

2010 Academic Senate Retreat
“Higher Education: National Trends and Local Impacts”
October 29, 2010
8:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m. at the Pointe at the Pyramid, CSULB

There are four short articles in this packet. The articles will serve to structure the exchange of ideas and information at the retreat.

1. Glenn, David. “The Quality Question.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (29 August 2010): <http://chronicle.com/article/The-Quality-Question/124185/>
2. Hacker, Andrew, and Claudia Dreifus. “Colleges: Where the Money Goes.” *The Los Angeles Times* (12 September 2010): latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-dreifushacker-college-cost-20100912,0,6821452.story
3. Shea, Christopher. “The End of Tenure?” *The New York Times* (3 September 2010): <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/05/books/review/Shea-t.html>
4. Zemsky, Robert. “Will Higher Education Ever Change as It Should?” *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (3 August 2009): <http://chronicle.com/article/Will-Higher-Education-Ever/47536/>

“The Quality Question” by David Glenn
The Chronicle of Higher Education
29 August 2010

Mediocrity happens. At this very moment at an institution of higher education near you, a mildly hung-over student is finishing a mildly plagiarized paper on travel-industry marketing, for which he'll receive a B-plus. Across campus, an assistant professor is drafting a tepid scholarly article that will eventually be read by 43 people and cited by one. In yet another building, administrators are holding a five-hour meeting about how to spruce up the campus golf course, which is four more hours than they'll devote this month to discussing their stagnant graduation rate.

So far, so familiar.

Virtually everyone agrees that many colleges and universities aren't as good as they could or should be. The conversation gets interesting, though, when people start to talk about whom to blame and how to move forward.

Over the next few months, *The Chronicle* will explore debates about quality in higher education—how to measure it and how to improve it. We will look at the institutions and

social forces that are commonly expected to protect the quality of education: Boards of trustees. Accrediting bodies. Federal and state regulators. Professional organizations and peer review. Market dynamics and consumer choice.

This series, known as "Measuring Stick," will cover a broad territory, but it will always be anchored by two sets of questions.

First, how should quality in higher education be measured? As many critics have pointed out, colleges are usually ranked according to inputs such as their students' admissions-test scores or the number of books in their libraries. Those measures don't reveal much about what colleges do directly for their students.

If I decide to attend College X, what knowledge, skills, job prospects, and habits of mind am I likely to acquire there that I wouldn't have gotten at College Y, or if I hadn't gone to college at all? The rankings systems that exist today make answering that question very difficult. In some people's eyes, that means that colleges have been able to evade accountability for the quality of their most important missions.

Second, are higher education's ostensible quality-control mechanisms functioning well? Trustees, accreditors, regulators, and consumers are all supposed to keep colleges on track. But at many institutions, the incentives seem to be perverse: Students don't feel pressure to put much sweat into their academic work. Faculty members are rewarded for publishing flaccid research, not for teaching effectively. And administrators often feel stronger incentives to build glossy facilities than to lower costs or to improve student learning.

Questions about what students need to know and how well colleges are teaching them are part of an increasingly prominent national conversation, one taken up by the Obama administration and major foundations, which seek not only to increase the number of college graduates in this country but also to ensure the quality of their degrees. As the price of college continues to outpace both inflation and the growth of average family incomes, students, parents, and policy makers are demanding to know just what families are getting for their money.

The short, unsettling answer: No one really knows. Few reliable, comparable measures of student learning across colleges exist. Standardized assessments like the Collegiate Learning Assessment are not widely used—and many experts say those tests need refinement in any case.

The lack of data hardly means, though, that college leaders should stand pat. Studies suggest that colleges can spend their resources more effectively. Institutions that spend more on student academic-support services than their peers, for example, tend to have higher graduation rates.

In the last few years, the federal government, private foundations, and university associations have invested millions of dollars in efforts to improve graduation rates and other student outcomes. Many of those projects are based on the notion of improving

quality by increasing openness. If a college is required to post its less-than-stellar graduation and job-placement rates on a prominent Web site, it might be shamed into mending its ways. Or so the theory goes.

But could such openness backfire? The common federal formula for calculating six-year graduation rates is famously flawed. Even leaving that problem aside, if graduation rates become a high-stakes measure, will colleges be tempted to let students slide through their classes without actually learning much? Similarly, if students' scores on a single senior-year test become a high-stakes measure, will colleges find ways to game those tests?

