American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century

Social, Political, and Economic Challenges

THIRD EDITION

Edited by
Philip G. Altbach, Patricia J. Gumport,
and Robert O. Berdahl

2011

The Johns Hopkins University Press
Baltimore

CHAPTER EIGHT

The Hidden Hand

External Constituencies and Their Impact

Fred F. Harcleroad and Judith S. Eaton

Postsecondary institutions have endured in the United States for over three and one-half centuries. All except those established recently have been modified over the years and have changed greatly in response to pressures from external forces. Particularly in the last century and a half, literally thousands of diverse institutions have opened their doors, only to close when they were no longer needed by a sufficient number of students or by the public and private constituencies that had founded and supported them. Those in existence today are the survivors, the institutions that adapted to the needs of their constituencies.

The varied external forces affecting postsecondary education in the United States have grown out of our unique three-sector system of providing goods and services for both collective consumption and private use. First, the *voluntary enterprise sector*, composed of millions of independent nonprofit organizations, often has initiated efforts to provide such things as schools, hospitals, bridges, libraries, environmental controls, and public parks. Such organizations are protected by constitutional rights to peaceful assembly, free speech, and petition for redress of grievances. These formidable protections, plus the nonprofits' record of useful service, led to their being nontaxable, with contributions to them being tax free.

Second, the *public enterprise group*, comprising all local, state, and federal governments, administers the laws that hold our society together. Third, the *private enterprise sector*, composed of profit-seeking businesses and commerce, provides much of the excess wealth needed to support the other two sectors. This pluralistic and diverse set of organizations implements the basic ideas behind our federated republic.

Our constitution provides for a detailed separation of powers at the federal level among the presidency, the Congress, and the judiciary. The Tenth Amendment establishes the states as governments with "general" powers, delegating "limited" powers to the federal government. Education is not a delegated power and therefore is reserved to the states, whose constitutions often treat it almost as a fourth branch of government. In addition, the Tenth Amendment reserves "general" powers to citizens, who operate through their own voluntary organizations, their state governments, or state-authorized private enterprise. Consequently, only a few higher education institutions are creations of the federal government (mostly military institutions, to provide for the common defense); more than 99 percent of postsecondary institutions are authorized or chartered by individual states and created and managed by the states, voluntary organizations, or profit-seeking businesses.

Both of the oldest institutions in the country, Harvard University (established in 1636) and the College of William and Mary (established in 1693), have closed for different reasons but opened up again when changes were made. Harvard (then a college) closed for what would have been its second year (in 1639–40), after Nathaniel Eaton, its first head, was dismissed for cruelty to students and the theft of college funds. After being closed for the year, government officials determined that the Massachusetts Bay Colony still needed a college to train ministers and advance learning. A new president, Henry Dunster, reopened the college in 1640, and by changing regularly, and sometimes dramatically, Harvard has remained in operation ever since. Two small examples illustrate this process. As Massachusetts grew and secularized, ministerial training at Harvard became only one function of this institution, so it was placed in a separate divinity school. Also, by the late 1700s, required instruction in Hebrew was replaced by student choice, a beginning of our current elective system.

William and Mary was the richest of the colonial colleges, supported by the Commonwealth of Virginia, with income from taxes on tobacco, skins, and hides. Nevertheless, the college had to make many adaptations in order to remain politically supported. For example, after the Revolution, in 1779, it dropped its chair

of divinity and established the nation's first professorship of law and police. The college closed during the Civil War (1861–65), reopened briefly, but closed again in 1881. It eventually reopened in 1888, when the state agreed to make it a state-supported institution if it would become Virginia's main teacher education college. Thus it changed from being essentially a private college operated by the Episcopal Church to a public one, an excellent example of a government taking over a private institution to meet the developing needs of society as a whole. Interaction of this type between government and private constituencies is a characteristic of the democratic republic established in the United States, and it is important to consider this in studying the relationships of colleges and universities to their external environment.

External groups, associations, and agencies from all three sectors can have an impact on the autonomy of the postsecondary educational institutions. This diverse group of external organizations includes everything from athletic conferences and alumni associations to employer associations and unions (or organized faculty groups that function as unions). The corporate boards that administer all of the private colleges, universities, and institutes authorized to operate in the respective states obviously belong in this group. Their power to determine institutional policies is clear and well known. However, many other voluntary associations can and do have significant effects on specific institutions or on units of the institutions. This is particularly true in the funding of colleges and universities, since the American system is based on income from varied sources. As states have decreased the proportion coming from their budgets for both public and private institutions, other sources of income and ways to economize have become increasingly crucial in the twenty-first century. External associations can play an important role in providing badly needed alternative funding and more effective operational use of existing funds. Five of these groups—private foundations, institutionally based membership associations, voluntary accrediting organizations, voluntary consortia, and regional compacts—are described below in some detail, indicating their backgrounds, their development, and their possible impact on institutional autonomy and academic freedom.

Private Foundations

The beginnings of private foundations in the United States took place over two centuries ago.[1] Benjamin Franklin led in the establishment, in Philadelphia, of a number of voluntary-sector organizations, including the American Philosophical

Society in 1743, an association with many foundation characteristics. In 1800 the Magdalen Society of Philadelphia, possibly the first private foundation in the United States, was established as a perpetual trust to assist "unhappy females who had been seduced from the paths of virtue." In the 1890s and early 1900s, long before the federal income tax became legal, due to the Sixteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, the Carnegie foundations, followed shortly by the Rockefeller foundations, set a pattern that continues to this day.

Andrew Carnegie established 1,681 free public libraries; contributed significantly to the University of Chicago; and founded the Carnegie Institute, which later became Carnegie-Mellon University. In addition, he established the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Carnegie Institution Of Washington, and Carnegie Hall. John D. Rockefeller established the University of Chicago, Spelman College, the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research (now Rockefeller University) and, in 1955, he provided 630 liberal arts colleges with faculty salary improvement funds equal to each institution's total for the previous year. These examples illustrate how Carnegie and Rockefeller established a high standard of operations and service. Few academics realize that their current TIAA pensions were developed and are currently administered by a foundation resulting from Andrew Carnegie's feeling of public service responsibility. Decades before such "contributions" became tax deductible, he gave several million dollars to set up the first pension fund for college teachers.

