

Lindenwood University

Digital Commons@Lindenwood University

Faculty Scholarship

Research, Scholarship, and Resources

2013

Market Forces and the College Classroom: Losing Sovereignty

Michael Stein

Christopher Scribner

David Brown

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/faculty-research-papers>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Market Forces and the College Classroom: Losing Sovereignty

Michael Stein, Christopher Scribner, and David Brown

This essay's focus is local and anecdotal. Using concrete examples from our own university we consider incremental changes, driven largely by concerns over external assessment and accreditation, that have altered the sovereignty professors once had in the classroom. At the same time, this turn of events is clearly more than local, and the anecdotes we offer are hardly confined to our institution alone. Thus, prior to "entering the college classroom," we must give consideration to market forces and such attendant issues as competition, standardization, bureaucracy, mass production, and technology. Although globalization did not create these forces, it has accelerated and exacerbated them. These forces have greatly modified traditional workplaces. Traditional industries such as print journalism are a clear example. It is assumed that people who do not adjust to these changes will be isolated and eventually left behind. Market "discipline" is now seen as a solution to a variety of problems. Proponents claim that competition can be the best and fairest distributor of goods and services. A by-product of such thinking has been the commodification of many things not previously thought of in such terms. Health care in the United States is one example. Increasingly, so is education.

As a consequence of these forces, education has become yet another product to be marketed. Market solutions to various educational crises have become common. Ancillary industries arise to facilitate the delivery of education, promoting the latest techniques and technology to ensure that students are engaged and successful. For some time the focus has been on K–12 public schools, especially those in inner cities. Outcomes on standardized tests, expressed in numerical terms, have become the ultimate and, in some cases, the only indicators of success. With threats of funding cuts or outright school closures, pressure mounts and focus narrows. With so much at stake, “teaching to the test” has become a common though lamented strategy. Although some success can be noted, so too can scandals in places such as Atlanta and Washington, DC, where miracles in improved test scores have been shown to be the result of various manipulations, including excluding some students from taking the exam, offering “hints” as to questions and answers, and simply changing answers after the tests have been taken.¹ These forces have also had an impact beyond troublesome schools. Social concerns have had a significant effect on the production of textbooks. The outside effect of the Texas State Board of Education on the content of texts in such subjects as history and social sciences had a nationwide effect on publishers and has caused great concern among high school teachers.²

Our concern here is with higher education. The forces noted above—standardization, bureaucracy, technology, and, especially, a general faith in market solutions, have likewise altered higher education as well. We provide examples of these broad forces at our own university. We specifically consider effects on the classroom, from syllabus construction to external evaluation. Embedded in these effects reside threats to academic freedom.

Market Forces and the Ivory Tower

It is too romantic a notion to suggest that the academy is a world set apart, that the ivory tower stands above and detached from the world around it. The medieval model of master and acolyte no longer applies. If nothing else, the sheer number of students being educated requires adjustments. Certain concessions to modernity must be granted. Sociologist Max Weber was

correct in asserting that bureaucracy—with all its spirit-numbing qualities—is the most efficient means for completing large-scale tasks, and a necessary feature of the modern world.³ Colleges of any size will be bureaucratic in organizational form. Likewise, the onslaught of technology will not be stemmed by any Luddite revolt.

Not so long ago, college was seen as a special setting, a kind of haven where students could hold full adulthood in abeyance and consider their place in the world, ruminate over issues large and small, and, if necessary, “find themselves.” In the past, a majority of entering freshmen would express nonmaterial goals such as learning new things or in some way bettering the world as their reason for going to college.⁴ Exposure to a wide array of disciplines and ideas, especially those that might be seen as exotic, counterintuitive, head-scratching, or even a bit threatening, was seen as intrinsically valuable, and a critical component of the college experience. This was especially true in connection with general education and the liberal arts. The professor would do just that—*profess*—and thus was a principle medium of new ideas and points of view, having great latitude in choosing assigned readings, the style of presentation, and the means of evaluation. This represented part of the classroom portion of academic freedom; similar rights and responsibilities govern our research activities. The broad changes we note here have been incremental rather than sudden. They are likewise pervasive; the specific examples we provide are hardly exclusive to our university.

