropriate level is will vary by the maturity level of the group. As a leader/manager, one of your primary responsibilities is to make an assessment of how much the staff need, and to give only as much direction as they need to feel led and appreciated.

Do you think the world of the young men and women who attend our colleges and universities today is very different from ours?

They have the same aspirations. We went to school because, however we defined it, we believed that our lives would be better by going to college. That aspect of it has stayed the same, but now there’s more of an expectation that you will go to college. When I went, it was considered unusual, particularly in my own immediate surroundings—very unusual—for a kid to go to college.

Our students know much more about the college choice process. They don’t stand in awe of faculty members anymore and are more willing to challenge them. Their expectations for institutional performance are much higher. So there are a lot of differences. Not to mention the content differences! They are much more sophisticated in technologies than we were. I was a psych major as an undergraduate. We would do statistics on old manual calculators. Pull the crank and the carriage would move back and forth. If you divided something by zero, that thing would run all day!

Do you think students today, sophisticated, in control, willing to challenge, are searching for something? How would that search connect them to us?

I went to college in the ’60s. We were on the cusp, the free love, antiwar generation. We were looking for some meaning. All groups of college-bound students are looking for their own sense of meaning, their own sense of identity, and the answer to that never-ending question: What’s it all about?

I think they realize that their parents are sophisticated people who enjoy a lifestyle that they now aspire to. I don’t know why, but I think some of the young people I encounter today really doubt that their lifestyle and their life position will be better than their parents’. When I grew up, there was no question in my mind that I would wind up in a better position financially and with more resources than my parents. Kids are not sure about that anymore. There’s some suspicion that we might have woken up from the American Dream and that’s regrettable. When you lose the dream, you lose possibilities. We can reinvigorate it. I think that’s the parent’s job in this mix. If some parent asks me, “What should I be doing?” I would answer, “Keep the dream alive! Make sure
your children understand they will end up in a better place than you, even if you are in a really good place.”

How did you choose where you went to school?
While I was still in a Christian Brothers’ high school, my older brother enrolled in Manhattan College, a Christian Brothers’ college, in New York City. He had things to do and was not very attentive to me. But I did have the key to his dorm room. I explored the city and spent some time wandering around on campus. Up to that point, I never thought about myself as a college student. I was too engaged in other things—athletics, fitting in. I was in a group that didn’t think about college, that’s where I thought I fit. But the idea of New York City was so exciting to a kid from Rhode Island. This gigantic place with all these cultural opportunities. Hundreds of things were going on. I decided right then and there that I was going to Manhattan College. I really liked living in New York and fell right into the life and rhythm of the city.

Where did you get advice about your education and career?
Totally by chance. Nobody I knew growing up said, “I’m going to be an enrollment manager.” Fireman, policeman, things like that. I got involved in higher education quite accidentally. In 1969 I was getting ready to graduate from college. The Vietnam Conflict was at its highest, and they were drafting men right out of college. I was looking around for something to do with my life. The young woman I was dating at the time had an older sister who was an admission counselor at Pace College in New York. She was leaving her job because she had just gotten married, and they were moving out of New York. We were at her home for dinner one night, and she asked me, “Have you ever thought about working in college admissions?” I said I really had no interest in it. She added, “I think it’s draft deferred.” My ears perked right up, and I went in for an interview. I took the job thinking I would stay for a year or two. That was 1969 and here it is 2004, and I’m still in higher education. Quite an accident!

I went to work for a college and thought that this is a good deal. But what started as a job became a career and something I saw had intrinsic value. I realized that I had the potential to make a difference for others the way my own college experience made for me. There’s a lot of gratification in that. At every point in my career when I had the opportunity to choose something else, I could find nothing that gave me that same sense of satisfaction. Opportunities for more money or higher profile positions, nothing appeared to have that same sense of importance.

What have you taught your children about getting around in the world of higher education?
I taught them what most deans of admission teach their children—virtually nothing! I have two daughters, 29 and 25. They both graduated from college. Both of them rejected any attempt on my or my wife’s part to work with them effectively on college choice. In fact, one of them said to us when we asked about her college preferences, “I want to go some place where no one has heard of you or Mom.” (Kathy Whiteside is the assistant vice president for academic affairs at Tulane University.)

Are there choices in those early years of growing up, attending college, and starting a career that you would change?
I would have been more serious about my college studies. I was not a good student in high school, and I was barely acceptable in college. Classes were an intrusion on my day. Fortunately, I was assigned to roommates who were brilliant students and kept me on course. I just never caught onto the joy of learning until I was in graduate school.

Part Two: Career Development

Given your interest in finances and facility with numbers and research, why did you choose a career in higher education and not in business or research?
Business and research were not strengths that I thought of myself as having until the last fifteen years or so. Before that I considered myself a “people person” and not particularly data or research oriented. Because of my responsibilities at the University of Hartford, I began to think about collecting data. Interestingly enough, I learned the value of research and information through SEM.

I had a wide portfolio of experiences in higher education by the time the first SEM meeting took place. I knew a little bit about program development, a lot about faculty issues, something about libraries and information systems, but I wondered if I had any mastery or was just a dabbler. I went to the first SEM meeting in Atlanta (1990) to find out what it was about. When Michael Dolence and the others talked about strategic enrollment management, I thought, this is it! This is the mastery that I had developed. I was a set of experiences in search of a profession. I knew for the rest of my career, I would be affiliated with a college or university, whether they called the position enrollment management or something else.

For awhile, particularly at new institutions, I had to understand the environment and use those research skills I hadn’t deployed in a number of years. When I was doing my doctoral studies, I started to understand how important research could be in avoiding mistakes.

Who and what influenced your vision of what higher education should be?
Most of the people who shaped my view of education tended to be those who were committed to certain ideals and were willing to sacrifice for them. As a result, they probably never rose to any position of great notoriety, for example, a provost at the University of Hartford who worked tirelessly to ensure student access. I thought that was terrific. I had an experience working with the dean of the Fine Arts division at Hartford
who really believed that there was a beauty to learning. Some of it was visual, some auditory, and some textual, and we needed to engage all of it.

In enrollment management, I have been most influenced by the same people who continue to come to these meetings—Michael Dolence, David Kalsbeek, Don Hossler. I really like Vincent Tinto’s work. It helps me put things into a conceptual framework that makes sense to me and is easy to explain to my colleagues. Jim Black, a man much younger than me—I’ve learned a tremendous amount from him. They are a group of people who are concerned about the issues and are willing to share their thoughts. From each I picked up certain perceptions or perspectives on problems.

What makes you unique among this group of people?
If you look at that group, they vary. They are either an academician or a practitioner. I think of myself much more as a practitioner. My whole publications and research record only started three or four years ago. Before that, I presented on what we were doing, but I didn’t do a whole lot of writing. I think the differences reflect the environments we grew up in. Don and Jim come from the public perspective. David Kalsbeek and I show a lot of similarities in the way we look at problems from the private sector. We are all tied together by this one commonality called enrollment management. We enjoy each other’s company. We have a lot to talk about.

You have held some very influential positions in well-known institutions including the University of Hartford, the Johns Hopkins University, City University of New York, Pace University and your current position at Tulane University. You have been an assistant and associate vice president for academic administration, vice president for enrollment, dean of enrollment management, university registrar, and director of computer services. Has success come easy?
I don’t think it has. I think I work pretty hard at what I do much to the chagrin of my family. There are times when I put in an extraordinary numbers of hours, yet I find that really gratifying. I wish the day had been created with thirty-six hours rather than twenty-four, and I could have spent the other twelve with my family. I had opportunities to work in areas that I knew very little about, so that created high risk for me and often brought me into conflict with existing perspectives on issues. It required hard work and some tolerance not to be flustered because I was being identified as different.

How do you deal with being the university’s “go to guy”? I love being the “go to guy.” There’s a certain attraction to me in being involved or at least consulted in the university’s most critical decisions. Being the “go to guy” means my opinion is sought frequently which increases the probability that occasionally someone might actually listen to it.

I used to feel very stressed. I was really a bundle of nerves. When it was deposit time, I would count them four or five times a day. That was annoying to the people I worked with and ultimately self-destructive. Maybe it’s age or maybe I really thought about things. My belief now is that I work as hard as I possibly know how, use every technique I can possibly think of, and execute every one of our programs and activities as well as I can. Then when things begin to happen, there’s no way I can change them. There’s nothing more I could do. I took all of the nervous energy that I used to focus on the last month and put it into upfront planning and execution.

I’m absolutely convinced that some year—we haven’t had one yet—we are going come up short of our goals. I know I’m going to be able to go to the president and say, “Sir, it didn’t come out the way we wanted, but we did everything we could possibly do. We are now going to figure out what went wrong and correct it. We did not choose to be inattentive to our duties or not creative in our approach, but something happened we couldn’t control.”

I also no longer feel singularly responsible for what happens. I work with a group of talented people, mostly young, and I found over the years that the more responsibilities they assume the better I do my job.

What advice would you give young men and women who seek to influence the direction of their colleges and universities?
Be attentive to the institution’s aspirations and desires. Always understand what the institution means by its mission. Decide if you can support that mission unabashedly, and if you do, then structure every one of your activities to realize its vision. If you can’t support it, seek some opportunity to change it. If the institution is unwilling to listen, find another place. I think one of the most frustrating things for people is working in situations in which they don’t believe in the objectives. You’ve got to believe.

Once they find a place where they can subscribe to the vision, take some risks. Learn from others’ mistakes. Be humble. Listen to others. Be sensitive. Be sensible: there’s only so much an institution can do at one time. Reconcile with yourself that you will never be rich, but you can be comfortable. But never rich. Don’t envy others. Celebrate. Celebrate the minor successes and the major victories. Never mourn. There’s very little that we do which turns out the way it does because we chose to have it happen that way.

Institutions don’t take enough time to celebrate. Look at the great traditions of higher education. Commencement, convocation are celebrations of things well done. We need to celebrate the day-to-day. It was one day in July, and I said to myself, “What are we doing here?” I bought three or four gallons of ice cream to make ice cream sundaes. People in the office were shocked. They asked me what the event was. I said that there was no event, that I just wanted ice cream. They thought I was after something. There’s a lot of pressure in institutions. Most student services areas are overworked and understaffed. We would like to do better, but we find ourselves spread way too thin. We should relax a little!
Should the colleges and universities reach out to children whose parents did not, could not, or would not save for their college education? Can they ever dream of “membership in the community of learners”?

I'm a firm believer that we can't hold the children guilty for the sins of their parents. We are going to have some parents who are not attentive to what they should be doing to prepare for their sons' and daughters' education. It would be inappropriate not to address the needs of this group. I think we should begin the process of educating parents as to their responsibilities much earlier. By the time their children reach high school, it is way too late.

Educational financing has reached a critical point. We have to decide as a nation: Do we want higher education to be universal? Do we want it to be funded primarily from public funds or do we want it available only to a smaller segment of society and paid for out of private resources? There's only one decision. It's going to become more and more pervasive and more and more universal. If we decide that it's only for a smaller portion of society and privately funded, we will have said as a nation that it's okay for certain groups, persons of color or heritage, to live in poverty. I don't think Americans are willing to tolerate that outcome.