Those are devilishly hard problems. As an alternative to that kind of number-crunching, some college associations and faculty groups have proposed looser, less formal measures of student learning that could more easily be adapted to each campus's particular culture and mission.

At their best, those looser student-learning measures might be more respectful of the diversity and complexity of higher education. At their worst, they might dissolve into watery, meaningless exercises in self-congratulation. ("Our students acquire excellent critical-thinking skills. Their survey responses tell us so!")

The continuing debates about college quality are happening alongside debates about whether higher education's structure will fundamentally shift during the next 20 years. On one side, prophets are roaming the land proclaiming that information technology will soon radically reduce the cost of college, radically improve the quality of instruction, or both. (Some of those prophets' specific promises might be snake oil, but some of them are probably on to something.) On another side, some critics say that American colleges are so institutionally rigid that they won't respond to the challenges and opportunities brought by new technologies.

In the latter camp is Robert Zemsky, chief executive of the Learning Alliance for Higher Education and the author of *Making Reform Work: The Case for Transforming American Higher Education* (Rutgers University Press). "We are the most moribund field that I know of," Mr. Zemsky said in an interview. "We're even more moribund than county government."

Few people have embraced Mr. Zemsky's favorite remedy—a new system of three-year undergraduate degrees—but many people in higher education will probably agree with his more general proposition: "What we need to do is have a basic discussion about what we want students to be able to do when they graduate from college."

Will faculty members, trustees, and the general public manage to have that basic discussion? If they can, then someday the day-to-day incentives on college campuses might point a little more strongly toward learning. Students might postpone their drinking until after 10 p.m. Faculty members might spend more time reading their students' work, while publishing fewer but better research projects of their own. And golf-course construction on American campuses might come to a halt.

Sara Hebel and Jeffrey Brainard contributed to this article.

<http://chronicle.com/article/The-Quality-Question/124185/>

“Colleges: Where the Money Goes” by Andrew Hacker and Claudia Dreifus
The Los Angeles Times
12 September 2010

Athletic teams, administrators and tenured professors soak up huge chunks of colleges' budgets, and tuition and fees rise to keep up. At Pomona College, a top-flight liberal arts school, this year's sticker price for tuition and fees is a hefty \$38,394 (not including room and board). Even after adjusting for inflation, that comes to 2.9 times what Pomona was charging a generation ago, in 1980.

This kind of massive tuition increase is the norm. In New England, Williams College charges \$41,434, or an inflation-adjusted 3.2 times what it did 30 years ago. USC's current tab of \$41,022 is a 3.6 multiple of its 1980 bill.

Tuition at public universities, in a time of ailing state budgets, has risen at an even faster rate. The University of Illinois' current \$13,658 is six times its 1980 rate after adjusting for inflation. San Jose State's \$6,250 is a whopping 11 times more.

If you look at how that added revenue is being spent, it's hard to argue that students are getting a lot of extra value for all that extra money. Why? Colleges aren't spending their extra revenues, which we calculate to be about \$40 billion a year nationally over 1980 revenues, in ways that most benefit students.

One thing colleges are spending more on is athletic teams, which have become a more pronounced — and costly — presence on campuses everywhere. Even volleyball teams travel extensively these days, with paid coaches and customized uniforms. Currently, 629 schools have football teams — 132 more than in 1980. And all but 14 of them lose money, including some with national names. It's true that alumni donations sometimes increase during winning seasons, but most of those gifts go specifically to athletics or other designated uses, not toward general educational programs.

And meanwhile, the cost of sports continues to rise. The average football squad has gone from 82 to 102 players, due to sub-specialties required by esoteric coaching strategies. The number of women's sports teams has also risen sharply. Since 1980, for example, the number of women's soccer programs has soared from 80 to 956. And teams cost money — often lots of it. Varsity golf at Duke, open to both genders, costs an estimated \$20,405 per player per year. Because there are no revenues for most sports, the deficits often have to be covered by tuition bills.

Another source of increased expense is administration. Since 1980, the number of administrators per student at colleges has about doubled; on most campuses their numbers now match the number of faculty. Here are some of their titles: senior specialist of assessment; director for learning communities; assistant dean of students for substance education; director of knowledge access services.