Business, an increasingly popular major, is now seen as offering an appropriate model for describing, understanding, and guiding the “enterprise” of higher education. Students today are more likely to cite instrumental than expressive goals as their primary reasons for attending college.⁵ “Getting a job” and “making a lot of money” now dominate as motives for students. There are some good reasons for this. Many jobs, careers, and vocations are credentialed and require some sort of postsecondary training. Costs for all these pursuits, whether expressive or instrumental, have dramatically risen, and parents and students increasingly expect some sort of return on their investment. Economic forces and conditions are part of the calculus, and to pretend otherwise would be naive. At the same time, we feel we are not alone in thinking that

something of real, though not of economic, value has been taken away in the process. Part of the appeal and charm of college life was that it was something apart from the real world and provided the time, space, and atmosphere conducive to considerations not at all related to job, career, or vocation. It was about examining life, existence, and meaning.

These changes may be observed in ways subtle and otherwise. Through the years at our university, more than one member of our faculty has taken exception and offense at our school's being referred to as a "business" and students as "customers" or "consumers." An analogy to another institution suggests why: imagine a church. Certainly relevant and important matters of business will arise there, including salaries and budgets to which attention must be paid. Still, if one refers to the church as a business and the congregants as customers, many would take offense and understandably so. Likewise, whatever the business and economic concerns, we remain a university, and those mostly young people milling around are students. This trend has happily been muted here, after some faculty members expressed written and vocal concern. Still, some of our administrators and certainly some of our board members are veterans of the corporate world and often speak of educational markets, and view other schools in the area as our competitors.

In order to compete successfully, schools seek to drum up business by advertising their unique benefits. Keeping up enrollments is, of course, an economic necessity, especially for schools like our own that are largely funded by tuition. Competition for students has become increasingly global. When our institution, Lindenwood College, became Lindenwood University more than fifteen years ago, one reason the administration gave for the change in designation was that many international students understand "college" as the equivalent of "high school" and therefore would not give us a second look.

This competition for students arises within the academy as well. A class must produce sufficient enrollment to "make," and sometimes the professor must market it with posters or by appealing to fellow faculty members and academic advisors. In some instances, new offerings may be seen as a threat to the enrollments of existing classes, with "turf wars" as a possible

consequence. This would seem to be especially true in general education. Even where a solid liberal arts curriculum with a general education core may be found—including, happily, our own university—students may question the relevance of such classes to their career choice.

Specialization is the watchword; this too is partly a product of the economic forces we have described. While classics was once a major found in most colleges and universities, including our own, the paucity of economic demand for Latin or for expertise in the plays of Euripides relegates the classics field to a shrinking island of esoteric value occupied mainly by those elite schools whose students can afford to engage in such pursuits. Though we may still proclaim good writing to be valuable to business, pursuers of careers may view classes in sociology or Shakespeare as offering little (economic) value, and thus as a waste of time. The compartmentalization of such courses—a bureaucratic necessity that may likewise be a source of turf battles—may also work against the organic ideal of education. The fear here, as elsewhere, is that after completing a required general education course students might tell themselves, with relief, “I never need to think about history or philosophy again.”

Economic demands and other forces we have noted have also led to various accelerated programs, themselves aimed at a growing market—nontraditional students—most of whom are already in the workforce but need more education to advance their careers. This is an increasingly important segment of the higher education market, as one can readily see in the advertisements aimed at them.

It would be an overstatement to suggest that the academy has become nothing more than a “widget factory” mass-producing educated “cogs” for the benefit of corporate interests. Still, the notion of “McDonaldization” of the modern world can be and has been applied to higher education.⁶ Certainly the rise of for-profit universities, whether on brick and mortar campuses or in “virtual” forms, is an example of the forces suggested above. Standardization and efficiency are among these schools’ hallmarks, as anyone who has ever taught for them will attest. They are also another competitor in the educational marketplace. That the “founders” of

such schools often come from the higher levels of the corporate world should surprise no one; nor should the salaries these executives command.