Part Three: The Future of SEM

What do you think about this quote from the front cover of the SEM XIV brochure: “Enabling Student and Institutional Success: It Takes a Team”? How would you assemble a SEM team? What qualities would you look for in your team members?

I need the right people or the right access to those people, so I can use their skills and talents. Whether or not they are administratively aligned is irrelevant. When I put something together, I want people with credibility on the academic side of the house who are willing to bring along their faculty colleagues. I also need people with some content knowledge about the best ways to outreach and communicate with students. In other words, teams with very different roles: influence players and content experts.

How would you inspire and motivate them?

You motivate teams by showing them that their work is important and respecting what they do. Most people who work in higher education are not scraping together money for their next meal, so they want to find something that's meaningful and important, and allows them an opportunity to test their skills. Give them meaningful work and let them be responsible for it.

My philosophy is that if no mistake you make could adversely affect the institution, you are of little value to them. If the mistakes you make could really hurt me, than you are of great value to me and to the institution. If people have that level of responsibility, they rarely will ever disappoint you. They will always want to do the right thing.
When we hire people, we tell them if they stay three years as a counselor, they will have rotated through every major function in the college admission office, including designing the recruitment program, handling publications, direct marketing, digital editing for video, one-on-one counseling, and academic outreach. We move them annually through those assignments. By the end of three years, they will have had a wide enough exposure to decide whether they want to stay or not. It serves to motivate them and keep them fresh. I think they like that.

My biggest kick would be if I were continually training people who were found to be in demand by other institutions. I would consider my program in personal development as pretty successful.

**How would you describe effective leaders?**

My benchmark for effective leaders is that they achieve the defined organizational outcomes and that the people they work with feel happy about the outcomes. If those two conditions exit, I think the person who is in the responsible position could be judged as a good leader. If either of those two conditions does not exit, then the leader is somewhat deficient.

**How do you view the power a leader possesses?**

In higher education the degree of legitimate authority you have is influence based rather than in formalized structures. Since we all work in universities, which are knowledge factories, the power we have is almost limitless.

What we all trade on is the ability to influence others. That’s power!

**How would you describe your leadership style?**

How I would define my own style depends upon the situation. When I take over or have been dispatched to solve a problem, I assess the maturity level of the people already in charge of solving that problem. By maturity, I mean the ability and willingness to do the job. If they are immature, all focus, then, is on the commitment to solving the problem. I become more task-oriented. I try to bring them through a cycle. They start off as being immature in terms of the task at hand, that is, they don’t have the background or experiences to solve the problem. I get them working to develop those experiences and then I become less task-oriented. I back off and let them assume more and more responsibility until we both become comfortable with the outcomes. They, then, seek me for assistance or advice only when they believe they need to.

I am also in charge of groups that are totally mature. When I got to Tulane, the Registrar’s Office was doing just fine. I do very little with them. We meet once a week as a tradition, but we sit around and do more jawboning than anything else. The Admissions Office was in trouble and required a lot of direction. If you asked people in the Registrar’s Office what kind of leader is Dick? They would say he’s very laissez-faire. At the same time, in Admission, they would say he’s really hands-on. It’s just a difference of what’s needed.

**Do you see yourself as mentoring, teaching, and coaching?**

That’s what it would look like from the perspective of somebody who works for me but that’s just a piece of it. I have got to use wisely the investments the university has made in me and my staff. The more we can get everyone performing at a peak level, the more work we can do to make the place better. I consider it responsible stewardship to get people to be self-sufficient and significant contributors.

**How would you describe your critics? Your admirers?**

I think, right now in my career, my critics and admirers are probably one and the same. Those who admire me have looked at the outcomes and said these are good things. We’ve been advantaged by having Dick work with us. The critics, I think, are the same people who say he tends to work very quickly, to have a decided opinion on things, and doesn’t consult enough.

I am intolerant of silliness and politics. When politics becomes an impediment against doing the right thing for the student, I have no tolerance for it. I’ll come down on the side of the student. If politics becomes defined as the competition for scarce resources, I can become an extraordinarily political animal. I think I can play it with the best of them. There are people who are somewhat envious of the resources we have been able to muster to do the job at Tulane. They would prefer to have those resources for themselves but would acknowledge that we have gone from being an average to a much better than average institution. We’ve gotten back on the right agenda, qualitatively and financially.

If you went down to Tulane you would find that people have a strong reaction to me. They either love me or hate me.

**A lot has been written about the science of SEM. Is there such a thing as the art of SEM?**

Absolutely, I think it’s all an art. The science is mostly underdeveloped. I think the art is what most of us come to learn. The science tends to be applicable in limited situations, but the concept of dealing with people respectfully and with a multiplicity of perspectives, and the artistic way you bring them together will determine how well you are going to do the job. This is much more an art than a science.

Our actions and what we do are not governed with the same degree of rigor as if we were field testing new drugs. We don’t have the rigor of the FDA. Our research points us in the right direction. Once the direction is established, we pursue what we see from our own experiences as the right strategies and evaluate them as we advance. If we wanted to research the best possible solution, we would never act! We have to deal with the concept of “satisficing,” the first solution that satisfies all the conditions and gives us the outcome that we want is the one we select. It may not be the best one. Rather than eliminate all the possible solutions, we take one that works, use it, and move on to the next problem. What’s the right solution? The one that works!
In your essay “Winds of Change and Enrollment Management” you express concern about the future of SEM. You state that “with the research at hand, it appears that major changes, unforeseen risks, critical unresolved issues, and emerging trends may well force a change in enrollment management strategy.” When you conclude the essay with “it seems it would be preferable to be remembered as a leader in these times as opposed to a superb accepter or adapter,” are you addressing particular limitations in current SEM practices?

When I wrote that I was addressing current demographic changes. Divergent student populations are coming into conflict with what we previously defined as quality. Our choices are now going to be just adapting to these changes and doing the minimal amount necessary on an incremental basis or anticipating and choosing to lead our institutions as adopters. An “adopter” recognizes what’s on the horizon, embraces it, and structures the organizational ethos to be of service and value in the face of change. “Adapters” give up their position somewhat reluctantly because they can no longer maintain it. One’s a positive approach, and the other, negative. I prefer, when I retire, not to be known as the person who was really good at adapting to situations but as somebody who led the institution to a position where it flourished in spite of change.

It’s a question of what’s the right thing to do. It’s not a question of what we can get away with! What’s the right thing to do, knowing that experiences in higher education can greatly affect a person’s life in a positive way? We know that the populations that are growing are those who have historically fallen through the cracks in the system. We have limited resources. One reaction could be, “sorry folks, there’s no room,” but this is a country founded on issues of equity and equality. Somebody has to stand up and say that the right thing for us is to be inclusive, and by God, this is how we are going to do it, rather than say we are going to get increasing pressure to take more of these underrepresented populations, so let’s create a special program. That’s an adaptation. It’s not leadership. Nobody ever got themselves distinguished because they adapted to circumstances. A true leader goes forward when the outcomes are uncertain and the direction is not clear. I would rather be distinguished by leading in difficult times.

Who and what is likely to guide the next wave of SEM thinkers/philosophers/visionaries? How will they shape the future of enrollment management?

The people you see presenting here for the first time. I think Jim Black started this diversification of the presenter’s schedule at SEM. Jim was sensitive to the issue that if this was going to be a real profession, it needed a membership and a body of knowledge that was not synonymous with three, or four, or five people. He put forward a good effort to get new people involved at presenting and thinking about the issues. Bob (Bob Bontrager, Conference Director for SEM XIV) continued that effort at this meeting. As we move into the future, you will see less of the old timers, which is a good thing. People ought to be looking at this profession with fresh eyes.

SEM will become more populated with people from academic affairs than has traditionally been the case. You will also see fewer staff from Admission and more from business affairs, but most new people will be from the faculty.

What do you see as the future direction of your career?

You are talking to someone who never had a career plan to begin with, so I’m not likely to have one from here on out! I am 58 years old. I’m going to be in the game as long as I enjoy it. One fortunate thing, I have had the same retirement plan, TIAA-CREF, since I was 21 years old. So long as the market’s good, I should do okay. I will be in enrollment management one way or the other. I think I’ll leave while I still have energy and maybe help out as a consultant.

What do you dream of achieving?

I would like to see Tulane University get within the top 25 or 35 institutions in the country. I would like to see, when I leave, a general recognition that we are among the finest institutions in America, that we do a really good job in undergraduate education, and that becomes our brand in the marketplace. My dream professionally is that people look back and say that I was one of the prime movers in that.
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Homeschooling in the United States: Growth…and Growing Pains

by Travis Reindl

Among trends in American education, homeschooling stands as one of the most complex and contentious—and least understood. Indeed, the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) did not issue the first comprehensive estimates and analysis of the homeschool population until 2001. As the body of knowledge about homeschooling expands and the movement grows in size and political activism, policymakers at all levels (local, state, and federal) should be prepared to engage (or re-engage) several key questions and debates.

Data compiled by USDOE in 1999 and 2003 (released in 2001 and 2004) provide a crucial snapshot of the size and characteristics of the homeschooling population, building on and in most cases confirming the findings of earlier, more limited research. Among USDOE’s conclusions:

- The number of homeschoolers and their share of the K-12 population have increased markedly in recent years. From 1999 to 2003, the estimated number of homeschooled students in the United States increased 29 percent, from 850,000 to 1.1 million. Similarly, the share of the nation’s school-age population represented by homeschoolers rose from 1.7 percent to 2.2 percent.

- Homeschooled students are more likely to be White and from two-parent households where only one parent works and parents have higher educational attainment. Three-quarters (75 percent) of the homeschool population in 1999 was White (non-Hispanic), compared with 65 percent of the non-homeschool population. Additionally, more than half (52 percent) of homeschooled students lived in two-parent households with one parent working, compared with 19 percent of their non-homeschool counterparts. Moreover, nearly half (47 percent) of homeschool parents in 1999 had attained a bachelor’s degree or higher compared with one-third (33 percent) of non-home-school parents.

- The reasons given for homeschooling vary, but settle into three primary camps—the desire to provide religious/moral instruction, concerns over the environment of other schools, and dissatisfaction with the academic instruction of other schools. The 2003 USDOE analysis found a roughly even split between the school environment (31 percent) and religious/moral instruction (31 percent) camps, followed by the academic dissatisfaction camp (16 percent). While direct comparison cannot be made with the 1999 USDOE data, basic response patterns are consistent.

As the ranks of homeschoolers have grown, so too have questions regarding the status of these students as they enter, exit, or re-enter the traditional education system. Such questions include: What are appropriate local and/or state-level requirements for assessment, record-keeping, and attendance? What college admissions and financial aid standards should be applied to these students, who lack traditional credentials? The advancement of standards-based reform and the advent of high-stakes testing in K-12 education, as well as increased competition for seats and student aid in postsecondary education, only sharpen these questions. At the same time, a substantial homeschool advocacy movement has emerged (driven predominantly by the religious/moral instruction camp) and is actively pursuing these and other questions at the state and federal levels.