Today, private foundations vary greatly in form, purpose, size, function, and constituency. Some are corporate in nature, many are trusts, and others are only associations. Many of them can affect postsecondary institutions through their choice of areas to support. They can be classified into five types: (1) community foundations, often citywide or regional, which make a variety of bequests or gifts (local postsecondary institutions often can count on some support from such foundations for locally related projects); (2) family or personal foundations, often with limited purposes; (3) special purpose foundations (including such varied examples as the Harvard Glee Club and a fund set up to provide every girl at Bryn Mawr with one baked potato at each meal); (4) company foundations established to channel corporate giving through one main source; and (5) national independent foundations (including many of the large, well-known foundations, such as Carnegie, Rockefeller, Ford, Lilly, Kellogg, Mellon, and Johnson, plus more recent ones such as Murdock, Hewlett, Packard, Lumina, and the Pew Trusts). The number of grant-making foundations, estimated at 60,000 in 2004–5, grows

constantly. Their total assets are variously estimated at $420 billion to $600 billion, and their awards range from $32 to $35 billion yearly. A significant portion of these funds regularly go to higher education. A recent special report from the Foundation Center stressed the wide range of their fields of interest and their increasing attraction as a valuable resource for institutions with budget problems.[2]

By their choice of areas to finance, foundations, especially those in the national independent category, entice supposedly autonomous colleges to do things they might not do otherwise. Institutional change continues to be a prime goal of foundations, as it has been for most of the past century. Thus, although their grants still provide a relatively small proportion of the total financing for institutions, they have had significant effects on program development and even operations. Grants from foundations have been instrumental in the establishment of new academic fields such as microbiology and anthropology, and in the redirection of the fields of business and teacher education.

An excellent, somewhat different example of a valuable foundation-supported activity during the first decade of the twenty-first century is the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education (NCPPHE), which was supported initially by the Pew Trusts and the Ford Foundation and currently by the Lumina Foundation and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. It provides numerous useful studies for decision making. The NCPPHE recognizes the importance of state responsibility for chartering, regulating, and supporting higher education in most colleges and universities, and it publishes a "report card" on each of the states in six areas: (1) student preparation, (2) participation (opportunities to enroll), (3) affordability, (4) student completion of programs, (5) benefits to the states from an educated population, and (6) student learning. Titled *Measuring Up*, these reports for 2000, 2002, 2004, 2006, and 2008 have produced vital information on which to base state efforts to improve opportunity in, and operations of, their colleges and universities. Other key publications include *Losing Ground* (in-depth data on affordability) and *State Policy and Community College–Baccalaureate Transfer*. These data, and many others from this foundation-supported center (available at www.highereducation.org), provide useful beginnings of benchmarks, or social indicators, for improving higher education in the United States.

It is important to stress, however, that private foundations affect institutional freedom only if the institutions voluntarily accept the funds for the purposes prescribed by the foundation. The redirection of programs, and even of private institutional goals, is possible and has occurred on occasion. Nevertheless, the private foundation model has been so successful that government has adopted it

in forming and funding such agencies as the National Science Foundation, the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, and the National Endowments for the Arts and for the Humanities. Clearly, private foundations have been and undoubtedly will continue to be important external forces affecting postsecondary education.

Institutionally Based Membership Organizations

Voluntary membership organizations of this type are almost infinite in their possible number.[3] The *Higher Education Directory*, a compendium of higher education associations, institutions, and government agencies, lists 298 of these organizations. Although formed by institution officials for their own purposes, the associations often end up having indirect or direct effects on the institutions themselves. The American Council on Education (ACE), probably the major policy advocate for postsecondary education at the national level, plays a critical coordinative role as an umbrella organization, composed of a wide spectrum of institutions. Other major national institutional organizations include the Association of American Colleges and Universities, the American Association of Community Colleges, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the Association of American Universities, the Council for Higher Education Accreditation, the Council of Independent Colleges, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. ACE also coordinates a larger group of fifty higher education associations, known as the Washington Higher Education Secretariat; the Secretariat convenes eight times per year to exchange information and discuss current or projected activities, many of them national policy issues, often regarding federal financing or control. These organizations represent most of the public and private nonprofit and some for-profit postsecondary institutions in the United States, with some institutions belonging to two or three of them. Based for the most part in Washington, D.C., they represent the differing interests of the varied institutions. Also, especially when these organizations work together as a united front, they can influence congressional committees and government agencies on key issues affecting higher education.

The strength of these national associations will continue to grow, along with taxes, the federal budget, and federal purchase of selected services from their member institutions. Even though most postsecondary institutions are state chartered

and many are basically state funded, the increasing power of the federal tax system will make such national associations even more necessary.

Many specialized voluntary membership associations contribute in diverse ways to the development and operations of functional areas within institutions. For example, the American College Testing Program (now ACT) and the College Entrance Examination Board (its service bureau, the Educational Testing Service, is not a membership organization) provide extensive information resources for their members: institutions and program areas within institutions. These data are vital for counseling and guidance purposes, student admissions, student financial aid programs, and related activities. In addition, different administrative functions (such as graduate schools, registrars, institutional research units, and business offices) have their own, extremely useful representative associations. Likewise, most academic fields and their constantly increasing subdivisions or spinoffs have set up specialized groups. Prime examples are engineering and the allied health professions, both with dozens of separate associations. Many of these academic organizations affect institutions and their program planning in direct ways. In particular, the associations that set up detailed criteria for membership in the association often directly influence the allocation of resources. Of the several thousand member organizations in this category, almost one hundred of them, from architecture to veterinary medicine, probably exert the greatest influence, since those programs or academic units admitted to membership are considered to be accredited. (The following section provides more detail on this group.) A sampling of these organizations illustrates their services, emphasizes their significance, and shows, in a limited way, their potential impact.

The American Council on Education includes separate institutions and other associations, with approximately 1,800 institutional members representing more than 70 percent of all college and university enrollments in the United States. (There are an additional 200 or so noninstitutional members.) Since the council's establishment in 1918, its work has changed from an emphasis on "consensus building," its primary charge for the first fifty years, to initiating action to improve higher education. Some of its special offices and centers indicate its thrusts: Center for the Advancement of Racial and Ethnic Equity, Adult Learner Programs, Center for Effective Leadership, Center for International Initiatives, Center for Policy Analysis, Office of Women in Higher Education, Center for Lifelong Learning, ACE Credit and Transcript services, ACE Fellows Program, Executive Search Roundtable, and numerous other specialized programs.

The publication program of ACE provides major documents on the field of higher education and a constant flow of documents and papers on current federal legislative activities and on major studies completed or underway. Many of these documents are available through the ACE Online Store (http://store.acenet.edu/). The ACE magazine, *The Presidency*, is available there and is very useful for current or aspiring institutional presidents. A regular series of publications on all aspects of higher education cover such topics as changing economics and funding, overseas branch campuses, the *Directory of Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education*, and especially their constant reports from the policy analysis service.

The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) is a nonprofit association serving more than 34,000 trustees and officials of 1,200 colleges and universities or their foundations, representing all types of boards—private, public, two-year, four-year, governing, coordinating, and advisory. Its mission is "to strengthen the practice of voluntary trusteeship as the best alternative to direct government and political control of higher education." In addition to membership fees, its support comes from several dozen national, personal, private, and corporate foundations. Its extensive program of publications, videotapes, conferences, and seminars is designed to provide trustees and institutional leaders with timely and useful resources in this specialized area. One package of materials, *Fundamentals of Trusteeship*, is designed for the orientation of new trustees. Another specialized service is its Presidential Search Consultation Service, which often serves several dozen institutions a year. Other projects include the AGB "Survival Kits," providing publications covering eight board basics, including such items as fundraising, leadership of a board, financial matters, foundation relations, and effective committees. Other of their publications cover public policy and governance, presidential compensation, and understanding financial statements.