Technology as Solutions

Technology has had an obvious effect on education, whatever the level. The professor as didact is increasingly replaced by the professor as projectionist. Whenever problems in education arise, be they real, virtual, or in some way manipulated, the markets develop solutions, sometimes to problems they themselves create. As has often happened in the past, technology is heralded as a “magic bullet” responding to “today’s” student, who is said to be like no other. Computer-assisted learning and teaching does constitute a kind of revolution, and this is certainly evident in the marketing of college and the classes offered. As amazing as these technologies may be, we believe learning still consists of fundamentals. An analogy may suffice here: A number of weight-loss regimens appear from time to time, including the Atkins, South Beach, and gluten-free diets, to name but a few. It nonetheless remains a fact that losing weight will always require expending more calories than are consumed. In the present case we speak not of losing weight but of gaining knowledge. Recent educational emphases such as the focus on self-esteem or on different learning styles, both of which seem to be fading, cannot alter the fundamentals of learning. Technology has greatly enhanced “distant” learning and forever altered the classroom. Whether this represents a magic bullet or a misfire is subject to debate.

Online courses are quickly becoming a necessary ingredient for any university that wishes to compete for students, and they have recently become part of our own curriculum as well. Their increasing availability offers obvious benefits of access and reach, though at times reach may exceed grasp. On the global level, massive open online courses (MOOCs) are dubbed by Laura Pappano “the occupational happening of the moment.”⁷ Although this trend has yet to have much impact on our campus, such offerings have raised a general alarm about standardization, the privatization of public education, the loss of faculty jobs, and the alteration of classroom based professor-student interaction.⁸ What is left out of such electronically

mediated intellectual experience is an appreciation of the embodiment of human beings. For all the advantages this brave new educational world may provide, we believe the physical presence matters because we are physical human beings. That is, we believe that face-to-face interaction involves intangible qualities that are missing when mediated by electronic means.

Technology has also provided commercial products for classrooms distant and present, mostly in electronic form, and promise various breakthroughs. They are brought to us by companies like Magna Online Seminars,⁹ whose e-mails we receive daily. They provide a virtual bandolier of magic bullets. One may learn—for a price—how to choose “Between Synchronous & Asynchronous Activities” (September 28, 2012), receive “Recommendations for Blended Learning” (December 12, 2012), or “Backward Design for Disciplinary Thinking” (January 23, 2013). But wait, there’s more! One may purchase (three different ways) what one needs to know about “Academic Freedom and Free Speech” (October 23, 2012). One is at times reminded of a Tony Robbins business seminar with its cult-like numerology. There are: “Four Strategies to Engage Students” (January 18, 2013), “Five Free Tools for Connecting and Engaging Online Learners” (November 28, 2012), “Eight Keys to Marketing Your Online Program” (December 12, 2012), “Nine Essential Traits of the Effective Professor” (October 3, 2012), and “Ten Ways to Improve Blended Course Design” (December 11, 2012). These examples seem the perfect blend of the forces we have addressed: College as a business needs to deliver its product in an increasingly competitive marketplace. Technology provides a medium for learning distant or near, and ancillary businesses arise to offer to better serve the market with convenience and “low, low prices.”

Electronic technology has changed the pace of the classroom as well as its nature. Information from the syllabus or class content delivered electronically need not be retained in (human) memory, as it can easily be retrieved using iPhones. Recalling facts, whether for application or mere “regurgitation,” requires nothing more than pushing a button on a device; memory fades along with attention. We agree that in certain classes (math comes to mind) such frequent and instant feedback is beneficial and electronic devices are a real boon to instruction

and learning. Other types of knowledge (literature or poetry, for example) are more contemplative and require reading, thinking, rereading, and rethinking the material. Whether we see these devices as aids or impediments to instruction, we believe the decision should be entrusted to the professor. We do note, however that their instantaneous quality can create an expectation of frequent and sometimes instant feedback. This is true for both students and administrators. We have found this to be particularly true during times of assessment and evaluation.