- State Issues. A current summary of state legislation and regulation (2003–2004) tracked by the Home School Legal Defense Association (HSLDA) indicated significant homeschooling-related activity in 40 states and the District of Columbia. Areas of focus include age of compulsory attendance/truancy, tax benefits (e.g., credits) for homeschool families, eligibility for state scholarships/financial aid, participation in extracurricular activities, and recordkeeping.
Federal Issues. Recent activity in this area has focused largely on the transition to postsecondary education, especially admissions and financial aid. While an HSLDA-led coalition failed in the 1998 Higher Education Act Amendments to bar colleges and universities from requiring standardized tests in lieu of an accredited high school diploma for admissions purposes, they were successful in extending federal aid eligibility (via the “ability to benefit” criteria) to completers of state-approved homeschools. Legislation before the 108th Congress (S.1562/H.R.2732) would have clarified student/institutional eligibility criteria for federal student aid, extend eligibility for specific aid/college savings programs to home-schooled students, and extend provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) to homeschools. The measures were introduced in July 2003, but saw no action before the conclusion of the 108th Congress.

The diverse array of legislative and regulatory issues at all levels of government revolve around two central balances:

- Parental rights and governmental responsibilities. This balance most clearly comes into play on issues of compulsory attendance age and assessment/instructor qualification requirements. Parents are clearly vested with certain rights with respect to the care and upbringing of their children, but these overlap with the national standard of an adequate, universally available primary and secondary education and government’s role in upholding that standard.

- State and federal policy roles. Postsecondary access and aid questions bring this balance most powerfully into focus. States and local schools have historically claimed primary responsibility for education policymaking, which makes federal intervention in areas such as college admissions problematic. At the same time, however, the wide range of state regulation and oversight with respect to homeschooling—from virtually none to very significant—appears to bring a legitimate federal role in assuring accountability for taxpayer resources in areas such as student financial aid.

In both instances, a prudent philosophical approach will emphasize autonomy and flexibility balanced with accountability. Homeschools should be given the latitude to meet the needs of the child and the priorities of the family, while demonstrating satisfaction of basic local/state expectations for skills and educational outcomes. Keeping a principle of balance at the forefront will be essential for the discussions and debates already underway, and those that lie ahead.
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In May 2004, Colorado Governor Bill Owens signed Senate Bill 189 into law, essentially transforming how public higher education is funded in that state. The measure, the first of its kind in the nation, changes the flow of state appropriations from the traditional enrollment-based block grant to institutions into two more market-based streams:

- A per-student undergraduate stipend (authorized at $2,400 per year for resident students at public universities and $1,200 per year for resident students at private universities in the state) that “follows” the student for up to 145 credit hours; and
- A fee-for-service contract between the state and the institution to provide graduate, professional, and developmental education, as well as public service and other mission-related functions.

Eligibility for either stream is contingent upon establishment of a performance agreement between the institution and the state’s Commission on Higher Education that will specify institutional performance targets (to be determined).

The law is scheduled to take effect July 1, 2005, but the debate over its significance—and wisdom—is already well underway. Some advocates see the measure as a new and important mechanism for promoting access and efficiency in public higher education, while more pragmatic proponents couch it as an essential means to loosen the grip of constitutional revenue/spending limits imposed by the Taxpayer Bill of Rights (TABOR). Critics contend that the law will do little to expand access, and will instead pave the way toward a system of publicly chartered, privately funded institutions, and may even constitute a death sentence for some.

While it is too early to tell which—if either—camp will ultimately be vindicated, pundits and proponents should look critically at the context surrounding the law before pronouncing it “the wave of the future” in higher education finance. Following are three key points to consider in thinking about the impact and future of Senate Bill 189:

- **Any potential benefits of a new finance system will not be realized until the state gets its fiscal house in order.** Specifically, Colorado is currently hamstrung by the combination of TABOR, which places strict limits on state revenue collections and spending increases, and Amendment 23, another constitutional provision that mandates annual state funding increases for K-12 education (at rate of inflation plus one percent). While Senate Bill 189 provides for some relief for public universities by exempting them from TABOR’s revenue limits,¹ the “double whammy” represented by TABOR’s taxing and spending restrictions and Amendment 23’s required annual hikes for the state’s largest general fund item will likely bring the starvation of other public services (such as higher education) over the long term.

  Legislative leaders and the governor are currently working on modifications to TABOR, thus easing half of the squeeze, but have not yet agreed on its provisions. Moreover, anti-tax groups such as the Club for Growth are touting TABOR as a national model, further complicating the political calculus for reform efforts. Failure to ease this fiscal vise before the next economic downturn will render the new law little more than a temporary stopover on the path to decline for the state’s universities.

- **It is unclear how much higher education funding prospects will change—if at all—by changing the mechanics of finance.** Some advocates of Senate Bill 189 argue that

¹ Done by declaring the state’s colleges and universities as state enterprises, owing to the fact that less than 10 percent of their revenues will derive from state general fund grants or appropriations (neither the per-student stipend nor the fee-for-service contracts are classified as such under TABOR).
connecting state funding directly to the student will broaden public awareness of higher education opportunity and build a constituency for higher education funding that is more potent (and thus harder to disappoint) than the current one. That argument is at least partially undermined by the fact that within days of the law’s ratification, some legislative leaders were warning that the need to remedy a $250 million structural deficit could land largely on higher education’s doorstep, thereby reducing the student stipend from $2,400 per year to $1,600 per year. While that reduction may not materialize, it is still a fairly clear indication that a fundamental shift in finance strategy is not going to move higher education from the “balance wheel” position in Colorado’s state budget. Indeed, Colorado has shown a greater tendency to balance its budget on higher education than peer states, judging from the fact that the state ranks 48th in state higher education funding effort (appropriations per $1,000 of personal income) in FY04, following a significant slide over the past decade. (See Figure 1.)

The law creates a murky tuition-setting environment. By removing institutions’ tuition revenues from Tabor limits (via enterprise status), Senate Bill 189 would appear to represent a step toward tuition deregulation, particularly since the state universities’ boards are now authorized by statute to set tuition rates. However, the state’s Commission on Higher Education has included tuition levels as part of institutional performance contracts, which would indicate relatively little autonomy in this area. Indeed, the assembly’s Joint Budget Committee cited the apparent overlap in authority in one of its analyses of the measure. Accordingly, tuition decisions will likely remain a political football, which could leave campuses with less diversified revenue bases and less political clout at a distinct disadvantage.

From this perspective, Senate Bill 189 appears to be part revolution in higher education finance, part “Hail Mary pass” for a state hemmed in by initiative-based budgeting. Only time—and the state’s voters—will determine which part ultimately wins out.
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Here are three scenarios to be used in a course in higher education administration.

In the first scenario, the president and executive vice president of a well-known, leading university are contemplating taking over another, less well-known university to create a truly giant institution that would, at least in its part of the country, have an enormous amount of influence on the way higher education is conducted. It wouldn’t be a monopoly, of course, but it would be a dominant institution. In fact, the two executives are so enamored of the idea, and so convinced that it will be a wonderful achievement, that prior to actually taking control of the second institution they award themselves enormous salary increases in anticipation of the increased workload, span of control, and responsibility that this action will create for them. Needless to say, this is done for the purpose of retaining such high-powered executives. Unfortunately, however, sometimes even the best of plans go awry, and the takeover never is completed. Questions arise about what went wrong, notably from the Faculty Senate, but also from other sources. Our president and executive vice president, being mere mortals and not particularly enamored of giving up the additional compensation originally thought of as a reward for conceiving what is now widely-regarded as an impossible scheme, turn for advice to an outside consultant to address the question of whether they are entitled to the additional compensation. The consultant they decide upon happens, perhaps by circumstance, to be the same consultant who advised on the question of their original increase and who also serves as their external auditor.

In the second scenario, another well-known institution, although not quite as prestigious as some of its competitors, hires a new president. The former president was let go for having failed his fiduciary responsibilities, although when he left he received a very large severance package. As the story unfolds, it turns out that the new president is being very well-compensated also, but the institution’s problems are not being resolved; in fact they are becoming worse. Enrollment is declining, the budget is in disarray and bankruptcy has become a real possibility. The institution’s board, on which the president serves, has also been giving loans to officials even as its financial condition worsened. The president, after only seven months on the job, resigns but it turns out that his contract calls for—you guessed it—a very large severance package. This is despite all measures indicating that the institution’s competitive position has worsened during his brief tenure. Just to add interest, a law firm hired to investigate the circumstances finds that administrators have engaged in personal travel disguised as professional visits, disguised enrollment numbers to show income projections that are unrealistic, and accepted improper payment from outside consultants. Although the president resigned his position, he is still on the board and is thus in a position to oversee a probe of his own actions.

In the third scenario, mid-level managers at a well-known university are discovered to have deliberately inflated enrollment figures. In addition, it is found that there is also a question about equipment and services that the institution sold two years ago to another institution. The scandal has become so wide-spread that other administrators are under investigation. The institution has stated repeatedly that it will cooperate fully in the investigation, but that has done little to dispel the concerns and uncertainty that have been created by these discoveries. To make matters worse, one of the persons involved in the actions is still employed. You might argue that these scenarios are wholly unrealistic and of no value to anyone interested in higher education administration. So why would any educator create such scenarios? Because they are an excellent first response to the question that many of us who work in colleges and universities...
are asked frequently; that is, “Why can’t colleges and universities be run more like businesses?” That’s a question that comes up in a variety of contexts from public debates to cocktail parties and is usually asked by a business person who, of course, begins with the assumption that businesses are always run in an efficient manner and in an environment that makes everyone accountable for his or her behavior. The reason, of course, is that “the market” is supposed to provide, even require, discipline. Sometimes, if the discussion gets a bit heated there is the additional commentary that businesses, unlike the academy, are not constructed in a manner as to allow the inmates to run the asylum. Well, it is clear that we have enough information currently available to give the lie to such assumptions. In fact, the scenarios described above are simply fictitious analogies to real situations that have played out in the wonderful world of business.

As reported in a column entitled “Unbridled Greed” in The New York Times, the two top executives of telecom giant Sprint—William Esrey and Ronald LeMay—“...awarded themselves stock options worth up to $311 million in return for thinking up a merger they couldn’t pull off. Next, they tried to protect this undeserved windfall from Uncle Sam, using a complex tax shelter devised by Ernst & Young, Sprint’s auditor.” Incidentally, the term “unbridled greed” was used by Senator Charles Grassley, head of the Senate Finance Committee in describing the behavior of these two men, as well as others mentioned in the article.

In an issue of Fortune, an article entitled “The Looting of Kmart, Part 2” describes the behavior of James Adamson, who “…had taken over as CEO in 2002 and was enjoying rich perks and a $4 million pay package, even though he served on Kmart’s board while the company slid toward bankruptcy and handed out millions in dubious loans to top executives.” The good news is that Adamson eventually resigned as CEO, but he was also supposed to receive another $3.6 million when Kmart exited Chapter 11—even though the employees Kmart planned to fire got next to nothing. The article goes on to indicate that no one is being held responsible for activities such as “…masking personal travel as store visits, incorporating bogus numbers into sales projections, and accepting a substantial improper payment from a consultant to the company.” Finally, the article notes that “Adamson will stay on as nonexecutive chairman through April, when Kmart gets out of bankruptcy. So once again Adamson is in the compromising position of indirectly overseeing a probe that will be scrutinizing his own actions.”