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) represents 430 public colleges and universities, constituting 56 percent of the enrollments in public four-year institutions. Since its beginnings in 1961, the AASCU has been a leading stimulator of all facets of international education. Its many presidential missions to such countries as Egypt, Israel, Greece, Poland, the People's Republic of China, Cuba, Argentina, Taiwan, Malaysia, and Mexico have fostered continuing educational exchange and on-campus programs. It has taken national leadership in developing cooperative interassociation and interinstitutional programs and networks, such as the Service Members Opportunity Colleges (with many AASCU institutions involved) and the Urban College and University Network. Its Office of Federal Programs monitors current funding programs and priorities and has been instrumental in increasing the participation of AASCU institutions in this ever-increasing source of funds. Its Office of Governmental Relations and Policy Analysis analyzes pending legislation, prepares testimony on major national issues, monitors state issues affecting public higher education, conducts surveys, studies trends, and keeps institutional officials informed. The Academic Affairs Resource Center and Academic Leadership Academy serve the chief academic officers of higher education institutions, emphasizing planning, faculty development, opportunities for minorities and women to attain senior administrative positions, leadership training, financial management, legal matters, and innovative educational ideas for new clientele.

An extensive seminar, conference, and publication program supports this alignment of institutional services. Some examples are the annual Summer Council of Presidents, which emphasizes current issues and presidential leadership; regular meetings of the chief academic affairs officials; the annual President's Academy for new campus chief executive officers; and the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA), developed in partnership with the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. The VSA project is a long-term, critically important project to provide detailed information on education outcomes and demonstrate accountability and stewardship by these public institutions to the public. Overall, the AASCU has had a profound effect on the institutions that founded it in 1961, and their graduates represent more than one-fourth of all those earning baccalaureate degrees and one-third of those earning master's degrees in the United States.

The Association of American Universities (AAU) is a distinctive higher education association, because it is open only to those institutions that are invited to join. Invitations are sparingly issued after they are approved by 75 percent of existing members. The AAU was first organized in 1900 by fourteen universities offering doctoral degrees. The original purpose was to strengthen and set standards for these degrees. A century later, the AAU focuses primarily on the PhD degree, although the multiple present-day doctoral degrees—which started at Harvard in 1872—have increased in number to almost 100. The sixty-two current invited members "focus on issues of importance to research intensive universities," such as research policy issues, research funding from all sources, and research education. From 1913 to 1948, the AAU was the "gold standard" for accrediting institutions. Its lists of three levels of institutional quality were based on student

success in the graduate schools of its member institutions. The AAU's membership numbers varied from twenty to thirty of the thousands of other institutions during this period.

Currently, the AAU concentrates on research leading to "innovation, scholarship, and solutions that contribute to our nation's economy, security, and well-being." Since 1932, the AAU has had a policy encouraging degrees other than the PhD to emphasize preparation for college teaching. In the 1960s, the AAU supported the new, developing DA degree as a college teaching degree.

AAU member institutions lead the world in discovery research, with faculties that include 43 percent of all Nobel Prize winners since 1999. Their faculty discoveries have been patented and licensed, providing thousands of "discoveries and technologies that have led to breakthroughs in medicine, information technology, communications, and energy, to name just a few areas." AAU members award over 50 percent of all doctoral degrees earned in the United States and receive almost 60 percent of federal research funding going to the nation's universities.

These summaries illustrate the significance and impact of this type of voluntary association. Each contributes in varied ways to the diverse needs of their member institutions or the program units within them. Fundamentally, the organizations are the creatures of their founding and continuing members, and they serve important functions for these institutions. When institutions need assistance in preserving such important features as autonomy of operation or academic freedom for students and faculty, these professional associations are buffers and important sources of support.

Voluntary Accrediting Organizations

The membership organizations in this important group barely existed a century ago.[4] However, the end of the nineteenth century was a confused and uneasy time in higher education, and major changes were under way. Five key factors contributed to the turbulent state of affairs in the period from 1870 to 1910: (1) the final breakdown of the fixed, classical curriculum and the broad expansion of the elective system; (2) the development and legitimation of new academic fields (psychology, education, sociology, American literature); (3) the organization of new, diverse types of institutions to meet developing social needs (teachers colleges, junior colleges, land-grant colleges, research universities, specialized professional schools); (4) the expansion of both secondary and postsecondary education and their resultant overlapping, leading to the question, What is a college?; and (5) a lack of commonly accepted standards for admission to college and for completing a college degree.

To work on some of these problems, as early as 1871 the University of Michigan sent out faculty members to inspect high schools and admitted graduates of the acceptable and approved high schools on the basis of their diplomas. Shortly thereafter, pressures developed for regional approaches to these problems, in order to facilitate uniform college entrance requirements.

In keeping with accepted American practice and custom, groups of educators banded together in various regions to organize private, voluntary membership groups for this purpose. In New England, for example, a group of secondary schoolmasters took the initiative. In the southern states, it was Chancellor Kirkland and the faculty of Vanderbilt University. Six regional associations have developed throughout the United States, starting with the New England Association of Schools and Colleges in 1885. It was followed in 1887 by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, in 1895 by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, in 1917 by the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges, and in 1923 by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Criteria and requirements for institutional membership (which now serve as the basis for institutions being considered as accredited) were formally established by these six associations at different times: in 1910 by North Central, with the first list of accredited colleges in 1913; in 1919 by Southern; in 1921 by Northwest and Middle States; in 1949 by Western; and in 1954 by New England. Thus, at the same time that the federal government instituted regulatory commissions to control similar problems (the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1887, the Federal Trade Commission in 1914, and the Federal Power Commission in 1920), these nongovernmental voluntary membership groups sprang up to provide yardsticks for student achievement, quality assurance, and institutional operations.

Regional groups dealt in the main with colleges, rather than with specialized professional schools or programs. The North Central Association finally decided to admit normal schools and teachers colleges, but on a separate list of acceptable institutions. Practitioners and faculty in professional associations gradually set up their own membership associations. These groups established criteria for approving schools and, based on these criteria, made lists of accredited schools and program units. In some cases, only individuals with degrees from an approved school could join the professional association. Later, some membership groups

made the approved program unit or school a basis for association membership. In any case, the specialized academic program and its operational unit had to meet exacting criteria, externally imposed, to acquire and retain standing in the field.

The first of the specialized or programmatic discipline-oriented associations was the American Medical Association (AMA) in 1847. However, approving processes for medical schools did not start until the early 1900s. From 1905 to 1907, the Council on Medical Education of the AMA led a movement to rate medical schools. The first ratings, in 1905, were a list based on the percentages of failures on licensing examinations by students from each school. This was followed in 1906–7 by a more sophisticated system, based on ten specific areas to be examined and inspections of each school. Of the 160 schools inspected, classified, and listed, 32 were in Class C, "unapproved"; 46 were in Class B, "probation"; and 82 were in Class A, "approved." The Council on Medical Education was attacked vigorously for this listing and approving activity. The then recently established Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1905) provided funds for Abraham Flexner and N. P. Colwell to make their famous study (1908–10) of the 155 medical schools still in existence (5 already had closed). By 1915, only 95 medical schools remained, a 40 percent reduction, and they were again classified by the AMA Council on Medical Education, with 66 approved, 17 on probation, and 12 still unapproved. This voluntary effort led to the ultimate in accountability: the merger and closing of 65 medical schools. In the process, medical education was changed drastically, and the remaining schools completely revised and changed their curricula, a process still continuing to this day. This case provides an excellent example of the work of an external voluntary professional association that, with financial support from a private foundation, took the initiative to protect the public interest. Thus, in some cases, intrusions into autonomy can have beneficial results.