Needless to say, these officials claim that they offer needed services. Who can be opposed to ensuring access and assessment? But let's not forget that tuition pays for all these deans and directors; having more of them means higher bills for students.

Added tuition revenue has also gone to raise faculty salaries. Yale's full-time faculty members now average \$129,400, up 64% in inflation-adjusted dollars from what they made in 1980. (Pay in other sectors of the U.S. economy rose only about 5% in this period.) Stanford's tenured and tenure-track professors are doing even better, averaging \$153,900, an 83% increase over 1980.

We're told such stipends are needed to get top talent, but we're not so sure. Faculty stars may raise prestige, but they are often away from the classroom, having negotiated frequent paid leaves and smaller teaching loads — underwritten, of course, by tuition. At Williams College this year, for example, three of seven religion professors are taking off all or part of the academic year. Complete data on college presidents' pay is easily accessible only back to 1991. Yet even in that relatively short span, many college leaders have seen their salaries double in inflation-adjusted dollars. Carleton's president today gets 2.4 times more than the president did 19 years ago; at NYU, pay has risen by 2.7 times. Measured another way, it takes the tuitions of 31 Vanderbilt students to cover their president's \$1.2-million annual stipend. We have yet to see evidence that lofting more money to the top enhances the quality of instruction.

In theory, all this extra tuition money should permit the hiring of more junior faculty, which might mean smaller introductory courses. But on many campuses, huge classes remain the norm. One reason is that most teaching budgets are consumed by senior professors. Amherst's tenured professors absorb 77% of the cash available for full-time faculty. At Berkeley, they sop up 73%. At Northern Arizona, it's 75%. The little that's left is parceled out among junior professors and underpaid adjuncts, who despite rising tuitions are doing an increasing portion of the teaching.

The cost of room and board has gone up sharply too, with charges often double or more in inflation-adjusted dollars. At Bowdoin and UCLA, they have gone up three times. Most college tours will show that student living standards have risen too. Rooms once had only iron cots, military mattresses and battered desks. Now suites are wired for electronic gear, with fully-equipped kitchens down the hall. Penn State enables students to legally download music — at last count about 2 million songs a week.

As to dining, food costs may be lower than ever, but not on college campuses, where the quality of campus dining has become a marketing tool. If your memories of dorm food

include mystery meat and overcooked vegetables, you'd be in for a shock on today's campuses. Here were some recent choices in the Middlebury College dining rooms: sun-dried tomato pizzas, African couscous, tandoori chicken, orange-ginger tofu steak, red beans and basmati rice. Whether these more elaborate menus make students more studious is not known.

The travesty of high tuition is that most of the extra charges aren't going for education. Administrators, athletics and amenities get funded, while history departments are denied new assistant professors. A whole generation of young Americans is being shortchanged, largely by adults who have carved out good careers in places we call colleges.

Andrew Hacker is on the faculty of Queens College and Claudia Dreifus teaches at Columbia University. Their book, "Higher Education? How Colleges Are Wasting Our Money and Failing Our Kids and What We Can Do About It," was published in 2010. Copyright © 2010, [Los Angeles Times](#)

latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-dreifushacker-college-cost-20100912,0,6821452.story

"The End of Tenure?" by Christopher Shea

The New York Times

3 September 2010

In tough economic times, it's easy to gin up anger against elites. The bashing of bankers is already so robust that the economist William Easterly has compared it, with perhaps a touch of hyperbole, to genocidal racism. But in recent months, a more unlikely privileged group has found itself in the cross hairs: tenured professors.

At a time when nearly one in 10 American workers is unemployed, here's a crew (the complaint goes) who are guaranteed jobs for life, teach only a few hours a week, routinely get entire years off, dump grading duties onto graduate students and produce "research" on subjects like "Rednecks, Queers and Country Music" or "The Whatness of Books." Or maybe they stop doing research altogether (who's going to stop them?), dropping their workweek to a manageable dozen hours or so, all while making \$100,000 or more a year. Ready to grab that pitchfork yet?