In our final example of misdeeds writ large, an article entitled “Charges Filed in Qwest Case” in The New York Times reports that the [Federal] Justice Department “…brought criminal fraud charges yesterday against four former mid-level executives at Qwest Communications International, accusing them of inflating revenues from a project to link Arizona schools to the Internet.” This is in addition to charges that Qwest “…inflated revenue reported in various quarters of 2000 and 2001 by $144 million. But the company has identifi-

fied about $2.2 billion in revenue that was improperly accounted for in 2000, 2001, and 2002 and warned that more restatements were possible as KPMG, the new auditor brought in last year, reviews its transactions.” It’s like the late-Senator Everett Dirksen said, “A billion here, a billion there, pretty soon it adds up to real money.”

The point that needs to be addressed is what we make of these sensational stories. Should we believe that they accurately represent all people involved in businesses large and small, or should we believe that the world of business operates in a reasonable manner in most cases? I, for one, believe the latter to be the case, and any attempt to paint everyone involved in the world of commerce as greedy, immoral, arrogant, and self-aggrandizing is simply unfair. Of course, I desperately want to believe that to be the case, because, if I’m wrong, my retirement fund is in truly desperate condition, regardless of what else goes on in the world. An enterprise run by individuals concerned only with their own needs as opposed to those of the organization cannot be sustained in the long run.

What’s the point for those of us in academic environments? First, judging any enterprise by the excesses of a few is inherently unfair and inappropriate. Further, while we should reserve the right to be outraged by behavior beyond the pale, we must also remember that when we judge any system as being desirable or undesirable, it’s always important to weigh that system against the pluses and minuses of whatever other system might take its place. It is too easy to attack something with which we disagree by pointing out its shortcomings, by conveniently overlooking the shortcomings of the position we espouse, or by failing to offer an alternative that is better than the system with which we disagree.

What’s the point for those in business? First, judging any enterprise by the excesses of a few is inherently unfair and inappropriate. In spite of this we continue to hear the apocryphal and hyperbolic stories beloved by critics of tenure about the professor who earned tenure and immediately retired in place, the tenured professor who died and nobody noticed for weeks, the tenured professor who was using the same yellow notes that s/he had been using for decades. It is rarely noted that such stories are no more than illustrations of what may, in fact, happen in exceptional circumstances, as opposed to a representative illustration of how the system of tenure actually works. Even in those relatively rare cases in which there is a foundation for such stories, it is important to remember that these are the exception and not the rule. My more than forty years in the professoriate, my more than two decades of experience in central university administration, and my study of the literature in this field all lead inexorably to the conclusion that the vast majority of faculty and staff members are hard-working and seriously dedicated to their students, their institutions, and their disciplines. Whether a faculty member’s time and energy are devoted exclusively to teaching, or they are also actively involved in research and scholarship, faculty members generally work hard and contribute greatly to the society that supports them.
Does this mean that the tenure system works perfectly, or that there are no faculty members who, once having attained tenure, fail to perform at the same level as before? Of course not! We must remember that tenure is a system administered by human beings, and, as such, will not always operate perfectly. However, in those cases where such exceptions do exist, it is more logical to lay the blame at the feet of those who are charged with oversight of the system, rather than with the nature of the system itself. In this context it seems important to also point out that blame lies not only with administrators who are unwilling to deal with circumstances that are messy or have potential legal liability issues, but also with faculty members who, while certain of their prerogative to make judgments of professional competence, sometimes fail to apply the criteria and standards they know to be appropriate. It is, after all, difficult to judge a colleague, particularly one with whom you have a personal relationship, and find that colleague has failed to meet the standards an academic unit has set for tenure. After all, the period of probation is intended to allow new faculty members to demonstrate their actual and potential contributions to the creation and dissemination of knowledge, that lovely phrase that, at its best, truly describes what the academy is designed to do. The fact that we do not always achieve our most noble ambitions does not make them any less noble or diminish the importance of their pursuit.

Today there is a great deal of discussion about tenure, whether it is still needed as a necessary facet of academic freedom, and whether it should be replaced by such alternatives as term contracts so that institutions can maintain more financial flexibility. In other words, the argument goes, colleges should be run in a more business-like manner, but that fails to recognize the vast differences in the nature of business as compared to the nature of the academy. Where one is operating a for-profit organization, it is obviously possible to apply a number of relatively objective criteria to determine how well that organization is functioning. Whether the criterion is annual profit or stock price, there is, in fact, a bottom line against which the organization can be measured. Compare that to the academy in which the bottom line is that there is no bottom line. While every one of the more than 3,000 colleges and universities in the United States has a mission statement that sets out its goals and objectives, those are invariably, and appropriately, vague and almost impossible to measure in objective fashion. How do we know that our graduates are well-educated, sensitive to issues of racial and ethnic diversity, able to act as responsible citizens, appreciate and respect their own cultural heritage and that of others, and function effectively in a constantly-changing environment? We may be able to determine some of these outcomes decades after our graduates leave our campuses, but we have
yet to find effective means for measuring the attainment of these lofty ambitions. Determining the mean salary of our graduates 20 years after graduation is not quite the same as determining if they are caring human beings. Ultimately, those of us who engage in education operate on faith; the faith that what is taught has meaning, that what is taught is useful to students, that what is taught will be remembered, even when the source of the lesson is forgotten, and, ultimately, that what is taught makes a difference in the lives of our students and the society in which they function. This is not always blind faith, because we sometimes are fortunate enough to receive feedback that informs us that our faith is warranted, that something we said had an impact on a student’s life. Sometimes, as the Development Office reminds us, that feedback can come in an extremely tangible form.

In regard to the continued need for tenure as it relates to academic freedom, no regular reader of higher education at the beginning of the 21st century needs to be reminded of how often academic freedom continues to come under attack, and how foolish it would be to ultimately depend on the goodwill of administrators or, even worse, entities outside the academy, to insure that faculty maintain their prerogatives to be the intellectual entrepreneurs for which they were trained, and which ultimately is their fundamental role in a creative and free society. Even a cursory look at the environment in which the academy operates today reveals more, not fewer, threats to academic freedom than has been the case in many years. Big science is increasingly dependent for funding on collaboration with industries that often have a far different time horizon than has been the norm in universities. The increasing concerns of the society with terrorism have created an environment in which dissent from public policy is sometimes viewed as traitorous, but universities are the organizations in society that are charged with the responsibility for addressing sensitive issues on which people may disagree with great belief and emotion, and in which highly emotional topics should be discussed and debated in terms of the worth of the argument, not its popularity or decibel level. Increasingly, colleges and universities are being led by persons whose professional experience was outside the academy, and who are not sensitive to the nuances, assumptions, and rhythms of academic life. Even the American Association of University Professors has been compromised in its historic role as the arbiter of issues related to academic freedom as a result of its also attempting to function as a union. The fact that not all faculty members see the need for tenure as an adjunct to academic freedom does not diminish that relationship; it demonstrates how deteriorating economic conditions have created haves and have-nots within the academy who set upon each other to secure their piece of a too-small pie. The current movement of adjunct faculty to unionize is in large measure a reflection of the fact that adjunct faculty have historically been poorly-paid, and often badly-used, by colleges and universities. However, none of these circumstances diminishes the fact that tenure is a necessary bulwark against a variety of encroachments on academic freedom, and its elimination, despite possible short-term economic advantages, would lead to negative consequences in the long run.

Finally, returning to the comparison between business and the academy, I would offer the observation that what should actually happen is that the question “Why can’t colleges and universities be run more like businesses?” should be changed to ask “Why can’t businesses be run more like colleges and universities?” We believe today that decisions within organizations should be made in a form that is more horizontal than vertical; that those involved in performing the core functions of an organization should be more involved in defining, executing, managing, and evaluating those core functions, and that expertise and knowledge should be more critical than seniority or title in determining the worth of one’s input to decisions. In fact, if one stops to consider these changes, it is obvious that they are exactly where business is headed; in other words, they are trying to function more like colleges and universities have historically functioned and less like businesses have historically functioned.

Does this mean that all colleges and universities operate on a collegial basis in which expertise alone is the appropriate currency? Again, the obvious answer is of course not. To begin with, colleges and universities are far too complicated to act in any one way, having both academic and business functions that operate with different degrees of hierarchical organization. However, in its core business, to borrow another term from the business literature, colleges and universities recognize that they are organized not to produce the greatest efficiencies, but to produce the greatest number of ideas and potential solutions to the problems that exist within the societies that sustain them, in addition to educating students for an uncertain future. This does not lead to the giving of orders, neatness, or a bottom line. This leads to a sometimes chaotic institution that at its best creates an environment within which answers to questions arise, and students are imbued not only with facts but with the love of learning. In this environment, tenure and academic freedom have played a critically important role and it would be a terrible bargain for the academy to gain financial flexibility or some relatively few dollars at the cost of an important element that has made American higher education the standard to which the world aspires. Why can’t colleges and universities be run more like businesses? Simply because they’re not in the business of business, they’re in the business of education.
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Tuition discounting began in the 1970s as the practice of using university funds to augment federal, state, and private aid and scholarships. When the 1980s saw a decrease in the number of high school seniors, universities began to compete in the arena of price for the first time, sparking what has been called an “arms race” of tuition discounting (Goral 2003). According to NACUBO’s 2002 survey—the 193 colleges with 13 years of data have increased their average discount rate almost 50 percent in that period, from 26.7 percent to 39.4 percent (Lapovsky and Hubbell 2003). Not surprisingly, financial aid is the fastest growing expenditure for most four-year private colleges (Redd 2000).

Recently, tuition discounting has changed in two main respects. The first, which has faced the most public criticism, is that discounts are no longer based solely on financial need. A number of studies have shown that growth in aid to wealthy students has far outpaced growth in aid to needy students (Redd 2000). In the past ten years, college-funded financial aid to wealthy students grew faster than aid to low-income students. In 1995, the average private school grant aid for higher income undergraduates was 39 percent of that for lower-income undergraduates ($1,359 vs. $3,446). Just four years later the average grant for higher-income students equaled 82 percent of the average grant for low-income students (Goral 2003). Aid at public colleges and universities has seen similar increases. These changes are due to the fact that discounting is shifting to become a tool of enrollment management, rather than a tool to increase access to education for needy students.

The second, even more risky, change in tuition discounting is in the methods institutions of higher education use to fund their discounts. Originally funding came from endowments and gifts. Today schools are increasingly redirecting tuition revenue to fund discounts. This practice has the potential to undermine the financial stability of a college, not to mention limit funds for instruction, academics, and student support (Goral 2003).