The success of the AMA did not go unnoticed. The National Home Study Council (now the Distance Education and Training Council) started in 1926 to do for correspondence education what the AMA had done for medical education. Between 1914 and 1935, many other professional disciplinary and service associations were started in the fields of business, dentistry, law, library science, music, engineering, forestry, and dietetics, plus the medically related fields of podiatry, pharmacy, veterinary medicine, optometry, and nurse anesthesia. From 1935 to 1948, new associations that were starting up included architecture, art, Bible schools, chemistry, journalism, and theology, plus four more medically related fields (medical technology, medical records, occupational therapy, and physical

therapy). Between 1948 and 1975, the number of specialized associations continued to expand rapidly, for programs from social service to graduate psychology and from construction education to funeral direction. Medical care subspecialties also proliferated, particularly in the allied health field, which included more than twenty-five separate groups. After 1975 the expansion slowed greatly, and only a few new specialized associations were created during the following two decades, these few being formed in developing allied health areas (for nontraditional types of institutions that could not obtain "listing" by recognized national associations) or to expand accreditation opportunities in fields in which existing associations were unduly restrictive. One such example is the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP), established in 1988.

In the meantime, new needs led to additional accrediting bodies developing in special areas. Recent examples are the American Academy for Liberal Education (AALE, 1993) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC, 1997), as well as the ACBSP. All have complete programs of accreditation and have been listed by the U.S. Department of Education or the Council for Higher Education Accreditation as recognized accrediting bodies in their fields. The ACBSP emphasizes teaching quality in the business field, in both community colleges and baccalaureate or graduate institutions. AALE is recognized as the first accrediting body for liberal arts institutions and programs, based on its emphasis on teaching, a commitment to undergraduate education, and a core of studies in the arts, sciences, and humanities. TEAC is devoted to the improvement of academic degree programs for professional educators. To achieve this goal, TEAC's accreditation process places primary emphasis on an audit of evidence of student achievement. These three new, quite different voluntary accrediting bodies graphically illustrate both the importance of the voluntary sector in our society and its constant renewal.

All of these external professional associations directly affect institutional operations, including curricular patterns, faculty, degrees offered, teaching methods, support staff patterns, and capital outlay decisions. In many cases, priorities in internal judgments result from their outside pressures. Local resource allocations often are heavily influenced by accreditation reports. For example, a law library, a chemistry or engineering laboratory, and teaching loads in business or social work may have been judged substandard by these external private constituents. Yet if teaching loads in English or history also are heavy, or physics laboratories are inadequate, will they get the same attention and treatment as specialized program areas with outside pressures? In cases such as these, association

memberships are not really voluntary if the institution is placed on probation, is no longer an accredited member, and has sanctions actually applied. Frequently, students will withdraw from or not consider attending a professional school or college that is not accredited. States often limit the professional licenses for individuals to practice in a field to graduates of accredited schools. Federal agencies may not allow students from unaccredited institutions to obtain scholarships, loans, or work-study funds. The leverage of a voluntary association in such cases becomes tremendous, and the pressure for accredited status can be extremely powerful.

Starting in 1924, presidents of some of the larger institutions have attempted to limit the effects of accrediting associations. Through some of the institutionally based associations described in the previous section, they established limited sanctions and attempted to restrict the number of accrediting associations to which they would pay dues and that would be allowed on campus for site visits. These efforts to limit association membership and accreditation repeatedly failed to stem the tide. In 1949, a group of university presidents organized the National Commission on Accrediting (NCA), a separate voluntary membership association of their own, designed to cut down on the demands and influence of existing external associations and to delay or stop the development of new ones. The number of new accrediting associations dropped for a few years, but the pressures of new, developing disciplines on campus led, since the 1950s, to many new organizations of this type.

In 1949, the regional associations also felt the need for a new cooperative association and set up what became the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education (FRACHE). In 1975 the two organizations, FRACHE and NCA, agreed to merge, and they became major factors in the founding of the new Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA). COPA also included four national groups accrediting specialized institutions, plus seven major, institutionally based associations. They, in turn, endorsed COPA as the central, leading voluntary association for the establishment of policies and procedures in postsecondary accreditation. After a few years, its large representative board became unwieldy and was made much smaller. Also, the institutional presidents, through their various associations, pushed vigorously for more representation. As a result, COPA reorganized further, into three assemblies: the Assembly of Institutional Accrediting Bodies (six national and eight regional), the Assembly of Specialized Accrediting Bodies (forty-two associations), and the Presidents Policy Assembly

on Accreditation (seven national associations of presidents from differing types of institutions).

The system for funding COPA required the member associations, particularly the large regional associations, to collect COPA dues along with their own dues, which were tied to institutional accreditation. When, in 1993, several regional associations decided not to collect the dues for COPA, it found itself without financial support and disbanded on December 31, 1993. One of COPA's major functions was the "recognition" and "listing" of approved voluntary accrediting bodies, and on January 1, 1994, the less-expensive, streamlined Commission on Recognition of Postsecondary Accreditation (CORPA) was set up by a voluntary founding commission to maintain this phase of the work. Nine organizations paid sustaining fees to keep this critical accrediting function alive. They included the American Association of Community Colleges, the American Association of Dental Schools, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the American Council on Education, the Association of American Universities, the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs, the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. A tenth was later added, the Western Association of Bible Colleges and Christian Schools.

From 1994 through 1996, various alternatives were debated throughout higher education, alternatives designed to continue a more extensive national accrediting presence beyond the efforts of CORPA. Finally, a presidents' work group on accreditation, consisting of twenty-five leaders from all types of institutions, developed a prospective new association to be called the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). After a number of associations voted to approve its plan for operation, in 1995–96 a ballot was sent to 2,990 colleges and universities. Replies were received from 1,574 (52.5%) of these, and 1,476 (94%) voted to support the new organization.

CHEA differs from COPA and CORPA in three critical respects. First, it is an institutional membership organization led by college and university presidents. Second, this membership is available only to degree-granting (associate's degree and above) institutions. Third, CHEA controls its own financial destiny by directly billing institutions for dues. CHEA is the largest higher education institutional membership organization in the United States; it includes approximately 3,000 degree-granting colleges and universities.

CHEA is the only national higher education association exclusively devoted to advocacy for quality assurance and improvement through accreditation. The organization sustains three major functions: government affairs, recognition of accrediting organizations, and membership services.

