© *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education*
ISSN: 2166-2681 Volume 1, Issue 1, 2012
http://isejournal.org/

What Comes after Profit? A Critical Look at the Vast Potential for Public Higher Education in the 21st Century

Angelo Letizia
College of William and Mary (USA)

Abstract

The Top Jobs Act of the 21st Century (TJ21) is a state policy in Virginia which passed the legislature in June of 2011. The policy is supposed to be a blueprint of success for public higher education institutions in Virginia. Yet, this vision of progress may be simplistic and ultimately detrimental to the true progress of Virginia's state institutions. This paper will employ a dialectal lens, borrowed from Critical Theory, to assess the view of progress expounded by TJ21. The intent is to offer a true vision of progress, a dialectal progress which entails the overcoming of contradictions inherent in a state of affairs and arriving at a new, dynamic condition which is always open to further change.

Keywords: Critical Theory, Public Higher Education, Dialectic

Introduction

The objective of this paper is to elucidate an evolutionary conception of the notion of public higher education. Currently, however, the notion of public higher education has been under attack for the last forty years (Newfield, 2008; Slaughter & Rhodes, 2004; Washburn, 2005). The theories of neo-liberalism have supplied the foundation of the attack. Neo-liberals generally promote the notion of negative freedom, which essentially is the freedom of all individuals to pursue their own ends. Further, neo-liberals hold that the market is the most beneficial method for an individual to achieve these ends. Ultimately the market is the best measure of success (Fowler, 2009; Peet, 2009; Plant, 2010; Slaughter & Rhodes, 2004). Any communal notion or visions of social or economic justice are thought to be coercive of individual pursuits (Plant, 2010).

It is my contention however that the erosion of the public sphere in favor of this individualism and market ethos will have

disastrous results for society. The erosion of the public sphere may lead to a type of moral poverty, and specifically a poverty of communal virtue, political mindedness, civic participation and social transformation. I hope to use the notion of the dialect, as derived from critical theory, to regenerate the notion of public education. The dialectic will be applied to the TJ21 policy. This policy was chosen because it is an embodiment of neo-liberal theory. With TJ21, higher education is measured solely in market terms.

The Framework: Critical Theory and Neo-liberalism

In the Western philosophical tradition, the dialectic is described as a process by which higher levels of reality are brought forth through contradictions that are inherent in the existing state of affairs (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1969; Jay, 1996; Kellner, 1992). It began with Plato, and is most closely associated with Marx. The dialectic was almost always thought of as a progressive notion because of its forward movement and its dissolution of outdated structures. By the mid-twentieth century, after the horrors of the World Wars as well as the Soviet gulags, the dialectic as a progressive notion was a hard notion to sustain. As such, some began to rework it. Adorno argued for what he termed "negative dialectics." Negative dialectics do not presume a progressive state of affairs as the Marxian dialect did. The purpose of negative dialectics is to "express the inexpressible" (Adorno, 1973). Adorno argued that when one attempts to apprehend reality, there is so much the human mind cannot comprehend. Negative dialectics only proceed by this ever elusive attempt to capture what we cannot name. Despite this inability to completely name the unidentifiable, there is an attempt at understanding. Adorno stated that when we do try to express the inexpressible, we must not simply equate idea and thing. Rather, we must see ideas and concepts as part of a much wider constellation of meanings. Adorno and his colleague Max Horkheimer noted that the dialectic does not render neat and easily classifiable information or discreet facts, rather the dialectic helps connect disparate pieces of information. More recent commentators have argued that the dialect must lead to social action and social transformation (Kellner, 1992; Jay, 1996). At the very least, the dialectic leads to more questions than answers in an effort of transformation (Adorno, 1973; Horkheimer, 1974; Adorno & Horkheimer, 1969).

I believe negative dialectics can be an extremely beneficial tool by which to understand the notion of public education. If we take the term "public" not as a simple concept or identifier of a state of affairs but rather begin to see it as part of this constellation of meanings which are dynamic and fluid, we can begin to truly understand the meaning of public higher education, meanings that we have not articulated yet. By dialectally analyzing the TJ21 act, perhaps we can shed light on this intricate web of meanings of the notion of the public, and by doing so, offer a much more powerful and more justified argument to stem the tide of privatization of higher education.