Today, price competition is a reality we must live with, and so assessing one’s peers’ discounting practices is an important tool. Unfortunately, until recently very little data were available on discounting practices. But now, new IPEDS tools allow researchers to learn what discounts rival institutions are offering. This article will discuss one method of doing so.

Using the IPEDS Peer Analysis System (PAS) for Freshman Discounting Data

The federal government, through the National Center for Education Statistics’ Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), collects a variety of data from higher education institutions. The data that are collected are made available to the higher education community and the public through the IPEDS Peer Analysis System (PAS). There are three levels of access to the PAS: guest level, institution level, and collection level. This article will focus on data available using the institutional level login. For more information on levels of access, interested readers can visit http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas/. The Peer Analysis System allows users to compare an institution (called a linchpin in PAS) with other colleges and universities (peer group). We have used the IPEDS PAS data to generate estimates of the freshman discount rate for a group of other institutions to compare with our own.¹

For this article, we will assume that readers have successfully logged in at the institutional level. The next step is

¹ We do not have space enough in this article to discuss methods for navigating the Peer Analysis System. Readers are urged to visit the AACRAO (www.aacrao.org) and Association for Institutional Research (AIR) (www.airweb.org) Web sites for information on opportunities for training on IPEDS at their annual meetings as well as at regional conferences. In addition, there is a user’s manual available at http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas/.
selecting the linchpin institution against which the peer group of colleges and universities are compared. As an example, we have used Suffolk University as our linchpin and have let the PAS automatically select a peer group of private, non-profit Masters I level institutions.

In the next section, we will discuss how the freshman discount rate is calculated and then, rather than going through a step-by-step process for selecting data from the PAS to generate the discount rate, we list the variables that we used.

**Calculating the Freshman Discount Rate**

Basically, to calculate the freshman discount rate for a new cohort of freshmen, you need the institutional grant aid awarded to those new freshmen and the gross tuition revenues generated by the new cohort. The discount rate is the ratio of the institutional grant aid divided by gross tuition revenue.

In order to get these two pieces from the IPEDS PAS, we have to pull several variables and then do some manipulating of the data. The first set of data come from the Institutional Characteristics and Student Charges survey (called Institutions in PAS). In this section, we can select the tuition rate for the year or years in which we are interested. Next, we go the Student Financial Aid survey data. In this section, we pull data on the average amount of institutional grant aid awarded to new full-time, first-time students, the number of these students who were awarded aid, and the number of new freshmen in that year’s cohort. (Note: Data for this article were from academic year 2002-2003.)

Table 1 shows the raw data that were pulled from the PAS. We have eliminated a few institutions that had blank or incomplete data. Table 1 includes: 1) the name of each school; 2) the Fall 2002 freshman tuition rate; 3) the number of new Fall 2002 freshmen receiving institutional grant aid; 4) the average institutional grant aid awarded to these new freshmen; and 5) the number of students in the Fall 2002 new freshman cohort.

To get total institutional grant aid awarded to new freshmen, we have to multiply the data in #3 with the data in #4 (the number of students receiving institutional grant aid multiplied by the average institutional grant award). To get gross freshman tuition revenue, we have to multiply #2 by #5 (the Fall 2002 tuition

### Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Fall 2002 Tuition</th>
<th>Receiving Inst. Grant Aid (n)</th>
<th>Average Inst. Grant</th>
<th>Fall 2002 New Freshmen Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut College</td>
<td>35,625</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>19,879</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield University</td>
<td>24,100</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>11,444</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Haven</td>
<td>18,800</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinnipiac University</td>
<td>19,890</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>7,934</td>
<td>1,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Heart University</td>
<td>19,260</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>6,117</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Joseph College</td>
<td>19,110</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>10,759</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity College</td>
<td>28,602</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>19,455</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan University</td>
<td>28,320</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>19,078</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Atlantic</td>
<td>22,266</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12,299</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowdoin College</td>
<td>28,685</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>19,567</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American International College</td>
<td>16,104</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>7,201</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherst College</td>
<td>28,304</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>20,305</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Maria College</td>
<td>17,710</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>9,428</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption College</td>
<td>19,980</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>8,893</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentley College</td>
<td>22,160</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>13,624</td>
<td>908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson College</td>
<td>21,514</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>10,699</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel College</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>8,913</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon College</td>
<td>19,100</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>12,012</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire College</td>
<td>27,884</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>15,195</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Holy Cross</td>
<td>26,440</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>15,158</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley University</td>
<td>18,475</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>9,256</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Holyoke College</td>
<td>27,708</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>17,593</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Manor College</td>
<td>12,964</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>6,739</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons College</td>
<td>22,668</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>10,382</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith College</td>
<td>25,986</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>18,444</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield College</td>
<td>18,690</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>9,081</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk University</td>
<td>17,610</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>5,147</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley College</td>
<td>26,702</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>19,976</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western New England College</td>
<td>17,434</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>6,751</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheaton College</td>
<td>27,105</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>14,278</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelock College</td>
<td>18,925</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>9,337</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams College</td>
<td>26,520</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>20,898</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Pierce College</td>
<td>19,560</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>9,214</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River College</td>
<td>17,730</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>7,006</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Anselm College</td>
<td>21,175</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>10,069</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant College</td>
<td>20,988</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>7,767</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson &amp; Wales University</td>
<td>18,282</td>
<td>2,096</td>
<td>4,113</td>
<td>2,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence College</td>
<td>20,820</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>10,420</td>
<td>878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salve Regina University</td>
<td>19,410</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>9,669</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennington College</td>
<td>26,540</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>12,660</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlboro College</td>
<td>19,660</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11,142</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich University</td>
<td>16,710</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>8,419</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Michaels College</td>
<td>21,200</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>10,271</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
rate multiplied by the Fall 2002 freshman cohort). Then, we divide the total institutional grant aid by the total freshman tuition revenue to get the freshman discount rate. Table 2 shows 1) total freshman institutional grant aid; 2) total freshman tuition revenue, and 3) freshman discount rate.

**IPEDS PAS Discounting Data Versus NACUBO Tuition Discounting Survey**

While the findings from the Lapovskv and Hubbell study (2003) are interesting as an overview of tuition discounting, they are of limited utility. Lapovsky and Hubbell sent their survey to all accredited, independent four-year institutions and approximately 350 institutions responded. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2004), there were more than 1,800 private, degree-granting, four-year institutions in 2002–2003. Based on these statistics, it would appear that about 19 percent of eligible institutions participated in the study. It would seem that, based on the comparatively low response rate as well as the fact that it was not a random sample, the survey results cannot be generalized across all independent, four-year schools.

On the other hand, the IPEDS PAS can provide access to the vast majority of these 1,800+ institutions (exceptions being institutions that did not respond to IPEDS or did not respond fully to the surveys). But, since the majority of institutions do provide the data we reported on in this article, the IPEDS Peer Analysis System offers a much richer source for mining tuition discounting data than is available through other means.

In future studies, we will try and replicate NACUBO tuition discounting study results using the IPEDS PAS.
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Educational literature is overflowing with testimonials, data, and research confirming that collaborative group work, at its best, produces better results (Baer 2003; Johnson and Johnson 1994; McKeachie 2002). Many claim that students enjoy group work and that it leads to both increased learning and enhanced social skills. If this is commonly known, why then do many college faculty still lecture most of the time?

Some still believe lecturing is more effective, and it may be for students with particular learning styles. Some lecture because, to be frank, it’s easier and it provides the teacher with a sense of control and importance. Some faculty lecture because they don’t believe the literature, the basic premise that students working together can learn as much or more from each other than they can from passively listening to the expert.

There are a few academics who bristle at the mention of group work and group grading. Spencer Kagan (1995) presents a cogent argument against giving students a single grade for a group project, claiming it is blatantly unfair. He states that “when grading is used for other reasons—to motivate, communicate with, or socialize students—grades lose their meaning” (p.4). Grading students in a group, according to Kagan, is “never justified” (p.1). To be fair, he is not arguing against cooperative learning, only against giving grades for the work done. But many educators do award group grades for collaborative projects. How do we compare these negative comments with other academics like Wilbert McKeachie (2002, p.15) who write that “cooperative learning produced positive results in ability to work with others as well as better cognitive outcomes”? One way to deal with this difference in opinion is to do action research and discover the answer.

The following two studies explored the practice of group work and its efficacy in the college classroom. The first experiment examined whether groups scored higher on in-class assignments than individuals. The second experiment attempted to answer this question: Do students working in groups learn as much or more than students working individually? Both experiments were conducted in Oakland Community College’s English composition classes.

In Winter 2004, two ENG 1520 classes (English Composition I, a research writing course) were targeted with four assignments: a library scavenger hunt, a source card exercise, a works cited exercise, and a plagiarism exercise. Students were given a choice with the scavenger hunt to work independently or to form groups. From that point, the assignments were alternated between the classes: class #1 worked in groups and class #2 worked individually; in the next assignment, class #2 worked in groups, class #1 individually. As the literature suggested, the groups scored higher on every assignment, sometimes dramatically.

To some, this information justifies the use of group work. Not only do most students seem to enjoy the social activity, they perform better on assignments. The crucial question, however, revolves around learning. Do the students working in groups learn as much or more than students working individually? The second experiment dealt with this question.

In Summer 2004, two ENG 1510 classes (English Composition I) were targeted. On the first day, each class was given a “Show Me What You Know” survey. This 40-item survey
measured students’ general knowledge of punctuation usage, sentence structure, subject-verb-pronoun agreement, sentence types, and plagiarism. Individual scores were not given to students and their scores did not count toward their grades. The survey was assessment feedback for the instructor.

### Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Score (avg.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class #1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class #2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The class averages were very close, both at the ‘D’ grade level. No significant differences in class performance or aptitude were evident.

After instruction and practice during the semester, the instructor gave four 10-point quizzes on 1) punctuation, 2) subject-verb-pronoun agreement and sentence types, 3) quotation marks, and 4) plagiarism and MLA style, the areas covered in the “Show Me What You Know” survey. The experimental design was to require class #1 to take all quizzes in randomized groups while requiring class #2 to take all quizzes individually. The final exam, which was the same “Show Me What You Know” survey, would be taken individually by all students. Examining the pretest/posttest scores would provide evidence that class #1 (using the group format on quizzes) either scored higher than class #2, scored as well as class #2, or scored lower than class #2.

The score averages on the four 10-point quizzes were as follows:

### Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quiz (points possible)</th>
<th>Class #1 (Group Format)</th>
<th>Class #2 (Individual Format)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pts. (avg.)</td>
<td>Groups (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiz 1 (10)</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiz 2 (10)</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiz 3 (10)</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiz 4 (10)</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class #1, placed randomly in different groups for each quiz, scored higher than class #2 on every quiz. These data supported the first study on group work. In addition, according to class evaluations, students indicated they preferred taking quizzes in a group format. Responding to the statement “I prefer taking quizzes as part of a small group,” 88.9 percent agreed or strongly agreed. Only 11.1 percent were undecided with that statement (n = 18). Anecdotally, the instructor observed students discussing quiz items, explaining rules and concepts to each other, debating, and problem-solving to select an answer. This evidence supports the idea that most students are less stressed with the testing situation and enjoy the social support system created by group work.

