

EDHE 6550
Policy Studies in Higher Education
Language #204
Wednesdays, 5.30-8.20 pm
Spring 2015

About the instructor

Barrett Taylor, PhD
Assistant Professor of Higher Education
Mean Green Village #122
T: 940.565.3238
E: barrett.taylor@unt.edu or bjt512@gmail.com

Office hours: Mondays, 2.00 pm – 5.00 pm
Wednesdays, 2.00 pm – 5.00 pm

Although I am in my office almost every weekday, I often have meetings scheduled during these times. I therefore strongly suggest that you email me to make an appointment before coming to my office. Simply write to me at one of the two addresses posted above, noting the days and times at which you are available to meet. I generally reply to email within 24 hours, and often even sooner.

Course objectives

This course is designed as part of a sequence of classes intended to prepare you for work in higher education as a scholar-practitioner. To that end, this course has two complementary objectives.

First, this class will familiarize you with basic principles and current issues of higher education policy. Every scholar-practitioner needs an understanding of educational policy because state and federal policy environments shape virtually every office on a campus. I seek to present core concepts in a way that they may be applied readily to educational practice. I will give special attention to the ways in which these topics touch upon other core issues in higher education – such as organization and administration, finance, and student choices – in an effort to integrate this course’s content with the other classes you will take while at UNT.

Second, this course will help you to develop the range of skills that characterize advanced scholar-practitioners in higher education. Necessary skills include the ability to write clear scholarly prose, and to present academic content orally. Course assignments will be graded accordingly. If you do not possess a copy of a “style guide” to writing, I highly recommend purchasing and familiarizing yourself with one. I remain partial to Strunk and White’s *Elements of Style*, but any of a number of guides can help you to improve your writing. Please note that this is a guide to writing style, mechanics and usage. Strunk and White is not a substitute for the “APA manual,” which is the official referencing guide of this department.

In addition, scholar-practitioners must be able to read and comprehend a variety of sources, including books, policy reports, and peer-reviewed journal articles. This will involve some familiarity with qualitative and quantitative research methods. If you do not possess this familiarity, simply do your best with course readings and raise relevant questions in class. You are responsible for learning all materials presented in the course, so please ask questions that you have so that you can hone your skills as a reader of academic content.

Assignments

There are four assignments in this course:

1. Final examination: This take home exam addresses major themes and content from the first two units of the course. Students will have one week to respond to exam questions using course materials. 30% of final grade.
2. State case studies: Students will present single-state case studies orally in weeks five, six, and seven. The oral presentation should last 10-12 minutes, and will be followed by questions/comments from the class. The case study should explore higher education within a state that is not covered by course readings (ie., not Texas, Georgia, etc.). The case study should draw on data from multiple sources – ie., SHEEO, the state governing agency, the *Chronicle Almanac*, peer-reviewed journal articles – in order to highlight key aspects of the state system. Each report should address:
 - a. The state’s demographics, higher education history, and the composition of the system (publics/privates; two/four years, etc.).
 - b. The state’s governance mechanism (centralized, coordinating, etc.).
 - c. The state’s mechanism for funding higher education (appropriations, student aid, performance- vs. formula-based, etc.).
 - d. The extent to which the state meets goals of access, affordability, and performance outcomes.
 - e. Significant challenges facing the state in the future.30% of final grade.
3. Final project: Final projects will be completed in small groups of 4 students. These groups will function as a policy analysis team. Groups will:
 - a. Identify a particular problem of higher education policy related to one of the topics addressed in Unit IV of the course. This problem must be more specific than the general theme covered that week. For example, “evaluating policy outcomes” is too general, but “tuition deregulation and enrollment patterns of low-income students” might work. Groups must submit single-page write-ups of their topics to the instructor for approval/revision in week four.
 - b. Utilize relevant descriptive data from policy and nonprofit sources to highlight the nature and scope of the problem. The group should specify clearly whether they approach the issue on the **state or federal** level.
 - c. Draw on scholarly sources (ie., course readings, peer-reviewed journal articles, and books/chapters from reputable presses) in order to analyze the problem. Papers should draw on at least one of the major policy analysis and formation frameworks discussed in Unit I.

- d. Based on this scholarly analysis, propose at least three policy remedies that the state/federal body may undertake.