Local Manifestations: Assessment and the Syllabus as Solution

The comments above are meant as a broad background to the “local” case we present below. We wish to suggest that an aspect of academic freedom—the sovereignty of the classroom—is being lost, or at least compromised. Talks with colleagues and examinations of other school’s websites suggest we are hardly alone in some of these concerns. Research-oriented universities in our area, including one widely considered as “elite,” face some of the same strictures that we do. Like the broader changes noted earlier, this movement has been incremental.

The three of us are full-time and long-term professors at an institution that has proclaimed itself as a “teaching university.” Although the current administration has renewed an acknowledgement, appreciation, and support for research, faculty members remain committed to the classroom, and teaching remains a central part of our obligation. We are pleased to say that we still offer a general education curriculum with a strong liberal arts focus. Our enrollment and our campus have experienced remarkable growth over the past two decades. Near bankruptcy before our arrival, our endowment has been replenished, and by all measures we are in good financial shape. Other positive changes have included stronger faculty governance. Though our teaching load is greater than that of colleagues at most similarly situated institutions, it has been reduced, and more recently further reductions have been negotiated by faculty members engaged in research. The threats we see originate not from our administration per se but from the forces discussed above.

Traditionally, academic freedom in research and the classroom has meant, among other things, being able to pursue ideas or issues that may be exotic, provocative, controversial, or otherwise “far out.” With the rising influence of the corporation, research has at times been compromised, at times in spectacular ways. Results of research have been sometimes treated as a commodity that can be purchased like any other product. Marcia Angell has shown in great detail the various ways “Big Pharma” purchases results it wants and suppresses or modifies those that do not advance its economic interests.¹⁰

Such examples have received a good deal of attention both within and outside the academy and need not concern us here. Although the classroom is, to the outsider at least, the most familiar aspect of higher education, it is less often analyzed as a site of academic freedom. We should point out that the threats we feel have to do less with style or content than with format. Although the forces we have discussed are manifested in a more subtle and, to some, more trivial fashion in the classroom, they nonetheless have increased bureaucratic uniformity at the expense of spontaneity, creativity, and other forms of pedagogical expression.

When do mere annoyances become infringements? Perhaps when external assessment becomes the ultimate arbiter of what constitutes quality in the classroom. We are not alone in needing to satisfy demands that our “product” meet preordained, measurable, and quantifiable results; it is simply again our turn. “Management by objectives,” once confined to the corporation, is now a common currency in colleges and universities. *Accountability* is the watchword, with an emphasis on the “counting.”

A kind of “quantaphrenia” that assumes most anything can be reduced to a numeric scale has taken residence on our campus. “Measurables” are the new currency, and professors had best be familiar with them. We are now told by Educational Testing Service—a business whose existence relies on large part on the perceived need for these exams—that the motivation of those taking the exams is critical to the entire enterprise, and thus itself needs measuring.¹¹ Yet another metric is added to the pile. What has been described (for the past several years) as an “ongoing” assessment process seems rather to be “never ending.”

Part of the dilemma here may lie in important differences in content and epistemology. Howard Pollio, for instance, has noted differences in style and motivation in learning and teaching between the natural sciences and humanities.¹² Thus, one the authors of this essay, who chairs the philosophy department, must not only deal with syllabi (discussed below) but also report to administrators on new trends and techniques in teaching, and how they will be measured in classes. It is not surprising that educators trained in math, engineering, and other “hard” sciences are often more comfortable with an exercise that reduces phenomena to numeric expression of measured certainty and predictability. The gains in science, technology, and engineering, to name a few domains, are indeed breathtaking. For certain questions and problems the application of science is clearly the optimal way of finding things out, making predictions, or offering solutions. Whether this approach allows for the conveyance of knowledge in nonscience classrooms is another issue. Gilbert Highet suggests that teaching, whatever the subject matter, is something closer to art than science.¹³ To the extent this is true, attempts to reduce the process to a post-hoc, universally agreed upon numeric metric may be intrinsically problematic.