Using a pretest/posttest model, both classes were evaluated to determine if learning growth had occurred, at least with regard to knowledge of punctuation conventions and basic grammar. The t-test statistical method was used to confirm the value of group work.

### Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class #1</td>
<td>23.86</td>
<td>30.36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.292*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class #2</td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>31.23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.66*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The t-test verifies that both classes statistically enhanced their knowledge of punctuation and grammatical understanding by the end of the semester at the .001 alpha level. Not only did the class testing in the group format score higher on the quizzes, it scored equally as well on the individual final exam.

Educators have written about the value of group work and its effect on learning for years. These two small studies lend more credence to that premise. If students who participate in group quizzes raise their final exam scores as significantly as students who worked on the quizzes individually, then teachers should seriously consider this technique. Of course, research in disciplines other than English is necessary, and larger sample sizes would be useful in confirming the results of this study.

However, the lessons from these minor experiments seem clear: students working collaboratively learn as much as those working individually and, in addition, gain valuable social experiences useful in real life.

### References


### ABOUT THE AUTHOR

David James teaches English at Oakland Community College. He has published four books of poetry, most recently a chapbook titled *I Will Peel This Mask Off* (March Street Press, 2004). Five of his one-act plays have been produced off-Broadway. He earned his doctorate from Wayne State University. His articles have appeared recently in College and University, College Teaching, and Teaching English at the Two-Year College.
Transcript fraud is a common problem for colleges and universities, businesses, employers, governmental licensing boards, and other agencies, with some experiencing it more so than others. The only difference between a large and small institution is the volume of degree and transcript fraud it experiences.

What is transcript fraud?
Transcript fraud can be defined as:
- any alteration to a legitimately issued transcript from a genuine college or university, by which the student’s name, Social Security or student identification number, age, courses, grades, grade point average (GPA), graduation status, or any other information on the document, is changed or deleted, or information that does not belong to the original document is added;
- any creation of a document purporting to be a transcript issued by a fictional college or university (so-called “diploma mill” or “degree mill”); or
- any creation of a document purporting to be an official record of academic work, showing courses or other academic work, with grades and/or credit, in which the student did not actually enroll, did not complete, for which appropriate academic work was not required, or which otherwise does not reflect real and/or appropriate academic achievement.

Transcript fraud is an international problem. Never once think that degree mills and transcript fraud exist only in the United States; fraudulent transcripts are routinely received by colleges, universities, employers, and government offices on a worldwide basis.

What are the types of fraudulent transcripts?
Generally, fraudulent transcripts fall into the following major categories:
- Transcripts issued by legitimate accredited institutions which are later altered.
- Transcripts from fictional/fraudulent/unaccredited institutions.
- Counterfeit transcripts produced with the names of legitimate accredited institutions, either based on real transcripts or on fabrications meant to look like real ones.

Why do we have transcript fraud?
Transcript fraud exists today in order to:
- Show academic degree(s) not earned
- Report as completed a major, or area of concentration, for which some requirements were not satisfied, or which the student never actually took
- Falsify reference to age
- Qualify for financial aid by altering dates of attendance
- Show coursework not taken
- Alter grades in hopes of enhancing employability
- Change the name of the record holder
- Change the name of the record holder as part of an identity assumption. Identity fraud is the fastest growing form of white-collar crime today.

How does transcript fraud come to light?
Transcript fraud normally comes to light when your institution receives inquiries resulting from:
- Pre-employment background checks
- Employee performing poorly on the job
- Individual applying for advanced degree or specialized training program, or
Other requests for verification of degree as based on unusual circumstances.

It can be as simple as a candidate for a local school board calling to verify the degree and transcript of his opponent. Or it may be a professor calling while writing a letter of recommendation for a valued colleague, and learning that his fellow worker has never completed his degree.

Once a person places false educational claims in his or her resume, job application, or on a Web site, it is analogous to placing a lit stick of dynamite in the resume. The question is not if it will explode, but when.

For example, an individual forged several transcripts from a well-known Midwestern university, whereby he claimed undergraduate and graduate degrees in Engineering. He then falsified a Ph.D. degree in Engineering from an unrelated institution, and formed a medical consulting business in Florida with a well-known physician. When this medical consulting business could not produce results commensurate with their alleged training, a client called the named issuing institution to verify the degrees. The ensuing lawsuit resulted in a judgment for the plaintiff in the amount of $327,271.48.

What is available on the Internet today?

Simply put: anything and everything is found on the Internet. You (and your students, former students, and members of the general public), can, with a click of the mouse (and a credit card), purchase any of the following with no impunity:

- Degree and transcript in the name of your institution (on security paper, with hologram and other security features)
- Envelopes bearing return address, logo (if any) of your institution
- Registrar’s Office rubber stamps, metal seal, etc.
- A toll-free telephone number for degree verification, or
- A third party transcript records archive service with accompanying degree verification.

Some of today’s Web sites offer to sell actual degree and transcript replicas, whereas others will sell you a template from which you can print the degree and transcript yourself. Most of these Web sites attempt to limit their liability with disclaimers indicating that the degrees and transcripts are being sold for “entertainment purposes only” or as “novelty items.”

In order to protect yourself and your institution, examine the following Web sites to see if/where your school’s name appears. Keep in mind that this list represents a sampling; there are many more Web sites like those shown in Table 1. (Also, see Figure 1.)

Are degrees and transcripts (on security paper) in the name of your institution for sale on the above Web sites? What have you done about this? If your institution does not attempt to put a halt to this, then why should law enforcement, since it is your good name that is at stake?

What can you do? Be proactive.

Your objective is to move your school’s name from the “Schools Offered” list to the “Schools Not Offered” list. Although we might laugh at the names of these Web sites, the number of such sites is growing steadily, indicating an increasing demand for their products. In turn, this is causing your office to receive an increased number of calls for verification of fraudulent credentials that bear the name and seals/stamps of your institution.

Brokers, your security paper, and fraudulent outsourced services

Several of the fraudsters who sell replicas of your degrees and transcripts are quite enterprising. While some have established “brokers,” some offer flat “commissions” on sales, and others have established “affiliate” networks, selling links of their Web sites to others, thus receiving first (5 percent), second (5 percent), and third (2 percent) level commissions for degree and transcript sales. Also, in order to increase sales, some also offer a “free verification service” depending on the institutional document they are selling.

You and your institution should also be alert for those fraudsters who are not only selling replicas of your degrees and transcripts, but are also selling various rubber stamps, envelopes, seals, and security paper, all in your name. When this is detected, identify the persons offering these items for sale, then take action.

Just as some colleges and universities have outsourced some of the functions of the registrar’s office to outside companies, the fraudsters have created their own entities in order to “blend in.” We have seen an increased number of purported independent third party transcript archive and verification centers, which provide toll-free telephone numbers where a caller can obtain “graduate verification.” Generally, these entities are also operated by the same fraudsters who produced the fictitious documents.

Many use a Washington, D.C. address as part of their camouflage of legitimacy. Of course, this is done to add an air of authenticity to the dubious supporting documents, such as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web site</th>
<th>No. of institutions whose are...</th>
<th>For Sale</th>
<th>Not Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>instantdegrees.com</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diplomasforless.com</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>16+ states of CT and IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phonydiplomas.com</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>customdegrees.com</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genuinedegrees.com</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diplomaville.com</td>
<td>350+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diplomaservices.com</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fantasydiplomas.com</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affordabledegrees.com</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>righttrackref.com</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
transcripts from the notorious St. Regis University, purportedly a Liberian university. AACRAO's International Education Services office has a St. Regis University transcript on file that shows a toll-free 877 telephone number for “Saint Regis Verifications,” as well as the address and telephone number of the Official Transcript Archive Center (OTAC) (www.transcriptarchive.com), formerly of 611 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E., Washington, D.C., now at 1812 Marsh Road, Suite 6-242, Wilmington, Delaware.

Another example using a Washington, D.C. address to give the impression of legitimacy is the National Academic Archive Registrar (www.academic-archive.com), 4401 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. LBBY A #121, Washington, D.C., which is, not surprisingly, the address of a UPS commercial mail facility.

These purported archivists use mail drop addresses in Washington, D.C. in an effort to appear official, national in scope, or associated with the United States government. Their Web sites state that they verify no documents given to them; they just act as a “clearinghouse” for both institutions and individuals. Their fees charged give a new meaning to the words “à la carte,” as can be seen when you examine their fee schedule.

Ironically, when viewing the OTAC Web site above, you will note links to “Apostille Services” and “Degree Evaluation Attestation.” Both of these links take you to the Web site of a “National Board of Education” (NBE) (www.nationalboardedu.com), which claims to be “recognized by the Education Ministry of the Republic of Liberia” and offers not only accreditation of education and training providers, but also services for individuals, including “degree evaluation,” “degree authentication,” “degree notarization,” and “verification,” all at a price.

In fact, NBE is associated with the infamous St. Regis University and other diploma mills run by individuals behind the St. Regis University operation, and has been declared fraudulent by the Embassy of Liberia in a statement posted on its Web site (www.embassyofliberia.org/news/item_a.html). A “who is” search discussed later) shows that the NBE’s domain name (www.nationalboardedu.com) is registered in Dominica, not Liberia. Further, on the bottom of each page on the NBE Web site, you will observe seals of the United Nations and The Great Seal of the United States next to the wording “United Nations Association of the United States of America and the Business Council for the United Nations.” What does this kind of verbiage have to do with an education board that is supposed to be recognized in Liberia? Sounds too good to be true, doesn’t it?

THE APPOSTILLE

In the past year we have seen an increased effort by degree mills to portray their services (and issued documents) as legitimate, by recommending their customers the Apostille service. With the Apostille service, the documents (transcript, degree, etc.) are authenticated for use in another country through a notarization process. For details on the Apostille process, see LesLee Stedman’s article, “Legalization: The Apostille” in the Summer 2001 (Vol. 77, No. 1) issue of College and University, available online to AACRAO members at www.aacrao.org/publications/candu/index.htm.

The Apostille process starts with having the foundation documents “notarized” by a local notary in the conventional manner, then at the county court level, state level, and finally by the United States Secretary of State. At each level,
another sheet with ribbon and seal is added to the underlying documents. The fee for this process varies by state, from less than $1 to about $35.

This service is offered by St. Regis University for a fee of $1,800, whereas NBE only charges $1,200. Degree mills encourage the Apostille for persons using their transcripts and degrees abroad. As law enforcement has seen in the past (especially when Dr. Henry Kissinger was Secretary of State), persons receiving these documents are blinded by the seals, ribbons, and signatures, and spend little time examining the underlying documents. Again, it’s all camouflage.