That sketch — relayed on numerous blogs and op-ed pages — is exaggerated, but no one who has observed the academic world could call it entirely false. And it's a vision that has caught on with an American public worried about how to foot the bill for it all. The cost of a college education has risen, in real dollars, by 250 to 300 percent over the past three decades, far above the rate of inflation. Elite private colleges can cost more than \$200,000 over four years. Total student-loan debt, at nearly \$830 billion, recently surpassed total

national credit card debt. Meanwhile, university presidents, who can make upward of \$1 million annually, gravely intone that the \$50,000 price tag doesn't even cover the full cost of a year's education. (Consider the balance a gift!) Then your daughter reports that her history prof is a part-time adjunct, who might be making \$1,500 for a semester's work. There's something wrong with this picture.

The debate over American higher education has been reignited recently, thanks to two feisty new books. **Higher Education? How Colleges Are Wasting Our Money and Failing Our Kids — And What We Can Do About It (Times Books, \$26)**, by Andrew Hacker, a professor emeritus of political science at [Queens College](#), and Claudia C. Dreifus, a journalist (and contributor to the science section of The New York Times), is if anything even harsher and broader than the cartoonish sketch above. It is full of sarcastic asides like "Say goodbye to Mr. Chips with his tattered tweed jacket; today's senior professors can afford [Marc Jacobs](#)." But its arguments have been praised in The Wall Street Journal and given a respectful airing on The Atlantic's Web site. They are also echoed in Mark C. Taylor's **Crisis on Campus: A Bold Plan for Reforming Our Colleges and Universities (Knopf, \$24)**, which is more measured in tone but no less devastating in its assessment of our unsustainable "education bubble."

The higher-ed jeremiads of the last generation came mainly from the right. But this time, it's the tenured radicals — or at least the tenured liberals — who are leading the charge. Hacker is a longtime contributor to The New York Review of Books and the author of the acclaimed study ["Two Nations: Black and White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal."](#) while Taylor, a religion scholar who recently moved to Columbia from [Williams College](#), has taught courses that Allan Bloom would have gagged on ("Imagologies: Media Philosophy"). And these two books arrive at a time, unlike the early 1990s, when universities are, like many students, backed into a fiscal corner. Taylor writes of walking into a meeting one day and learning that Columbia's endowment had dropped by "at least" 30 percent. Simply brushing off calls for reform, however strident and scattershot, may no longer be an option.

The labor system, for one thing, is clearly unjust. Tenured and tenure-track professors earn most of the money and benefits, but they're a minority at the top of a pyramid. Nearly two-thirds of all college teachers are non-tenure-track adjuncts like Matt Williams, who told Hacker and Dreifus he had taught a dozen courses at two colleges in the Akron area the previous year, earning the equivalent of about \$8.50 an hour by his reckoning. It is foolish that graduate programs are pumping new Ph.D.'s into a world without decent jobs for them. If some programs were phased out, teaching loads might be raised for some on the tenure track, to the benefit of undergraduate education.

And if colleges are ever going to bend the cost curve, to borrow jargon from the health care debate, it might well be time to think about vetoing Olympic-quality athletic facilities and trimming the ranks of administrators. At Williams, a small liberal arts college renowned for teaching, 70 percent of employees do something other than teach.

But Hacker and Dreifus go much further, all but calling for an end to the role of universities in the production of knowledge. Spin off the med schools and research institutes, they say.

University presidents “should be musing about education, not angling for another center on antiterrorist technologies.” As for the humanities, let professors do research after-hours, on top of much heavier teaching schedules. “In other occupations, when people feel there is something they want to write, they do it on their own time and at their own expense,” the authors declare. But it seems doubtful that, say, [“Battle Cry of Freedom,”](#) the acclaimed Civil War history by Princeton’s James McPherson, could have been written on the weekends, or without the advance spadework of countless obscure monographs. If it is false that research invariably leads to better teaching, it is equally false to say that it never does.

Hacker and Dreifus’s ideal bears more than a faint resemblance to Hacker’s home institution, the public Queens College, which has a spartan budget, commuter students and a three-or-four-course teaching load per semester. Taylor, by contrast, has spent his career on the elite end of higher education, but he is no less disillusioned. He shares Hacker and Dreifus’s concerns about overspecialized research and the unintended effects of tenure, which he believes blocks the way to fresh ideas. Taylor has backed away from some of the most incendiary proposals he made last year in a New York Times Op-Ed article, cheekily headlined [“End the University as We Know It”](#) — an article, he reports, that drew near-universal condemnation from academics and near-universal praise from everyone else. Back then, he called for the flat-out abolition of traditional departments, to be replaced by temporary, “problem-centered” programs focusing on issues like Mind, Space, Time, Life and Water. Now, he more realistically suggests the creation of cross-disciplinary “Emerging Zones.” He thinks professors need to get over their fear of corporate partnerships and embrace efficiency-enhancing technologies.