Term papers should demonstrate students' fluency with higher education policy by allowing for detailed exploration of a particular topic, concept, or issue. All papers will analyze the topic in light of course readings and other relevant materials, and also will draw upon external readings. Evaluation is based upon demonstrated knowledge of material, quality of analysis, stylistic clarity, and writing mechanics. Groups will present their reports in weeks 12-15, and will facilitate discussion for approximately one hour as part of their presentation. Groups will submit a paper of approximately 20-25 pages at the conclusion of the course. Each group member also will submit directly to the instructor a confidential one-paragraph statement declaring the approximate share of the project attributable to each group member. The purpose of this submission is not to evaluate individuals' contributions precisely, but to ensure that everyone did approximately equal work toward the final presentation and project. 30% of final grade.

4. Class participation: **Attendance at all course sessions is required.** In accordance with Texas state law, absences on religious holy days will be considered excused. Students must complete assignments within a reasonable time frame after the absence at no penalty to their grade. I request that you let me know at your earliest convenience if you will be observing a religious holy day at a time during which we have scheduled a course meeting. If you must miss a course meeting for any other reason, please notify the instructor immediately. In addition to attendance, students are required to complete all readings and to participate in all class sessions. Please note that "participation" does not necessarily require speaking, and certainly does not indicate speaking out of turn or talking over classmates. 10% of final grade.

Grades and evaluation

A course grade of "A" (90-100) indicates exemplary work. A "B" (80-89) denotes work that meets expectations of a graduate student. A "C" (70-79) is assigned to work that does not meet expectations of graduate student performance. Grades of "D" (65-69) and "F" (<65) are assigned when work is unacceptable.

Late assignments

Assignments are due at the dates and times specified in the syllabus. Late work will be penalized one plus or minus for each day that it is late

Course readings

There are two required texts for this course:

McMahon, W. W. (2009). *Higher learning, greater good*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

In weekly assignments, I will refer to this text as "McMahon."

St. John, E. P., Daun-Barnett, N., & Moronski-Chapman, K. M. (2012). *Public policy and higher education*. New York: Routledge.

In weekly assignments, I will refer to this text as “St. John.”

In addition to these texts, we will read from a variety of book chapters, peer-reviewed journal articles, and policy reports. Some of these documents will be made available to you through an electronic course reserve. This reserve is offered as a convenient way to access materials available through the UNT library, and its contents are intended only for educational “fair use” within copyright provisions (ie., you are not to distribute these documents to others).

Find the course reserve by clicking the “course reserve” link on the UNT library’s main page. You then can search for this class using the course number found at the top of this syllabus. The password for this reserve is “neoliberalstate” (case-sensitive). You must not share this password with others outside the class. Further, library staff will not be able to provide the password to you should you lose it. Please ask a classmate or request a duplicate copy of the syllabus.

Peer-reviewed journal articles are available through the UNT library. They are not part of the electronic reserve because you can find them easily using the citation information found in this syllabus.

A few readings, including those from Thomas Piketty’s (2014) *Capital in the twenty-first century* and Paula Stephan’s (2012) *How economics shapes science*, are available through the UNT library as electronic books. Here again, these chapters cannot be posted as part of the course reserve, but can readily be accessed from the library’s main page.

Finally, policy reports are available publicly through the body that published these documents. A simple google search using information in the citation should take you to the items that you will need to read.

Academic Integrity

All incidents of academic dishonesty will be reported to the Academic Integrity Office within the Office of the Provost. For any act of academic dishonesty, the instructor may impose a sanction from a warning up to and including an “F” in the course. Further and more stringent sanctions may be imposed from the Provost’s Office.

As discussed in the UNT Graduate Catalog (www.unt.edu/catalog/grad):

A strong university is built upon the academic integrity of its members. As an intellectual enterprise, it is dependent upon trust, honesty, and the exchange of ideas in a manner that gives full credit and context to the sources of those ideas. UNT’s policy on the Student Standards of Academic Integrity is designed to uphold these principles of academic integrity. It protects the rights of all

participants in the educational process and validates the legitimacy of degrees awarded by the university.

The policy covers categories of academic dishonesty such as cheating, plagiarism, forgery, fabrication, facilitating academic dishonesty, and sabotage. It includes descriptions of infractions, penalties, and procedures. In the investigation and resolution of all allegations of student academic dishonesty, the university's actions are intended to be corrective, educationally sound, fundamentally fair, and based on reliable evidence. The full policy (18.1.16) is available online at <http://vpaa.unt.edu/academic-integrity.htm>. If I suspect that you have engaged in academic dishonesty, I will deal with the situation as outlined in the University Policy shown above. You will be allowed to remain in the class during the entire time that the academic misconduct accusation is being investigated, adjudicated, and appealed. As noted above, the maximum academic penalty that can be assessed by an instructor is an F in the course. However, university officials use the academic misconduct information to decide if other misconduct sanctions are then to be applied, and the student has separate rights to appeal those decisions, remaining in the class until all appeals are exhausted.