Government affairs involves work with the U.S. Department of Education and Congress on federal policy matters that relate to accreditation. Many of the federal policy issues with which CHEA deals stem from the 1965 Higher Education Act (HEA), as amended, Title IV (Student Assistance), Part H (Program Integrity Triad). This section of the law provides for federal scrutiny of accrediting organizations (also known as *recognition*). Since 1952, the federal government has relied on accrediting organizations for affirmation of the quality of institutions and programs for which federal funds (e.g., for student grants and loans and for research) are made available. However, these organizations must be federally recognized. Only institutions and programs that are accredited by these federally recognized accreditors are eligible for federal funds. As of 2008, fifty-eight accreditors were recognized by the Department of Education. Government affairs issues before CHEA include, for example, how well accreditation addresses quality in distance learning; accreditation and student learning outcomes; accountability; and the effect on U.S. accreditation of efforts by the World Trade Organization to address quality in higher education through the General Agreement on Trade in Services.

CHEA's recognition function began in 1999. By the end of 2008, sixty institutional and programmatic accrediting organizations have been recognized by CHEA. Many of these organizations are also recognized by the Department of Education. CHEA's membership services include conferences and meetings, and an extensive publications program. CHEA conducts research and undertakes policy analyses of accreditation; it makes this work available in print and electronic form.

With the 2002–8 reauthorization of the HEA, CHEA became a leading advocate to sustain and enhance the traditional institutional leadership role of colleges and universities in academic decision making. Both the HEA's reauthorization in the legislative branch and the work of the executive branch—through the Secretary of Education's Commission on the Future of Higher Education, established in 2005—reflected a significant effort to shift at least some of this decision making to the federal government, using federal authority over accrediting organizations as a key vehicle to achieve this goal. CHEA, in concert with other higher education associations, worked to assure that academic decisions related to curriculum, faculty, and academic standards remained at the institutional level and did not move to federal agencies.

CHEA, after eleven years, has emerged as a major policy forum for U.S. accreditation through the framing of key complex topics such as accreditation and public accountability. CHEA's research and policy analyses are focused on emerging issues and on enhancing accreditation's capacity to deal with the extensive changes and challenges facing quality assurance in higher education, such as the internationalization of higher education. CHEA also plays a significant role in international quality assurance and accreditation, regularly convening experts from countries around the world and routinely participating in the ongoing international dialogue on quality-related issues. CHEA has been formally identified as the official, national, competent authority on accreditation and quality assurance in the United States.

The relationship of voluntary accrediting associations to state and federal governments also is a major factor in current considerations of academic freedom, institutional autonomy, and institutional accountability. The states charter most of the postsecondary institutions and, thus, establish their missions, general purposes, and the level of degrees offered. However, the states also license individuals to practice most vocations and professions. In many fields, the licensing of individuals is based on graduation from accredited programs. Thus a form of sanction has developed, and membership in the involved, specialized professional associations, supposedly voluntary, becomes almost obligatory.

In the federal arena, the listing of institutions by federal government agencies had little or no effect before World War II. However, the entrance of the federal government into the funding of higher education on a massive basis since World War II has drastically changed the overall uses of accreditation. Reported abuses of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (the GI Bill) led to a series of congressional hearings, which led in turn to major additions related to accreditation in Public Law 550, the Veterans Readjustment Act of 1952. Section 253 of that law empowered the Commissioner of Education to publish a list of accrediting agencies and associations that could be relied on to assess the quality of training offered by educational institutions. State-based approving agencies then used the resulting actions of such accrediting associations or agencies as a basis for approval of the courses specifically accredited. The enormous increase in federal assistance to students attending postsecondary educational institutions since 1972 made this federal listing process extremely important. Federal efforts to exert control over institutional processes have been constant for the past thirty

years, with institutional membership in a listed accrediting association becoming almost obligatory. Default rates on student loans have been blamed on the postsecondary institutions and accrediting associations, and laws have been passed making the institutions enforce the police power of the government. Since voluntary associations cannot be either forced or allowed to enforce state police powers, in 1992 Congress established a new state enforcement system, called state postsecondary review entities (SPREs). The public outcry against this law led Congress to rescind it in 1994–95 by not funding it. And in 1995 the president's budget contained no request for funds to continue SPREs, effectively eliminating them. SPREs were formally eliminated from the law in 1998.

Extensive legal arguments about the resulting powers of the Department of Education still continue. However, greater institutional dependence on eligibility for funding is now based on membership in much-less-voluntary accrediting associations. A delicate relationship exists between the federal government (and eligibility for federal funding), state government (and its responsibilities for establishing or chartering institutions and credentialing individuals through certification or licensure), and voluntary membership associations (which require accreditation for membership).

Thus these voluntary associations have come to represent a major form of private constituency, with a direct impact on an institution's internal activities. Possible sanctions that would prevent state licensing of graduates, the loss of eligibility for funds from federal agencies, and problems caused by peer approval or disapproval enhance the importance of these sometimes overlooked educational organizations.

Voluntary Consortia

Formal arrangements for voluntary consortia, based on interinstitutional cooperation among and between postsecondary institutions, have been in operation for many decades. Probably the oldest continuous consortium is the Ohio College Association, founded in 1867 and finally incorporated in 1967, after its first century of operation. Its *Administrative Directory* is called "the telephone book" of Ohio higher education. Its rating programs for workers' compensation have saved more than forty of its almost one hundred current institutions more than a million dollars yearly. Decades later, Claremont Colleges (in California) started in 1925 with Pomona College and the Claremont University Center, and they were joined by Scripps College in 1926. The Atlanta University Center (in Georgia),

sometimes called the Affiliation, started shortly thereafter, in 1929, and included Morehouse College, Spelman College, and Atlanta University. Over the decades, both of these latter groups have added additional institutions to their cooperative arrangements and proven that voluntary consortia can be valuable for long periods of time. Some early examples from the 1927–29 period illustrate the reality of the cooperation between Morehouse and Spelman. In those years, several faculty were jointly appointed to both faculties. Upper-division students could take courses offered by the other college. Also, they operated a joint summer school with Atlanta University. In 1932, a new library was built, and the three libraries were consolidated into a joint library serving all three institutions. Thus, although they remained separate institutions, they sacrificed some autonomy to extend their academic offerings and services.

In the years since these early beginnings, hundreds of institutions have developed informal and increasingly formal arrangements for interinstitutional cooperation. By 1966, a national study by the U.S. Office of Education found 1,107 consortia operating in the United States, with some evidence that a number of them had not responded. The Council for Interinstitutional Leadership, a voluntary national organization formed in 1968, was composed of many of the consortia. It published an updated directory regularly for more than two decades, until 1991; shortly thereafter, it was replaced by the newly established, national Association for Consortium Leadership (ACL). The most recent edition of ACL's *Consortium Directory*, published in 2004, listed data from more than one hundred consortia of many diverse types, representing about 1,800 institutional members. A planned new directory, in 2010, undoubtedly will be considerably larger. A significant number of the consortia also include business, commercial, public service nonprofit, and public school district associate members. A careful reading of the directory and its listing of consortium activities clearly demonstrates the importance of consortia in cutting-edge innovations in higher education, as well as in overall operational efficiency in providing educational services.