This last statement may again strike some as overly romantic. As we have acknowledged, concessions must be made to the “real world” and its demands. Higher education is bureaucratic, and accreditation requires that we answer to still other, external bureaucracies. Certainly the notion of wanting somehow to assess how students are learning is reasonable, especially when economic issues of payoffs and efficiencies come to the fore. Somewhere along the line it was determined that grades were not assessment, though when an experienced and expert assessor spoke to our faculty a few years ago, she said essentially that although grades are not assessment, sometimes they can be. In an exercise during the same session, she noted that although most of the objectives listed for a social science class were appropriate, one was not “measurable.” She said this despite having given approval to an objective listed by the music faculty that “students will play music artistically.” We have faith in our music faculty and trust their expertise to make such evaluations. We only ask that we be granted the same

discretion. In fairness, we should note that our music colleagues are no doubt officially struggling with the same issues we struggle with. Even in the humanities one may find support for the process of external assessment,¹⁴ although cautions are noted. Other assessments of the assessment process range from the polemical to the practical and suggest threats to academic freedom in the classroom.¹⁵ One worry frequently expressed by the faculty at Lindenwood is how much time it takes to respond to assessment demands, which threaten to redirect or divert attention away from the classroom and toward the dictates of accrediting agencies. Laurel Barrington suggests that assessment interferes with classroom teaching in at least two ways: by unnecessarily duplicating efforts and by taking time away from more effective methods.¹⁶ (As we will show, such duplication and diverted attention also plagues syllabus creation.) This sometimes nudges the professor toward two unavoidable options: fabricating data and “teaching to the test,” both of which at one time seemed restricted to K–12 schools. In either instance, the range of choices (i.e., freedoms) traditionally granted to the teaching professor is at least compromised.

Irony abounds: Given all the emphasis on objective outcomes through scientific (i.e., measurable, “hard”) data, we, along with John Powell and Scott Jaschik, are astonished to learn that no comparisons with control groups can be found in the assessment literature, and that a fundamental condition of doing science thus has yet to be employed.¹⁷ Furthermore, for all the “hard,” measurable, objective data that the proponents of assessment have demanded, scores for reading comprehension, writing comprehension, and math do not suggest any significant improvement. Worse still, recent surveys suggest that many students believe themselves to be proficient in these areas, regardless of what the objective findings reveal.¹⁸ Even members of the Higher Learning Commissions (HLC) admit to a certain confusion in the definition of terms. We have been called to meetings designed to help prepare our faculty for the assessment visit coming in October. At one such meeting, a hired consultant discussed things we could anticipate and handed out supporting material. This included an insert prepared by the HLC itself.¹⁹ This insert noted that “goals and outcomes are used inconsistently by member

institutions in the context of assessment of student learning to the extent that one institution's goal may be another's outcome and vice versa."

This is the third experience of an HLC visit for the senior author of this essay. Each of these visits revealed clear and focused concerns of the administration. The first visit was conducted shortly after the aforementioned author joined the faculty, during the reign of a "top-down," corporate management style. At that time, campus governance was a clear concern of the HLC as well as of the faculty. A change in administration has resulted in a number of improvements in that area, and such concerns are now seldom expressed. The second visit, ten years ago, zeroed in on the issue of student retention. One consequence of this was the introduction of a policy of entering four-week grades. Although there were strong suggestions that some sort of quiz, exam, or other evaluation should be given within this time, this was not made mandatory. In addition, the four-week check on student progress requires only a "pass/fail" response. It was also at this time that faculty members began to receive directions about the style and content of syllabi. Although nothing was suggested as to the style or content of the classes themselves, incremental dictates in how the syllabus should be constructed have reached a point where annoyance at least borders on infringement.