Student Behavior in the Classroom

Student behavior that interferes with an instructor's ability to conduct a class or other students' opportunity to learn is unacceptable and disruptive and will not be tolerated in any instructional forum at UNT. Students engaging in unacceptable behavior will be directed to leave the classroom and the instructor may refer the student to the Dean of Students to consider whether the student's conduct violated the Code of Student Conduct. The university's expectations for student conduct apply to all instructional forums, including university and electronic classroom, labs, discussion groups, field trips, etc. The Code of Student Conduct can be found at www.dos.unt.edu/conduct.

Access to information – Eagle Connect

Your access point for business and academic services at UNT occurs within the my.unt.edu site www.my.unt.edu. All official communication from the university will be delivered to your Eagle Connect account. For more information, please visit the website that explains Eagle Connect and how to forward your email: <http://eagleconnect.unt.edu/>

ADA statement

The University of North Texas makes reasonable academic accommodation for students with disabilities. Students seeking accommodation must first register with the Office of Disability Accommodation (ODA) to verify their eligibility. If a disability is verified, the ODA will provide you with an accommodation letter to be delivered to faculty to begin a private discussion regarding your specific needs in a course. You may request accommodations at any time, however, ODA notices of accommodation should be provided as early as possible in the semester to avoid any delay in implementation. Grades assigned before an accommodation is provided will not be changed. Note that students must obtain a new letter of accommodation for every semester and must meet with each faculty member prior to implementation in each class. For additional information see the Office of Disability Accommodation website at

<http://www.unt.edu/oda>. You may also contact them by phone at 940.565.4323.

SETE

The Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE) is a requirement for all organized classes at UNT. This anonymous short survey will be made available to you at the end of the semester, providing you a chance to comment on how this class is taught. I am very interested in the feedback I get from students, as I work to continually improve my teaching. I consider SETE to be an important part of your participation in this class.

Emergency notification and procedures

UNT uses a system called Eagle Alert to quickly notify you with critical information in the event of an emergency (i.e., severe weather, campus closing, and health and public safety emergencies like chemical spills, fires, or violence). The system sends voice messages (and text messages upon permission) to the phones of all active faculty staff, and students. Please make certain to update your phone numbers at www.my.unt.edu. Some helpful emergency preparedness actions include: 1) know the evacuation routes and severe weather shelter areas in the buildings where your classes are held, 2) determine how you will contact family and friends if phones are temporarily unavailable, and 3) identify where you will go if you need to evacuate the Denton area suddenly. In the event of a university closure, please refer to Blackboard for contingency plans for covering course materials.

Retention of student records

Student records pertaining to this course are maintained in a secure location by the instructor of record. All records such as exams, answer sheets (with keys), and written papers submitted during the duration of the course are kept for at least one calendar year after course completion. Coursework completed via the Blackboard on-line system, including grading information and comments, is also stored in a safe electronic environment. You have a right to view your individual record; however, information about your records will not be divulged to other individuals without the proper written consent. You are encouraged to review the Public Information Policy and F.E.R.P.A. (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act) laws and the university's policy in accordance with those mandates at the following link:

<http://essc.unt.edu/registrar/ferpa.html>

Unit I – Understanding policy

Week 1 – January 20, 2016 – Introduction and overview

Week 2 – January 27, 2016 – Understanding the policy environment

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford.

- Chapter 3, “The Neoliberal State”

Labaree, D. F. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34(1), 39-81.

Mettler, S. (2011). *The submerged state*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Introduction, “Confronting the Submerged State”

Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap.

- “Introduction”
- Available as an electronic book through UNT library

Finance and economics refresher (as needed)

Paulsen, M. B., & Toutkoushian, R. K. (2006). Overview of economic concepts, models, and methods for institutional research. In R.K. Toutkoushian & M.B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Applying economics to institutional research: New Directions in Institutional Research Series, no. 132* (pp. 5-24). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Winston, G. C. (1999). Subsidies, hierarchy and peers: The awkward economics of higher education. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 13(1), 13-36.

Discussion points: revenues; expenditures, costs; equilibrium; value; marginal costs/returns; subsidies; prices; hierarchies; peers; elite vs. access institutions; role of state governments; federal government and HE as a policy instrument; economies of scope and scale; strengths and weaknesses of economic frames of analysis; Piketty & Saez; Keynesianism and neoliberalism; politics vs. policy; competition vs. appropriation; governance vs. steering; the “hollowed out” state; academic capitalism; the old (Fordist) economy; the new (innovation) economy; external control of organizations; relating policymaking to theories

Week 4 – February 3, 2016 – Five frameworks for policy analysis

Liberalism: Rawls, J. (1985). Justice as fairness: Political not metaphysical. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 14(3), 223-251.