Also, we have seen the increased use of foreign credential evaluation or validation services that are now used to further buttress degree mill documents as “equivalent to regionally-accredited U.S. or Canadian degrees.” AACRAO International Education Services staff members have spotted questionable evaluation service Web sites that have “cloned” the Web pages of a long-standing and well-known evaluation service, have fabricated a quote by a leader in the field of foreign credential evaluation, and have even pirated the wording and format used by a highly-respected evaluation service to pass off as their own original product. Regrettably, we have also seen more than one such entity highlight its affiliation with AACRAO. Claiming “affiliation” with, “recognition” by, or membership in such organizations as AACRAO, NAFSA: Association of International Educators, EAIE (European Association for International Education), and other well-known, reputable, and authentic professional associations, is another attempt to give the impression of legitimacy.

**How Do You Detect Fraudulent Transcripts?**

Some institutions do not assign their more experienced personnel the task of handling transcripts and verifications. Like a teller in a bank, this is your first line of defense—this is where alertness, training, and experience come together. Catching the attempt to defraud your institution at this early stage can save you time, litigation, and embarrassment later.

Like an experienced bank teller who can detect counterfeit currency even when blindfolded, your frontline staff should have the skills and experience to be able to detect a fraudulent transcript, or at least become suspicious, just by the look and feel of the document. Here are questions to help you develop that sense that “something just isn’t right.”

- What is your first impression? What do your instincts tell you? Sometimes, you “just know” it’s wrong.
- Are the fonts, horizontal, and vertical alignments correct? What does it look like?
- What is the quality of the paper?

**FIGURE 2A: DETECTING FRAUDULENT TRANSCRIPTS—LOCATION OF SCHOOL AND SENDER OF DOCUMENTS DIFFER IN UNUSUAL WAYS (IN THIS EXAMPLE, TRANSCRIPT FOR A “LIBERIAN” SCHOOL SENT FROM AN ADDRESS IN THE U.S.)**

**FIGURE 2B: DETECTING FRAUDULENT TRANSCRIPTS—RETURN ADDRESS OF INSTITUTION AND POSTMARK INCONSISTENT IN AN UNUSUAL WAY**
Does the envelope bear the correct printed name and correct address of the issuing institution? Is the return address preprinted, is the address typed, or was a rubber stamp used?

Was a postage stamp used on the envelope, or a postage meter machine with the name of the issuing institution?

Does the document contain a current date, or is it “stale dated”? If “stale,” where has it been?

Is the registrar’s signature and embossed university seal correct for this institution? If correct, are they crisp, clear, and legible?

Was the document mailed directly from the registrar’s office at the issuing institution, or is it from a third party? How was the envelope sealed?

Is the overall appearance of this document similar to others you have previously seen from this same institution? Or does it appear to be remarkably similar to a transcript from a different university?

Does this institution really exist? Is this school listed in your AACRAO Member Guide? Is it a regionally-accredited institution in the United States? What if it’s a foreign school? Do you know how to confirm whether it is legitimate?

Do the dates of birth, attendance, graduation, etc. match up? Do the courses correspond to the degree? Do the grades look right or was the student just “too good?”

(See Figures 2A and 2B on the previous page.)

**What are Look-alikes and Sound-alikes?**

A “look-alike” or “sound-alike” is any college or university (and accompanying Web site), which has been expressly established in a name similar to another institution in order to deceive potential students. You and your institution must be constantly vigilant for the fraudster who establishes a Web site with the name of your university or one that sounds very close to it.

For example, an individual set up his own Western Washington State University Web site (www.wwsu.edu [now defunct]), at which he welcomed students, claiming it was “the leader in distance learning education.” Costs for degrees, with transcripts, were listed as $3,500 for a bachelor’s degree, $4,500 for a master’s degree, and $5,000 for a Ph.D. Naturally, as designed, some individuals confused this Web site with the real university Web site for Western Washington State University in Bellingham, Washington (www.wwu.edu). When confronted by personnel of the legitimate Western Washington State University, the only thing the fraudster did was to change the name of his entity to Western Washington International University. He kept the same Web address, and continued his business.

**“Who Is” the Owner of That Web Site?**

An Internet “who is” search of an IP (Internet protocol) of a Web site URL can be a helpful tool to determine or identify the owner of a Web site or the party responsible for content or technical support on a Web site. For example, a “who is” search using the Web site www.whois.net shows that the domain of the National Board of Education (NBE), www.nationalboardedu.com, which claims to be “recognized by the Education Ministry of the Republic of Liberia,” is registered at 7 Old Street, Rosseau, Dominica, not in Liberia (see Figure 3). This should send up a red flag about the identity of this organization. You
might want to do an Internet search for your school’s name to see if you find any “look-alikes” or “sound-alikes,” and if you do, do a “who is” search for the registrant of the domain name. It is a first step in protecting your institution’s name and reputation.

**How Do I Prevent Transcript Fraud? What Is My Role in This?**

I believe these two questions should be addressed together. You have a duty to yourself and to your institution to prevent your institution from being victimized. Again, be proactive! Your institution’s name is at risk.

- Insist that your institution, (if they have not previously done so), trademark your school seal, logo, name, etc. Thus when anyone sells counterfeit degrees or transcripts in the name of your institution, it is an automatic violation of the Trademark Statute (18 U.S.C. 3320). When used properly, this statute can have a chilling effect on counterfeiters, as evidenced by the action of University of Notre Dame officials (via the U.S. Attorney’s office and the FBI), resulting in the prosecution of an individual doing business as UNI/BACD (Unlimited Success Strategies, Inc./Buy A College Degree), Sunrise, Florida. He was prosecuted in United States District Court, Southern District of Florida, for violation of the Trademark Statute relative to his manufacture and sale of degrees and transcripts under the name of Notre Dame. (He also offered hundreds of other colleges and universities.)

- Your institution has clout with both state and federal prosecutors—use it. Write them a letter, file a complaint, and let your voice be heard.

- Be alert for persons selling not only degrees and transcripts in your school’s name, but also offering rubber stamps, seals, security paper, and other means of authenticating your school’s documents. When any of these fraudulent activities are detected, identify the persons offering these items for sale, and then do something about it.

**WHAT DO I DO? HOW DO I DO IT?**

- **Do your research.** Find out what’s for sale. In an effort to “build your case,” do your research on what the fraudster is actually offering. You should consider buying at least one of each of the items being offered for sale under your institution’s name. In this manner, you will be able to recognize the source of some of the fraudulent items that are presented to your institution for verification. Also, be sure to save all envelopes in which these items were delivered to you, as all these items will be later used as evidence, in either threatened litigation, litigation, or by law enforcement in criminal prosecution.

- **Now, take action against the fraudster.** Do this on behalf of your institution, or on behalf of all schools facing a similar situation. Your action can be as simple as your attorney sending the fraudster a “cease and desist” letter, with copies directed to your state’s attorney general, the FBI, U.S. Postal Inspector, etc. Your letter can be similar to the “Gotcha Letter” shown in Figure 4. The fraudster will get the message. If for some reason this has no effect on him/her, consider litigation.

- **Demand action from law enforcement.** Once you and your institution have done your parts, it is up to you to demand that local/state/federal law enforcement do theirs. Demand that they do something. Keep up the pressure by frequently calling the assigned investigator or the prosecutor. Let them know of your institution’s continued interest and that your institution is paying attention. Demand results. If you are successful in getting a case prosecuted, make time in your schedule to attend each court hearing. Each jurisdiction has its own rules regarding “victim witness.” Normally, the District Attorney’s office will complete a form that will be given to the judge hearing the case. Thus, the judge knows that your institution is represented in court and is watching for results. At the time of sentencing, most jurisdictions will offer the victim witness a chance to address the court if there is anything he or she desires to say prior to sentencing. This will be your chance to advise the court if this person has been cooperative or not, has identified his supplier of the counterfeit documents, and of the harm done to your institution. **This is your chance to stand up and be heard.**

**How Do You Handle Fraudulent Documents?**

- Handle/touch the documents as little as possible. Place each original document in a plastic sleeve in order to protect latent fingerprints, original ink signatures/rubber stamps, and printing/typewriting.

Dear [fraud suspect]:

The purpose of this letter is to inform you of the [telephone call or letter] which we received from [current/prospective employer or education institution] in their effort to verify your education credentials. We were advised you had indicated you were a graduate of [school name] and you may have submitted documents to support your graduation from [school name].

Since we are unable to locate any record of your graduation from our institution, we have so advised those persons attempting to verify your purported education credentials.

We hereby request you cease and desist your assertion that you are a graduate of this institution and request you destroy any and all documents which you may have created or purchased indicating your graduation from our institution.

As you appear to be using fraudulent credentials—which may be in violation of various local, state, and federal statutes—we have referred this matter to our university attorney. Additionally, a copy of this letter has been furnished to the FBI and U.S. Postal Inspector for any action they deem appropriate.

**FIGURE 4: SAMPLE “GOTCHA LETTER” LANGUAGE**
Once the original is in plastic, make a working copy to use in lieu of the original.

Retain the original envelope in which you received the fraudulent document. Treat in the same manner as above. This is your only evidence as to how you received the document, and the use of the United States Mail (a violation of the Mail Fraud Statute [18 U. S.C. 1341]).

Date and initial the reverse side of all documents/envelopes.

If faxed documents are involved, save the original fax. The fax header line identifies the sender’s fax machine, and thus is the evidence needed to show if the fax traveled in interstate commerce (Fraud By Wire Statute [18 U. S.C. 1343]).

Retain all fraudulent documents in a secure location for later “chain of custody” by law enforcement. (They will inquire as to where the document has been, and who has had possession since it was received.)

Deterrents to Transcript Fraud:
Devalue the Product and Eliminate the Source

I believe the same approach to degree fraud should be taken with transcript fraud—devalue the product and eliminate the source. By doing this, the laws of supply and demand will take effect.

Embarrass and prosecute those using fictitious transcripts. Should law enforcement execute a search warrant on your false credential case, ensure they understand your desire to obtain a listing of any and all persons who purchase degrees and transcripts in the name of your institution. In all my cases as an FBI agent, as each case was adjudicated in United States District Court, the Assistant United States Attorney placed into the court record a computerized listing of all persons purchasing such degrees and transcripts, along with their addresses, type of degree/transcript purchased, date on document, etc., thus making it a “public record.”

This public document was then immediately available both to any interested college or university, and to the press. To make it more enticing, these listings were alphabetical, by state of residence, and by degree type. Thus, it was easy to identify persons purchasing a degree in a specific area, such as Education, Law Enforcement, or Medicine. This document was a big hit with the press. Several stories appeared in The Chronicle of Higher Education, and other publications, in which they listed the identities of these graduates. Publicity and the resulting humiliation for the purchasers serve as a strong public deterrent, and devalue the product.

At the same time, stop the transcript mill when it first opens. Do not let it establish a presence in the marketplace. If it sells degrees and transcripts of your college or university (or templates containing your blank degrees and transcripts), then consult your university counsel and the Attorney General’s office for prosecution, or as an alternative, for a cease and desist order. Stop them immediately.

With diligence on the part of higher education professionals, the business and employment community, government service agencies, and law enforcement officials, the problem of fraudulent transcripts, and credential fraud overall, can be addressed, and hopefully eradicated in the near future. For this to happen, we each must get involved and do our part. Be a part of the solution, not the problem!
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College Unranked: Affirming Educational Values in College Admissions

LLOYD THACKER, ED., THE EDUCATION CONSERVANCY, 2004
WWW.EDUCATIONCONSERVANCY.ORG $19.95, 220 PP.