At one time a syllabus—whose style and form were left to the instructor's discretion—referred only to a particular class. Varying in detail, it could be a brief and broad outline informing the student of the professor's name, office location, office hours, and office phone number, the assigned readings, and a schedule of exams and the material they would cover, as well as the exams' relation to the course grade. This certainly describes the format followed by one of us, whose syllabi, until last year, consisted of less than a single page. Others might produce considerably more detailed syllabi including a day-by-day accounting of material to be covered. In either case the syllabus was a kind of contract, but a contract between the student and professor only, and the conditions therein were understood to apply to that course only.

Gradually, requirements that initially applied only to syllabi for courses in general education (itself an intrusion) have expanded to all classes. Goals and objectives, once assumed

for any class (e.g., read, comprehend, and apply assigned material to the best of your ability) must not only be spelled out; they must be uniform as well. A bewildering array of acronyms and abbreviations—OA, SLOs, PSLOs, and ISLOs—dictates a template for all syllabi and covers “outcomes” (which, as the HLC has noted, may be confused with “goals”) for general education, departments, and programs. This new expectation sometimes even dictates the exact wording that is to appear in the syllabus. A page-and-a-half description of various forms of cheating includes (appropriately, one must admit) a “works cited” segment. This “full coverage” now even includes accounting for the time students are expected to study outside the classroom. After defining “student work” in the classroom, we are expected to apply a ratio of two hours a week outside of class for each credit hour. These documents are now sufficiently complex that department chairs have to provide us with a checklist for the eighteen expected categories to ensure that they have been included. This, we can only hope, represents a final iteration, as several earlier versions have been suggested this academic year. For one department, the mandatory syllabus information now comprises nineteen pages.

Clearly these demands originate outside the university. It was only after the HLC visits that administrators paid any attention to the syllabus, which is now entered as a “supporting document” and as “data” to be examined and approved by people far removed from the classroom. What was once easily and satisfactorily accomplished with a single page now requires volumes. It is as if a table of contents takes precedence over the contents themselves. For those preparing new classes, opportunities for spontaneity and creativity are fast being replaced by uniformity. Our university, which once proudly proclaimed itself as not being a “one size fits all” sort of place is becoming just that. These demands now reach out further in time as well. Completed syllabi for all classes for the coming fall are due by no later than the end of May.

Summary and Conclusions

We have considered in this essay how the forces of markets, competition, bureaucracy, technology, and the like have altered higher education. We believe that these forces, which have only intensified with globalization, visit the campus in a variety of ways. The competition for students has increased, and college and universities must adapt and find their niche or go out of business. Values associated with the corporation are evident everywhere and are reflected in myriad ways. To successfully compete for and retain students, schools must adapt to these market forces. Lindenwood's transformation from a college to a university is one example. The creation or abandonment of majors or specialties within them reflects in part changes in the economy. Students and their parents expect a return on their investment. The need for and use of technology only increases, and bureaucracy is a necessary means of educating students, whatever their numbers. The brick-and-mortar campus needs an online presence to compete for students and survive. Classrooms themselves are now "smart," and we are increasingly dependent on the tools they offer.

We have conceded these and other points; to ignore them is tantamount to defeat and ruin. (Our own university was once on the edge of financial collapse and according to many was only saved by a previous administration's imposition of "market discipline.") The idea of a college experience as an insular haven of sheer contemplation is risky at best.

These forces and trends have served as a backdrop to our local focus. We believe they have had an impact on academic freedom. The concerns and compromises of "publish or perish," or research as a product to be sold to the highest bidder, have been a source of extensive commentary, and we thus have turned our attention to the classroom. Likewise, we have granted that the emergence of accelerated courses in various forms and formats was a necessary response to changing demographics and economic demands. Certainly one concern for the classroom is that pressures may be building to condense or otherwise dilute course content. More "efficient" courses may augment the "bottom line," but at a cost to scholarly interests.