- Discussion points: “liberal” in the US and the UK; sovereignty of individual; justice as fairness; veil of ignorance; HE as vehicle of opportunity

Human capital theory: McMahon, chapters 1-2

- Discussion points: portable knowledge and skills; wage premium; HE as economic growth

Efficient market model: Leslie, L. L., & Johnson, G. P. (1974). The market model and higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 45(1), 1-20.

- Discussion points: higher education as a market; portability; competition; rational actor hypothesis

Critical theory: Bell, D. (1980). *Brown v Board of Education* and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 93, 518-533.

- Discussion points: interest convergence; “microaggressions” and critical race theory in higher education research; HE as “sorting” mechanism and reproducer of inequality

Academic capitalism: Taylor, B. J., Cantwell, B., & Slaughter, S. (2013). Quasi-markets in US higher education: Humanities emphasis and institutional revenues. *Journal of Higher Education*, 84(5), 675-707.

- Discussion points: policy incentives and responses; definitions and classifications; HE as means of accumulation; HE as site of contestation; colleges/universities in policy

Students will identify groups and select broad topics from those covered in weeks 12-15.

Unit II – State governance and policy

Week 5 – February 10, 2016 – The structure of state systems

St. John, chapters 7, 11-12

Finney, J., Perna, L., & Callan, P. (2012). *Hard choices ahead: Performance and policy in Texas higher education*. San Jose, CA: National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. Available at

http://www.gse.upenn.edu/pdf/irhe/Hard_Choices_Ahead_Texas.pdf

Finney, J., Perna, L., & Callan, P. (2012). *Perpetuating disparity: Performance and policy in Georgia higher education*. San Jose, CA: National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. Available at

http://www.gse.upenn.edu/pdf/irhe/Perpetuating_Disparity_Georgia.pdf

Richardson, R. C., Bracco, K. R., Callan, P. M., & Finney, J. E. (1999). *Designing state higher education systems for a new century*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

- Chapter one, “The States and Higher Education Governance”

Discussion points: coordinating boards; planning agencies; constitutional autonomy; competition and quasi-markets; mission drift; matching structure/policy to environment; Weberian bureaucracy, specialization, and expertise; centralization; budget and program review; articulation between two- and four-year colleges in a centralized system; competition in a centralized system;

Groups present preliminary topic ideas in class.

Week 6 – February 17, 2016 – State budgeting and accountability

Doyle, W. R., & Delaney, J. A. (2009). Higher education funding: The new normal. *Change*, 41(4), 60-62.

McGuinness, A. M., & Novak. (2003). *Foundations for the future: Higher education in South Carolina*. Boulder, CO: NCHEMS. Available at

<http://www.che.sc.gov/InfoCntr/Foundations.pdf>

- Tandberg, D. A., & Hillman, N. (2013). *State performance funding for higher education: Silver bullet or red herring?*. Madison, WI: WISCAPE. Available at: <http://www.wiscapewisc.edu/wiscapewisc/publications/policy-briefs>
- Zumeta, W. (2001). Public policy and accountability in higher education: Lessons from the past and present for the new millennium. In D.E. Heller (Ed.), *The states and public higher education policy* (pp. 155-197). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Discussion points: historical emergence of the balance wheel model; theoretical rationale behind this shift; performance funding; performance budgeting; consequences of performance measurements

Four students present state case studies in class

Week 7 – February 24, 2016 – State-funded student financial aid

St. John, chapter 8-9

- Hearn, J. C., & Longanecker, D. (1985). The enrollment effects of alternative postsecondary pricing policies. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 56(6), 485-508.
- Toutkoushian, R. K., & Hillman, N. W. (2012). The impact of state appropriations and grants on access to higher education and outmigration. *The Review of Higher Education*, 36(1), 51-90.
- Zhang, L., Hu, S., Sun, L., & Pu, S. (2016). The effect of Florida's Bright Futures program on college choice: A regression discontinuity approach. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 87(1), 115-146.

Discussion points: “high tuition, high aid” model and accountability; theoretical rationale behind this model of HE funding; purpose of merit aid programs; effects of merit aid programs; unintended consequences of merit aid programs; is merit i.i.d.?