Taylor’s eyes also seem to have been opened to the world beyond Williams and Columbia. After his Op-Ed article appeared, a colleague from a cash-short [California State University](#) campus wrote to say that the “mind-pulping” teaching load left no room for research of any kind, even if it fell short of the five-courses-a-semester load at some community colleges. “This is an extremely unfortunate situation,” Taylor writes, “because the escalating cost of higher education is driving more students to these institutions.”

Here we have the frightening subtext of all the recent hand-wringing about higher education: the widening inequality among institutions of various types and the prospects of the students who attend them. While the financial crisis has demoted [Ivy League](#) institutions from super-rich to merely rich, public universities are being gutted. It is not news that America is a land of haves and have-nots. It *is* news that colleges are themselves dividing into haves and have-nots; they are becoming engines of inequality. And that — not whether some professors can afford to wear Marc Jacobs — is the real scandal.

Christopher Shea writes the Brainiac blog for the Ideas section of The Boston Globe.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/05/books/review/Shea-t.html>

“Will Higher Education Ever Change as It Should?” by Robert Zemsky
The Chronicle of Higher Education
3 August 2009

The history of American higher education is well supplied with reform movements that have gone nowhere. Despite fervent calls for change in a number of areas, most often issued by a commission with an impressive masthead, nothing much happens—or worse, the only visible result is hurt feelings and a hunkering down by the college leaders on whom change depends.

But reform, while difficult, is possible. Consider Europe's Bologna Process, a decade-long effort in which the ministers of education from dozens of countries have put in place a process of extended consultation that has resulted in greater integration and cooperation. The process has gone a long way toward creating commonality and interchangeability among Europe's competing systems of higher education—and is being celebrated as a remarkable achievement in multinational reform.

What can would-be reformers of American higher education learn from that? First, the Bologna Process was conceived of as a multiyear undertaking. Second, it linked six sets of key actors: ministers of education, university administrators, student leaders, heads of international organizations, European Union bureaucrats, and policy wonks. And third, a limited number of goals were set, with clear benchmarks.

Would a similar process work to reform higher education in this country? Could the president of the United States ask the secretary of education to organize not a national commission, but a multiyear process? Could the 50 states work together and with Congress to create and carry out strategies to promote purposeful change?

Unfortunately, many people in American higher education would be uncomfortable with the idea of a federally organized process. Leaders of private colleges in particular would argue that the market, for all its imperfections, is a better gauge of what does and doesn't work in higher education. But the problem, as the economist Richard Vedder and others have noted, is that the classic rules of supply and demand apply at best imperfectly to higher education. In a market so awash with federal money—for research support, for grants and loans to students and parents—competitive pressures aren't sufficient to change the system.

Our previous reform efforts have also taught us that:

- Strong rhetoric changes nothing—not even a clear indictment, based on what the reformers believe is overwhelming evidence, will shame the academy into changing.
- Demand for reform must be internal. Faculty members do not necessarily have to want to reform, but they do have to see in the proposed reform a means to a desirable end.

- Like outside reformers, state agencies cannot prescribe change (unless they are prepared for a long, exhausting battle) but must create the conditions that make change possible. Money can't in itself secure the changes reformers want, but unwillingness to invest new money almost guarantees that change won't be forthcoming—especially given higher education's practice of hunkering down when appropriations are cut.
- It is best to focus on truly systemic change. The nature of the academy sucks the air out of piecemeal reforms. People lose interest, and old ways win out. Individual institutions can—and do—change, but their successes tend to pale with time because of the inertia in the system.

For true reform, we need a process that will change most, if not all, institutions simultaneously. What is required is a kind of dislodging event. Such an event might promote reform because the various parts of our higher-education system, despite their distinct missions and organizational arrangements, are linked to one another. What happens in one place is almost always translated into something happening in another.