The importance of voluntary consortia to concerns regarding institutional autonomy also becomes evident with the enumeration of their activities. The 2004 directory listed several dozen widely differing programs and services being carried on cooperatively, in seven major areas: administrative and business services; enrollment and admissions; academic programs, including continuing education; libraries, information services, and computer services; student services; faculty; and community services, including economic development. Cross-registration between nearby institutions is quite common, as are joint library services, professional

development activities, seminars, joint purchasing through group-negotiated contracts, high school and college career-advising services, and joint development projects for new technology. Many of the consortia have World Wide Web pages, e-mail, and fax capability, and some have teleconferencing capability.

A few brief examples illustrate the diversity of services expedited by the consortium method of organizing. The Massachusetts Higher Education Consortium provides an exceptional and extensive group-purchasing service for almost one hundred institutions, including members of seven smaller consortia (with varied projects). It saves each college from having to develop individual contracts (the consortium has more than eighty contracts for its institutions to use), and its joint buying power saves many millions of dollars on purchases totaling more than $150 million a year. The Council of Christian Colleges and Universities (founded in 1976 and incorporated in 1982) has ninety member institutions and provides internship, travel, and service-learning opportunities to their students in such regions as Russia, the Middle East (particularly Egypt), and Latin America (especially Costa Rica).

A relatively recent consortium is the Center for Academic Integrity, with over 360 member institutions. Funded by the Hewlett and Templeton foundations, its official location is at Clemson University. It provides research, information, and assistance to campuses in assessing the integrity climate. It publishes the *Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity* and an *Academic Integrity Assessment Guide*, and it conducts related conferences and training programs. With the increasing use of technology and the Internet for distance-learning courses, there have been dozens of consortia formed to develop and deliver courses and degree programs in this way. The Internet2 project, for example, has become such a consortium for over a hundred institutions. A U.S. Department of Education study of public universities recently found that almost 90 percent of these institutions offered electronic distance-learning opportunities, and 60 percent were in a consortium to do so. Of those, 75 percent were part of a state- or system-level group.

The diversity of academic consortia is further illustrated by the following examples. The U.S. Office of the Director of National Intelligence awarded $3 million to fund a consortium of seven campuses of the California State University (CSU) System to develop an intelligence-community center of academic excellence. The lead institution is CSU–San Bernardino, along with six other campuses in the southern part of the state. In Chicago, the Project Align Consortium involves the public schools, the city colleges, and five local public and private universities. They cooperate with the ACT organizational data system so that

students are able to move "seamlessly" through the high schools, the two-year city college, and on to universities. The goal is to use the ACT system and excellent guidance to ensure that students are ready for college and that the articulation from a two- to a four-year institution is effective. Another example of a diverse consortium function is in the field of teacher education. In Texas, the CREATE Center and a select group of seven universities are working to identify data and incorporate its use in creating continuing improvement in their teacher education programs. The Texas group organized as a consortium in order to expand their data, when it has been fully developed as credible evidence of quality, so that it could be widely used.

One other, more extensive example illustrates the nature of the many comprehensive consortia and their program possibilities. The Virginia Tidewater Consortium for Higher Education (VTC) is one of six regional consortia covering all of Virginia. They were established in 1973 by state law to coordinate off-campus continuing education courses. The VTC is an example of what can happen when institutional leadership works cooperatively. It now offers a variety of services, including the cross-registration of students, faculty exchanges, interlibrary courier services, cooperative degree programs, and faculty and administrative development programs. In addition, it operates the consortium's higher education digital cable channel, off-campus centers and their continuing education programs, and the Educational Opportunity Center.

In the years since its founding in the Hampton Roads area, the VTC has grown from eight original institutions to fifteen, and includes the following: four community colleges; four public colleges and universities; four private institutions; two nonresident public universities; a national defense university (the Joint Forces Staff College); two associate members, Skyline College (formerly ECPI Technical College) and Troy University; and two affiliate members, Cox Communications and WHRO-TV. This is similar to many of the comprehensive consortia that have varied memberships, such as businesses, community organizations, and multiple school districts.

The VTC's early cooperative projects have expanded and new ones have been developed. Cross-registration has been enlarged to include the new college and university members, on both a credit and an audit basis. Articulation programs between the community colleges and the four-year, baccalaureate degree institutions have been created so students earning two-year associate of arts and associate of science degrees have them fully recognized when transferred. The Educational Opportunity Center provides free educational, career, and financial aid

counseling at eleven locations. The digital cable channel operates full time and serves almost 500,000 homes, offering college courses. Study abroad programs are coordinated and offered by seven of the institutions, and an International Education Committee was designed to broaden global understanding and cooperative academic efforts. For over a quarter century, a Summer Institute on College Teaching has been attended by hundreds of college teachers. More recently, specialized programs on substance abuse prevention and institutional security have been developed. In addition, the consortium works closely with the military community, maintaining offices at differing military bases.

Another important service of the Virginia Tidewater Consortium is in hosting the national office for the Association for Consortium Leadership. After its beginning in 1968, the national office was housed at the Kansas Regional Council for Higher Education until 1991. After 1991, the VTC assumed this key responsibility, with great success. Nearly seventy groups of all types—ranging from ones with three members to ones with 1,500 members—comprise the ACL. The ACL's expanded *Consortium Directory* now includes extensive data on more than one hundred consortia.[5] The "Topic Index" lists the major activities of consortia (twenty-eight categories of service) and each individual consortium provides one in its directory entry. The "Geographic Index" lists consortia by state location. Data for each individually listed consortium contains its name and location, governance and staffing, funding, membership, and programs and services. The ACL also provides mentoring services for new groups of institutions interested in consortial-type collaboration, and it publishes a quarterly magazine of consortia activity. A detailed book, *Leveraging Resources through Partnerships*, was prepared by the leaders of the VTC and published for the ACL.[6] A yearly conference/workshop on consortia activity and future-oriented programs rounds out the extensive and valuable efforts that the ACL has undertaken through the VTC's leadership, and the ACL is open to other groups that can profit by such cooperative ventures.

The examples above illustrate the move by consortia from being primarily private institutions to representing developments in all three sectors. Although started essentially by the voluntary enterprise sector, the public enterprise sector has moved in, and several consortia now include the profit-seeking sector. The federal government passed the National Cooperative Research Act in 1984, which awards special status to research and development consortia regarding antitrust statues and gives them a monopoly exception, and a number of states passed laws to facilitate their start-up. The Illinois Higher Education Cooperative Act of 1972

provided some state support for voluntary combinations of private and public institutions. California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Virginia have used the consortium approach for specific purposes. This trend toward public financing of consortia thus becomes a factor in institutional planning, and even in regional intrastate planning.

In the past, consortia have been developed to provide for interinstitutional needs both in times of growth and in times of decline. They are uniquely capable of handling the mutual problems of public and private institutions, and thus they provide a powerful deterrent to further governmental incursions into private and sometimes public institutional operations. At various levels of formality, consortia currently are being used by significant numbers of institutions of all types to adjust to changing curricular and funding necessities. As governmental controls continue to increase, and thus to affect institutional autonomy and academic freedom, voluntary consortia provide another way to plan independently for future operations and program development.