Reviewed by: Robert J. Massa

One rule from “Marketing 101” is to have but a single purpose attached to each promotional activity. A brochure that is designed for prospective students and for guidance counselors, for example, rarely works. Lloyd Thacker and his colleagues brilliantly disprove this theory in College Unranked, a collection of essays on the current challenges in college admission from multiple perspectives written by admission deans and presidents. This important book also treats the reader to four interspersed chapters of true stories from the editor, himself a long-time college counselor, about the adventures of high school students and parents as they trudge the road of college admission. At once, College Unranked contains valuable messages for educators, the media, college admission vendors, parents, and students. It is a “deans tell all” book that defines the challenging issues and placing them in perspective, while offering sound advice to its respective audiences about how to end the commercialization and “high stakes” attitude that pervades the contemporary college admission process, restoring “studenthood” to its rightful place.

“Studenthood,” a term coined by Thacker, is defined as “those qualities that equip a student to make education happen, to engage learning as a process. Curiosity, self discipline, effort, imagination, intellectual verve, sense of wonder, willingness to try new things, empathy, open–mindedness, civility, tolerance for ambiguity—these are some of the qualities that define and give value to being a student” (p. 8). The irony is that while these are the exact qualities that colleges claim to be seeking in students, the current commercial environment does not only fall on the shoulders of the colleges themselves, all of whom are eager to fill their classes with the “best” students they can lure while netting the highest revenue possible. Students, parents, and high school profile writers are frequently more concerned about the “prestige factor” than about finding the appropriate match for a particular student. The media is obsessed with the most prestigious schools and focuses on a handful of colleges as representative of the world of higher education (which they are not), while at the same time persisting in the counterproductive “rankings game” which further betrays the concept of “studenthood.” The vendors, large and small, profit and “non-profit,” play to the fears of admissions deans and students in their marketing of products to help colleges achieve their enrollment and revenue goals, and to help students “beat the odds.” Where, oh where has education gone?

The essays cover a wide range of observations about college admission today. Many are written expressly for students and their parents—advice on how to enjoy the journey of college selection rather than to “play the game” and ruin the junior and senior year of high school in the process. Some are written for our admission colleagues and college presidents with the goal of promoting an understanding of how far we have strayed from the original purpose of a college education and what we can do to change our orientation. We spend hundreds of thousands of dollars marketing our institutions rather than investing at least some of those dollars in the academic program. The quest for more and more applications, heavy and competitive non-need discounting, the manipulation of data for ranking purposes—all of these and more are addressed in the essays. At least one essay is directed toward the media and the admission vendors, though portions of many essays cite numerous challenges from these players and offer insightful recommendations.
The last essay in the book is a wonderful summary, written by Thacker. "In some ways," he writes, "this book can be seen as an experiment in community expression for college admissions: a sort of neighborhood meeting—the kind that might naturally develop in response to threats or infringements on the shared values of the community" (p.181). The book is indeed that, but much more. While there is no question that college officials will find much to reflect about and consider within its pages, College Unranked is a resource like no other for students and parents, because it will help them see the shallowness of what they have been told is a “game,” and will, through a careful reading and subsequent family discussion, lead to a sane admission journey for the family. Thacker outlines the problem of the commercially distorted marketplace of college admission and then proceeds to summarize the personal revelations and judgments of selected essayists. He concludes by calling on the professional associations to reclaim “studenthood.”

The book concludes with a chapter of recommendations, also written by the editor, and culled from the various essays. His recommendations specifically address each audience. He enumerates six themes for students with advice regarding each: college is what you make of it; confidence counts; you are doing precision guess-work—and that is ok; there is no such thing as the one perfect college; resist the marketplace mentality of college admissions; and there will always be exceptions (e.g., some of these themes may not apply to you). Thacker gives advice to parents suggesting that “Ivyholism” take a back seat to finding a good fit for the student and allowing them to own the college admission process. He implores colleges to view these challenges as opportunities to provide educational vision and leadership and—a favorite of mine—to stop the admissions “arms race.” While falling short of making specific recommendations to associations such as the College Board and the media, he does ask them to think hard about how standardized testing and rankings have contributed to the health of higher education. He ends on a high note of hope and inspiration, suggesting that “Do the right thing” replace “Just do it” as our mantra on the road to reclaiming “studenthood.”

College Unranked is published by the Education Conservancy (www.educationconservancy.org), a non-profit organization committed to helping students, counselors, and colleges overcome the commercial influence in college admissions. Lloyd Thacker has done education a great service by assembling this book. His passion is evident throughout—a passion that all of his co-authors share. College Unranked is a “must read” for educators, families, associations, and reporters. It represents a beginning—an opportunity to redefine college admission for the 21st century.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Robert J. Massa is Vice President for Enrollment and College Relations at Dickinson College.

The Future of Higher Education: Rhetoric, Reality, and the Risks of the Market

FRANK NEWMAN, LARA COUTURIER, AND JAMIE SCURRY.
JOSEY-BASS, SAN FRANCISCO, 284 PP. 2004. $33.00

Reviewed by: Thomas L.W. Johnson

This book is the result of a series of reports and articles written under the auspices of The Futures Project: Policy for Higher Education in a Changing World. The authors recognize that market-based strategies in higher education are rapidly becoming the norm not only in the United States but throughout much of the world. By market strategies they mean a loosening of regulations that tie higher education to state mandated approvals and close oversight of business practices. Should tuition setting be held to a rigid state formula or should a school be permitted to set tuition in conjunction with its practices of managing its enrollment to achieve its goals and objectives? They argue that the era of setting marketing strategies is here. The question really becomes one of how do we channel that activity to promote the good of society? The authors acknowledge that government intervention plays a legitimate role which they liken to the activity of the Securities and Exchange Commission in overseeing the financial markets of the nation (pp.83 and 86–92). In the authors’ view the state should be monitoring roles, missions, and performance of colleges and universities for which it has responsibility (pp.104–05).

The authors cite surveys which indicate public support for higher education (p.70) but want skills useful in the workplace taught (p.71). Business leaders also support higher education but want skills taught and are interested in how higher education operates. Public officials, on the other hand, want to see higher education as being more flexible, consumer friendly, adaptable, and innovative (p.73).

The authors review efforts to decouple higher education from the pattern of micro-management common in many jurisdictions. The use of the public corporation (p.111), charter colleges, (p.114), and the voucher system (p.118) are discussed. The use of the educational compact receives attention (pp.127–29). Institutional agreements (pp.130-31) are also explained. The authors recommend the use of statewide educational compacts followed up by agreements made at the institutional level. Schools must set learning goals, demand new intellectual skills, and new knowledge. Recognition of the need for educational leadership to respond to questions from both the public and policymakers is stressed. If these questions are ignored, the authors are fearful that higher education will find itself modeled after K-12 with firmly defined, state-dictated modes of setting standards and assessing performance (p.140).

With respect to students who are coming to college for the first time and may be coming from backgrounds in which higher education is not valued, the authors acknowledge that there is much work to be done. Given the limited financial resources available in most states, they would severely limit
the use of merit-based scholarships in favor of need-based awards. They would also make more aid available to part-time and adult students and promote outreach programs designed to engage prospective students’ interest in going to college. They would ensure that a supportive campus environment be in place with adequate advising and counseling resources made available for students. They would support remedial programs where needed, and work to align each level of education to be mutually supportive. Transfer and articulation policies that can be understood need to be put in place and reporting of learner outcomes should be compiled and reported. And finally, decision-making should be based on data gathered and analyzed (pp. 175-179).

First-generation students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds need help to make their way through the thicket of courses, majors, options, and the like. Through strong advising programs and other support services, enlightened institutions can help to set up the student for a successful experience. The old ways of doing things left much to be desired years ago and do not fit the model of a nurturing society eager to expand opportunities for its citizens.

In short, the authors argue that the academy needs to revamp its thinking and accept its share of responsibility for the success of its students rather than place that burden almost solely on the students themselves. Traditionally, universities and colleges have provided the setting i.e., the classrooms, faculty, libraries, laboratories, and computers that students require to be successful. But they have left it to the students to search out what they needed pretty much on their own. This approach may have worked for students who already had an appreciation for the resources available, but it is unworkable for students coming from a broader spectrum of society in which opportunities for higher education are new and strange. The recommendations cited literally turn the traditional approach on its head.

This work clearly sees education as one of the answers to the building of a successful and unifying society. But if opportunity is to be made available to a broad range of society, it also means that the doors must be open to those who aspire to gain an education. Here traditionalists might argue that it is enough to set out what an institution has to offer and let the students pick and choose pretty much on their own. Reformers would likely side with the authors of this study.

The authors make a plea for involving bold leadership in the governance of higher education and the need to seek out that type of leader. They offer opportunities for leadership development as one means of identifying those qualities for the future.

They are also critical of the current state of strategic planning as practiced on many campuses. Plans are too general in nature and do not address specific situations that can be identified and remedied. Too often the plan is written with a
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“one size fits all” mentality when the local situation cries out for specific solutions in problem areas that are easily recognized (p.201). They believe it takes bold leadership to make strategic planning worthy of the name.

The authors are critical of the proliferation of honors programs in institutions that, a few years ago, would not have been considered as a part of their offerings. They see this trend as another attempt to build prestige so as to better compete in the annual ratings game (pp.14-15). And they are critical of the higher education ratings supplied by nationally circulated publications. The ratings emphasize selective admissions, library holdings, faculty with earned doctorates, the amount of research dollars generated, and publications produced. In the authors’ opinion more attention should be paid to learning outcomes of the students enrolled. In their view, drop-out rate, time to degree, and the success of graduates in the working world or in graduate and professional programs are better measures of success and deserve much more weight in the ranking of institutions (pp.143-145).

Readers of this work will find statements to argue over and haggle about. It does not presume to represent the unanimous thinking of the higher education community. But its value lies in the provocative nature of how it treats its subject matter. The principal author, the late Frank Newman, was president of the University of Rhode Island from 1974 to 1983 and for fourteen years was president of the Education Commission of the States, stepping down in July of 1999. He passed away in May of 2004.

Is this book worthy of the time of admissions officers and registrars? In this reviewer’s opinion, the answer is “yes.” Perhaps it does not need to be read cover to cover, but collegiate leaders need to be conversant with the trends and changes in higher education that this work discusses. Admissions officers and registrars are on the front line talking with students and their parents, high school counselors, and principals. They need to possess a comprehensive understanding of the issues and concerns that are current. This book will provide much of that information and in a concise and readable manner.

The book includes extensive annotated notes to include specific references and some narrative that expands on the text itself often with additional data. A bibliography of some 33 pages is also included together with a name index and a subject index. These features help the reader to find references that are buried in the book.

If one has not read the Futures Project report itself, this may be the next best source. This reviewer has touched on the highlights presented in this study. Discerning readers will find much more of interest as they peruse its pages and ponder the recommendations presented.
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