Four students present state case studies in class

Week 8 – March 2, 2016 – Policy formation at the state level

- Griswold, C. P., & Marine, G. M. (1996). Political influences on state policy: Higher-tuition, higher-aid and the real world. *Review of Higher Education*, 19(4), 361-389.
- Lacy, T. A., & Tandberg, D. A. (2014). Rethinking policy diffusion: The interstate spread of “finance innovations.” *Research in Higher Education*, 55(7). DOI: 10.1007/s11162-014-9330-2
- Ness, E. C. (2010). The politics of determining merit aid eligibility criteria: An analysis of the policy process. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 81(1), 33-60.

Discussion points:

Four students present state case studies in class

Unit III – The federal role

Week 9 – March 9, 2016 – Federal student financial aid

Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance. (2010). *The rising price of inequality*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education.

Archibald, R. B., & Feldman, D. H. (2011). *Why does college cost so much?*. New York: Oxford. Chapter 11, “Outside Financial Aid.”

Hearn, J. C. (1998). The growing loan orientation in federal financial aid policy: A historical perspective. In R. Fossey and M. Beteman (Eds.), *Condemning students to debt* (pp. 47-75). New York: Columbia University.

Four students present state case studies in class

March 16, 2016 – No class – Spring Break

Week 10 – March 23, 2016 – The federal government and R&D

McMahon, Chapter 6

Kerr, C. (2001). *The uses of the university*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Chapter 2, “The federal grant university”

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (1996). The emergence of a competitiveness research and development policy coalition and the commercialization of academic science and technology. *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 21(3), 303–339.

Stephan, P. (2012). *How economics shapes science*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard. Chapter 6, “Funding for research.”

- Available as an electronic book through UNT library

Taylor, B. J. (2016). The field dynamics of stratification among US research universities: The expansion of federal support for academic research, 2000-2008. In S. Slaughter, & B.J. Taylor. (Eds.), *Higher education, stratification, and workforce development: Competitive advantage in Europe, the US, and Canada* (pp. 59-79). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

- Available as an electronic book through UNT library

Instructor will answer students’ questions as an exam review

Final exams distributed in class

Week 11 – March 30, 2016 – Final examinations submitted to barrett.taylor@unt.edu no later than 5.30 pm

Unit IV – Current issues in higher education policy

Week 12 – April 6, 2016 – Access and affordability

St. John, chapters 5, 6

Archibald, R. B., & Feldman, D. H. (2011). *Why does college cost so much?*. New York: Oxford. Chapter 12, “The college affordability crisis.”

Archibald, R. B., & Feldman, D. H. (2008). Why do higher education costs rise more rapidly than prices in general?. *Change*, 40(3), 25-31.

Bastedo, M. N., & Gumport, P. (2003). Access to what? Mission differentiation and academic stratification in U.S. public higher education. *Higher Education*, 46(3), 341-359.

Student group presents and facilitates discussion in the second half of class

Week 13 – April 13, 2016 – Completion

Garrison, W. (2012). It’s not so easy: The completion agenda and the states. *Liberal Education*, 98(1), 34-39.

Mullin, C. M. (2011). *The road ahead: A look at trends in the educational attainment of community college students* (Policy Brief 2011-04PBL). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

- Available from aacc.nche.edu

Rhoades, G. (2012). The incomplete completion agenda. *Liberal Education*, 98(1), 18-25.

Student group presents and facilitates discussion in the second half of class

Week 14 – April 20, 2016 – Co-evolution: Higher education and economic development

Hillman, N., & Orians, E. L. (2013). Community colleges and labor market conditions: How does enrollment demand change relative to local unemployment rates?. *Research in Higher Education*, 54(7), 765-780.

McMahon, chapter 3

Stephan, P. (2012). *How economics shapes science*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard. Chapter 9, “The relationship of science to economic growth”

- Available as an electronic book through UNT library

This American Life. (2011). When patents attack [podcast]. Minneapolis, MN: American Public Media.

Student group presents and facilitates discussion in the second half of class

Week 15 – April 27, 2016 – Globalization and higher education policy

St. John, chapters 13-14

Marginson, S. (2016). Global stratification in higher education. In S. Slaughter and B. J. Taylor (Eds.), *Higher education, stratification, and workforce development: Competitive advantage in Europe, the US, and Canada* (pp. 13-34). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

- Available as an electronic book through UNT library

Slaughter, S., & Cantwell, B. (2012). Transatlantic moves to the market. *Higher Education*, 63(5), 583-606.

Taylor, B. J., & Cantwell, B. (2015). Global competition, US research universities, and international doctoral education: Growth and consolidation of an organizational field. *Research in Higher Education*, 56(5), 411-441.

Student group presents and facilitates discussion in the second half of class

May 4, 2016 – Final papers submitted electronically to barrett.taylor@unt.edu no later than 5.30 pm.