Regional Compacts

Regional compacts, although they are nonprofit, private organizations, are quasi governmental. Groups of states create them, provide their basic funding, and contract for services through them. They operate much like private organizations and receive considerable funding from other sources, including private foundations. Some of their studies (including policy ones), seminars, and workshops directly affect the institutions in their regions.

Soon after World War II, three regional interstate compacts developed to meet postsecondary education needs that crossed state lines. Originally, they concentrated on student exchange programs in the field of medical education; however, in the past half-century their areas of service and influence have expanded considerably. Although established, funded, and supported basically by state governors and legislatures, their indirect effects on institutional programs and operations can be significant. Listed in order of their establishment, these regional compacts are the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB, 1948), the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE, 1953), the New England Board of Higher Education (NEBHE, 1955), and the Midwestern Higher Education Compact (MHEC, 1991). By 2004, forty-seven of the fifty states were actively involved in one of the four state compacts. Only New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania were not members.

The valuable and varied programs of the compacts have often expanded far beyond the four state groups. Some interesting examples are what is now the National Center For Higher Education Management Systems, which developed out of WICHE. SREB developed a "High Schools that Work" network that has greatly expanded into thirty-one states. Several other joint projects between compacts include SREB's Educational Cooperative and WICHE's Technology Costing Methodology. WICHE has joined the MHEC's Master Property Program to improve risk management and lower insurance costs for their member institutions, saving over one hundred campuses between $3 and $4 million a year. WICHE also administered a national State Scholars Initiative, funded by the U.S. Department of Education, to arrange state-level business and education partnerships to encourage student readiness for college. These assorted projects illustrate the current and potential value of the compacts beyond their regional borders, but each one still meets regional needs in varied ways.

The Southern Regional Education Board includes governors, legislators, and other figures (some from higher education) from sixteen states (Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia). SREB was formed by the political leaders of its member states, and they retain leadership in the organization. SREB has played a major part in the development of such important areas as equal opportunity for all students in higher education and expanded graduate and professional education. Its research and information program has been vital in state and institutional planning. Its regular legislative work conferences, planned by its Legislative Advisory Council, have been influential in setting policy and funding directions in the region.

Regionally, SREB has provided extensive "state services," including the State Data Exchange and its outstanding *Fact Book on Higher Education*. Its Academic Common Market and Doctoral Scholars programs assist students in attending out-of-state colleges and provide states with cost-effective programs that do not duplicate expensive majors unnecessarily. The Electronic Campus uses modern technology to deliver educational opportunity throughout the region (and beyond). It offers more than 8,000 courses and 325 major programs at more than 300 institutions for online, anytime, anyplace education. The Distance Learning Policy Laboratory provides key studies on all phases of distance and e-learning, regionally and nationally. SREB's special institute designed to help minority scholars is an essential part of the effort that has resulted in a 90 percent graduation rate of doctoral scholars from the program who are preparing to be college

professors. The Council on Collegiate Education for Nursing keeps nurse educators informed about regional developments in their field. Current initiatives include a leadership program for staff from state agencies in higher education and a college readiness project to better prepare prospective students for study in higher education institutions. These varied areas illustrate the breadth and positive effects of this first regional compact and its influence on collegiate institutions.

The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education has members from fifteen states: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. WICHE was formed originally to pool educational resources; to help the states plan jointly for the preparation of specialized skilled manpower; and to avoid, where feasible, the duplication of expensive facilities. The student exchange program has been a major effort. Originally set up in the fields of medicine, dentistry, and veterinary medicine, it expanded greatly to include physical therapy, occupational therapy, optometry, podiatry, osteopathic medicine, dental hygiene, nursing, mental health, physician's assistants, pharmacy, public health, architecture, and graduate library studies. Later, the Western Regional Graduate Program (for all member states except California) included specialized interdisciplinary fields not commonly available in the WICHE states, allowing nonresident students to pay in-state rates. Thousands of professionals, mostly in health care areas, have received this assistance while enrolled in one of the contract programs in another WICHE state. Another special program supports efforts to recruit minority students into graduate degree programs and assist them in becoming college and university faculty members. All told, WICHE programs of this type assist close to 20,000 students a year, making maximum use of regional institutional facilities and saving costs for both the states involved and the students who participate. A more recent development, the Internet Course Exchange and its operations manual, provides member institutions with specialized course options and information about transferability and cost. WICHE's professional student exchange program, plus its state inventory of rural-health-practice incentives, helps students in twelve of its states to enroll in programs not yet available in their homes states.

WICHE contributes by sponsoring annual legislative workshops and timely special projects. Currently, it makes policy analyses and data available, through the Internet, on higher education in North America. A comparative research series was published on major policy issues and differences in higher education in Mexico and the United States. WICHE has developed a Western Cooperative for

Educational Telecommunications, which serves at least forty states and four continents in promoting the effective use of technology in higher education. Also, WICHE has produced quality standards for distance learning (Principles of Good Practice), developed a purchasing service for electronic equipment and services, and conducted research on actual returns in learning from these investments, as well as attempted to meet the needs of students in rural or under-served areas.

Another unique WICHE program with national and international impact is the Consortium for North American Higher Education Collaboration (CONAHEC). As a founding partner, WICHE has been active in establishing a regional bank of institutions and programs available to students from participating colleges and universities in Canada, Mexico, and the United States. CONAHEC sponsors the North American Student Exchange Program and fosters higher education's role in building economic ties and development in the North American trade area.

The enormous diversity of the WICHE programs and their ability to change to meet new needs is again indicative of the value of regional compacts. Their diverse services provide flexibility in the states they serve, often with positive influences far beyond their immediate region.

The New England Board of Higher Education serves six states—Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont—and is authorized by the U.S. Congress. It administers such projects as the regional student exchange program and conducts studies regarding current needs in higher education that cross state lines. Data on higher education in the New England states are collected, analyzed, and published widely for use by all interested groups in the region. Its Excellence through Diversity project gathers data from all six states and analyzes and publishes this information for regional planning purposes in each of the states. Also, timely special projects are coordinated through NEBHE, such as Project Photon, a funded endeavor stressing photonics as an important educational subject in all phases of education, from elementary schools through higher education. The program has been funded four times by the National Science Foundation, and the most recent grant employs problem-based learning where technology students solve real-world challenges from industry and research partners. Another topic, the STEM project, emphasizes work in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics through the NEBHE Science Network; it is another example of meeting a critical need in the six states. However, NEBHE's major program continues to be the student exchange, with its savings for students and optimum use of facilities. In one year, 8,000 New England students saved more than $37 million in tuition and fees.

One interesting NEBHE project was its studies of the need for veterinary medicine in the region. Political disputes about the potential location for such a program were so great that it did not develop until Tufts University started one in 1978. In this way, an important project of a regional compact (to bring a needed academic program to its area) led to the service being established by a private university. Currently, about six hundred students from many locations apply for admission, and sixty-five to seventy are accepted in each class, for a four-year program leading to a doctoral degree in veterinary medicine. This is an excellent example of the law of unintended consequences in higher education and of the importance of voluntary enterprise in American higher education.