To successfully compete, schools must pass muster with external accrediting agencies, and here too concessions must be made. To fail or fall short of their demands is to lose bureaucratic

legitimacy and thus ground in the competition. These agencies, and the local administrators who must respond, demand measurable outcomes. This in turn imposes demands on the instructor, from the format and wording of the syllabus to the timing and methods of assessments. The professor's traditional assessment through grading is insufficient to external demands. Technology stands ready to offer new, exciting, and relevant techniques as necessary aids. This has resulted in a sort of standardization unheard of not so long ago. These external pressures to conform to a consistent, uniform standard challenge attempts at spontaneity or creativity.

We cannot ignore these forces. The sovereignty of the classroom is eroding and something is being lost. What is being lost is intangible and thus not easily measured in objective ways. We argue that it is a loss all the same.

Michael Stein, Christopher Scribner, and David Brown teach at Lindenwood University, where Stein is professor of sociology, Scribner is professor of psychology, and Brown is department chair and professor of philosophy. The authors acknowledge and appreciate the comments of an anonymous reviewer on an earlier version of this essay. Any correspondence may be directed to mstein@lindenwood.edu.

Notes

¹ See, for instance, Greg Toppo, "Schools Marred by Testing Scandals in 2011," USA Today.com, January 30, 2011.

² Gail Collins, "The Textbook Wars," *New York Review of Books*, June 21, 2012, 18–20.

³ Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, ed. Talcott Parsons (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947).

⁴ A. Levine and J. S. Cureton, eds., *When Fear and Hope Collide: A Portrait of Today's College Student* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1998).

⁵ Joy E. Beatty, "Grades as Money and the Role of the Market Metaphor in Management," *Academy of Management and Learning & Education* 3.2 (June 2004): 187–96.

⁶ George Ritzer, *The McDonaldization of Society: An Investigation in the Changing Character of Contemporary Life* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge, 1993). See also Jason Lane and Kevin Kisner, "MOOC's and the McDonaldization of Global Higher Education," *Chronicle of Higher Education* blog, September 28, 2012.

⁷ Laura Pappano, "The Year of the MOOC," *New York Times Education Life*, November 4, 2012, 26–28.

⁸ Amanda Ripley, "College Is Dead. Long Live College," *Time*, October 29, 2012, 33–41; Tamar Lewin, "Professors at San Jose State Criticize Online Courses," *New York Times*, May 3, 2013.

⁹ Magna Online Seminars, home page, <http://www.magnapubscom/online/seminars>.

¹⁰ Marcia Angell, "Is Academic Medicine for Sale?," *New England Journal of Medicine* 34.8 (2000): 1516–18.

¹¹ Scott Jaschik, "Tests with and without Motivation," *Inside Higher Ed*, January 2, 2013.

¹² Howard Pollio, "The Two Cultures of Pedagogy: Teaching and Learning in the Natural Sciences and the Humanities," *Teaching/Learning Issues*, no. 75, Learning Research Center, University of Tennessee, 1996.

¹³ Gilbert Highet, *The Art of Teaching* (New York: Vintage, 1989 [1959]).

¹⁴ Gerald Graff, "Assessment Changes Everything," *MLA Newsletter* 3–4 (Spring 2008). See also American Philosophical Association, *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 68.2 (2008): 94–95.

¹⁵ For the polemical, see, for example, John Champaign, "Teaching in the Corporate University: Assessment as a Labor Issue," *AAUP Journal of Academic Freedom* 2 (2011). For the practical, see, for example, Laurel Barrington, "Less Assessment, More Learning," *Academe Online*, November–December 2003.

¹⁶ Barrington, "Less Assessment, More Learning."

¹⁷ John W. Powell, "Outcomes and Assessment: Conceptual and Other Problems," *AAUP Journal of Academic Freedom* 2 (2011); Jaschik, "Tests with and without Motivation."

¹⁸ See, for example, Joe Mathews, "For Math Students, Self-Esteem Might Not Equal High Score," washingtonpost.com, October 18, 2006.

¹⁹ Higher Learning Commission, "New Criteria for Accreditation," January 1, 2013, <http://www.ncahlc.org/Information-for-Institutions/criteria-and-core-components.html>.