Over the past three years, I have asked friends, colleagues, students, even potential adversaries, "Can you imagine a dislodging event of sufficient magnitude that it breaks the gridlock that now holds hostage any attempt to reform higher education?" My questions have produced three pretty good answers. Although none may prove feasible or desirable, they suggest that a dislodging event could in fact drive real reform.

Dislodging Event #1: Congress could metaphorically "nuke" today's federal student-aid program, and turn the experts loose to craft a system that supports participation, invests in motivation, and rewards institutions that use aid money effectively. Such a system would link what happens in schools more directly to what happens in colleges, involve better incentives for family savings, and get students—perhaps as early as sixth grade—actively engaged in planning and saving for college.

Jonathan Grayer, a former chairman and CEO of Kaplan Inc., has proposed, in fact, giving every sixth-grader in the nation a \$10,000 stake in a 529 plan—a federally guaranteed college-savings account whose value would grow as that of the federally monitored stock accounts increased over time. The impact would cascade across higher education. Colleges would have both the opportunity and the rationale to work early with school students in their neighborhoods. As a result, they might be committed to grooming and not just recruiting their students. Faculty members might also be more focused on understanding how their would-be students learn as well as determining what they know.

Federally funded 529 plans could even help spark a broad-based consumer movement in which students and their families learn early on to ask tough questions about the nature and quality of the higher education they are purchasing. The administrative side of colleges would have to rethink how prices are set, what services are provided, and what kinds of information would have to be routinely made available.

Dislodging Event #2: Institutions with big endowments have become like hedge funds: They use their accumulated capital to make money through the shrewd buying and selling of capital assets. It is not hard to imagine Congress passing legislation requiring college endowments to pay the same taxes on their earnings from their investments that other, similarly constituted hedge funds are required to pay.

A simple rule could differentiate the strictly commercial from the educational: All dividends, interest, rents, and realized capital gains would be taxed at current rates, but the money owed the IRS would be reduced by the amount of cash an institution withdrew from its endowment to support educational and research programs. In years when the money spent exceeded the growth in the value of the endowment, a credit would be awarded to offset future taxes.

Such a proposal would have little immediate effect on institutions with small endowments. But the megabillion-dollar endowments that often earn annual returns in excess of 15 percent would have to significantly increase their expenditures on education and research or pay substantial federal taxes.

Ultimately this dislodging event would have mixed consequences. Institutions with large endowments that appreciably raised their spending would flourish, and their students would benefit. The rest of higher education, however, could find itself increasingly disadvantaged. One result could be a drastic consolidation of the industry.

Or, if many institutions chose to pay taxes instead of spending more, an unintended consequence might be a renewed scrutiny of academe as a source of tax revenue for cash-strapped states and localities. The resulting fracas would draw state legislatures, and perhaps the public, into an examination of just when a college is an eleemosynary institution or is not.

Dislodging Event #3: What would happen if a Bologna-like process concluded that the standard undergraduate degree in the United States, as in Europe, should be a three-year baccalaureate? With more Americans pursuing advanced degrees, it makes sense to look for ways to shorten the undergraduate portion of their postsecondary education. For many college-ready students, the senior year in high school is something of a waste. More of that year's curriculum could be devoted to acquiring advanced college-ready skills in a foreign language, composition, and mathematics. What's more, an undergraduate education would then cost 25 percent less.

In many ways, the second-order effects of a shift to a three-year baccalaureate curriculum make the proposal attractive and establish its bona fides as a truly dislodging event. Suddenly all the questions about teaching and learning would be on the table as faculty members everywhere would have to wrestle with questions of how to teach what. To judge whether their shorter degree programs were achieving the same learning outcomes as their four-year programs had promised, they would find themselves in need of the performance measures they had hitherto eschewed. Technology might become a

handmaiden of change rather than an educational add-on, while the balance between general and specialized education would have to be restructured.

Those are just a few examples of dislodging events. I am not offering a list of solutions but rather am recommending a fundamental change in how people inside and outside of higher education generally conceive of the reform process. To overcome the gridlock that, for most of the last half-century, has held reform captive, we must create conditions that foster change—even change for change's sake—such that those of us in higher education will own the results

Robert Zemsky is chairman of the Learning Alliance for Higher Education, based at the University of Pennsylvania. This essay is adapted from Making Reform Work: The Case for Transforming American Higher Education (Rutgers 2010).

<http://chronicle.com/article/Will-Higher-Education-Ever/47536/>