The Midwestern Higher Education Compact serves twelve states: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. Its three current core functions are cost savings, student access, and policy research. Its service area involves 1,000 public and private nonprofit institutions and over 4 million students. MHEC was the last of the four regional compacts to be formed. Originally, it was established to provide for interstate student exchanges at in-state tuition rates, similar to the other compacts. In addition, it included cooperative programs in vocational and higher education, and an areawide approach to gathering and reporting information that facilitates state educational planning. MHEC is recognized by legislation in each of its member states and governed by a fifty-member commission made up of legislators, governors' appointed representatives, and leaders in higher education appointed by the governors and legislatures.

In its first decade, MHEC's productivity and cost-saving projects resulted in savings of $146 million. Key initiatives came from such items as a natural gas contract system, risk management (property insurance), purchasing contracts for computer hardware and operational software, and operational maintenance. MHEC set up the original American TelEd Communications Alliance with a nonprofit Michigan group (MiCTA). This was so successful that SREB, WICHE, and NEBHE joined it. It provides nationwide contracts for local area networks, wide area networks, and national wireless technology systems, including local voice services.

MHEC's original student exchange program has involved thousands of students attending more than one hundred of the member institutions' colleges. The

Graduate Exchange Program for Minority Scholars combined three smaller projects and has increased both scholarship aid and completion by future faculty members. A recent project, funded by the Lumina Foundation, expanded the *Midwestern Data Book* to provide further analyses of distance learning in the Midwest, economic growth factors and other policy priorities regarding student access, student retention, and adult education in the region.

MHEC was the last of the regional compacts to develop, but it has clearly shown that such an organization of states can have significant effects for colleges and universities. With the member states' governors and key legislators being an active part of the system, MHEC can influence the operation and services of the region's colleges and universities.

The current four interstate compacts cover all but a few of the states in the entire country. Their diversified programs alter as the needs of their regions change. The basic costs of their operations are funded by state legislatures from tax revenues, but foundation grants plus federal projects pay for several of the new thrusts of the regional commissions. This provides another excellent example of the flexible way that the mixed society of the United States operates to adapt to changing needs and emphases.

Conclusion

During the first two centuries of American higher education's existence, religious tenets and basic social agreements resulted in a relatively fixed, classically oriented program of studies. However, as society began to open up, industrialize, and expand, it demanded change in its colleges. When this was slow to occur, new institutions met these needs, and many existing ones closed. Between 1830 and 1900, normal schools, engineering schools, military academies, and universities were copied from institutions in Europe and adapted to American norms. However, even these were not sufficient to meet democracy's needs. New types of institutions were developed, unique or almost unique to America. The land-grant colleges of 1862 and 1890, the junior colleges of the early 1900s, the comprehensive state colleges of the 1960s to 1980s, and the post–World War II community colleges all represent essentially new types of institutions. Private constituency groups often pressured state or local governments to establish them, and in some cases these private groups pressured Congress into funding some of them, including the 1862 land-grant colleges and, particularly, the 1890 land-

grant colleges. The critical point, again, is that in the United States, new institutions replace existing ones that do not change.

Private constituencies, such as the five types detailed in this chapter, have a significant impact on institutional autonomy and academic freedom. Much of this impact is positive, supportive, and welcome. However, those that provide funds can affect institutional trends and directions by determining what types of academic programs or research efforts are supported. As federal and state monies tighten up even more in the years ahead, funds from alternate sources will become even more attractive. Acceptance of grants moves institutions in the directions dictated by the funding sources, and faculties are well advised to consider this possibility as the "crunch" of the twenty-first century becomes greater.

Finally, the real benefits accorded to institutions by private organizations must be mentioned again. Many membership organizations have been created to provide such advantages. In some cases, these benefits have been greater than anyone could have foreseen. Probably the most dramatic examples have come from private accrediting associations in relation to state political efforts to limit the autonomy and academic freedom of their public institutions. In 1938 the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools dropped North Dakota Agricultural College from membership because of undue political interference. The U.S. Court of Appeals upheld the action of North Central, and the state government backed away from its prior method of political interference in internal institutional affairs. In the post–World War II period, sanctions of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools stopped legislation banning on-campus speakers in North Carolina and, after 1954, contributed strongly to the development of open campuses in other states in its region. As the nation has worked to expand higher education opportunities for minorities, almost every type of association has participated. And as society has demanded that higher education become more cost-effective, many of these associations and commissions have adopted systems that have saved large amounts of money, so that academic programs may still be offered to the students they were established to serve.

Private organizations related in some way to postsecondary education clearly continue the great tradition of direct action by voluntary citizen associations. Increasingly, they stand in the middle, between control-oriented federal and state agencies and the private and public institutions. Governments have abandoned the self-denying ordinance that in recent decades kept a state at a distance from the essence of many of its institutions. The nurturance of supportive and helpful

private constituencies, therefore, becomes even more crucial as higher education enters the twenty-first century.

NOTES

1. For detailed information about foundations, the best overall source is the Foundation Center. Twelve regular publications constitute its core collection. They also have offices and reference collections in Atlanta, San Francisco, Washington, D.C., and Cleveland and cooperating collection centers in numerous libraries in each state. Its two main references are its own annual *Foundation Directory*, and the *Annual Register of Grant Support*, published by Information Today, Inc.
2. Two very useful foundation references are Joel L. Fleishman, *The Foundation: A Great American Secret: How Private Wealth is Changing the World* (New York: Public Affairs / Perseus Books Group, 2007); and the Chronicle of Philanthropy's *The Non-Profit Handbook*.
3. Three major references with extensive information about institutionally based associations are the *Encyclopedia of Associations*, published annually by Gale / Cengage Learning; the regular editions of *American Universities and Colleges*, available from the American Council on Education; and the *Higher Education Directory*, published annually by Higher Education Publications, Inc.
4. Two key sources of historical background information regarding voluntary institutional accreditation are Kenneth E. Young, Charles Chambers, and H. R. Kells and Associates, *Understanding Accreditation* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983); and Fred F. Harcleroad, *Accreditation: History, Process, and Problems* (Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1980). Since 1997, the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) has published an electronic *Directory of CHEA Participating and Recognized Organizations* (updated as changes become known) and a biannual print *Almanac of External Quality Review*. A somewhat different list of accrediting associations, by the U.S. Department of Education, has been available since it was required in the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. Inclusion on this list is one of several ways in which institutions can participate in a number of federal funding programs.
5. The best source of current information on consortia is this *Consortium Directory*, published by the Association for Consortium Leadership, c/o The Virginia Tidewater Consortium for Higher Education. Two major references about the work of consortia are Lawrence G. Dotolo and John B. Noftsinger, eds., *Leveraging Resources through Partnerships* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2002); and Lawrence G. Dotolo, *Access to Higher Education through Consortia* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2007.
6. Dotolo and Noftsinger, *Leveraging Resources*.