The task was to use the information gleaned from various notions of public higher education and integrate this information with the information of the policy, in order to dialectally transform it. Drawing on Adorno's conception of negative dialectics, I created questions regarding the juxtaposition of the radical notions of public higher education with the information contained in the TJ21 act. Adorno argued that we must try to conceptualize the inexpressible without becoming its equal (1973), this for him was the essence of negative dialectics.

The theory of neo-liberalism developed in the mid-twentieth century in the United States. It developed as a result of the perceived attack on American businesses by New Deal liberals (Overtvelt, 2007; Peet, 2009). The movement was largely spearheaded by the University of Chicago economists F.A. Hayek, Milton Freidman and Gary Becker. Neo-liberalism rests on a few key tenets: a militant defense of the free-market system, a staunch defense of the notion of individual freedom, and above all the notion that the workings of social institutions could be understood quantitatively (Filia, 2010; Overtveldt, 2007; and Reder, 1982). In a broad sense, the tenets of this paradigm were derived from the Enlightenment thinkers such as Adam Smith and other 18th century liberals who advocated laissez-faire policies and later industrial preoccupations with rational functioning, individual autonomy, and efficiency. For neo-liberals, the free-market is the embodiment of reason. Allowed to operate unencumbered, the free-market will produce the most rational and efficient society. Neo-liberal theories became a permanent part of the American political landscape with the election of Ronald Reagan in 1981. The TJ21 policy is the embodiment of neo-liberalism because it casts the market as the sole source of legitimacy and value for higher education.

Methodology

The first step was to gain an understanding of what the notion of public higher education actually means. For this step, I read classic and current work regarding the notions of public and public education. From these readings I gained a "public matrix" which allowed me to understand exactly what public higher education entails, or should entail. The notion of "public education" is extremely multifarious. Due to this I consulted relevant higher education literature and looked for themes and commonalities amongst the literature in order to demarcate a definition of public higher education. The sources chosen represent some of the most recent literature on public higher education, within the last 20 years. Additionally, I chose literature that dealt with the history of higher education in the United States.

Step 1: Sources and Themes

Sources:

Howard Bowen's *Investment in learning: The individual and social value of American higher education.*
Lewis and Hearn's *The public research university: Serving the public good in new times.*
Newfield's *Unmaking the public university: The forty year assault on the middle class.*
Washburn's *University Inc: The corporate corruption of higher education.* Slaughter and Rhoades' *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state and higher education.*
Rhoads and Torres's *University, state and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas*
Thelin's *History of American Higher Education*
Geiger's *The rise and fall of useful knowledge: Higher education for science, agriculture & the mechanics arts, 1850-1875*.
Horowitz's *The 1960s and the transformation of campus cultures*
Wolfe and Zuvekas' *Nonmarket outcomes of schooling*
Goan and Cunningham's *The Investment payoff: A 50-state analysis of the public and private benefits of higher education*
Greenwood's *New developments in the intergenerational impact of education*
Vestrich's *The academy under siege: Threats to teaching and learning in American Higher Education*
While this list is not exhaustive, each of the works examined the notion of public education from a variety of angles. I tried to formulate

some general and related points from the literature. The ideas from this list became the public matrix and were used to question and critique the static visions neo-liberalism. Below is a listing of the related themes I found:

1. Public higher education benefits every member of society (Bowen, 1996).
2. This benefit can be described in a four point framework (articles,)
   a. Private monetary benefits
   b. Public monetary benefits
   c. Private non-monetary benefits
   d. Public non-monetary benefits (which are the hardest to measure)
3. Public higher education has tremendous intergenerational benefits (Bowen, 1996; Greenwood, 1997).
4. Public Higher Education forms a social contract with society (Lewis & Hearn, 2003, Bok, 2000)
5. The public nature of education allows for the free flow of scientific information, in the forms of journals, conferences and research (Washburn, 2005)
6. Over the last 30 years, there has been a trivialization and neglect of the humanities, yet these disciplines are crucial to a society (Harvard)
7. Public Higher Education is a multiracial, democratic, egalitarian institution (Newfield, 2008).
8. Public education, in the widest sense has the capability of producing positive social change (Newfield, 2008; Bowen, 1996).
9. Social change, both positive and negative, is evident from the almost 400 year history of Higher Education in the United States (Thelin, 2004, Sugrue, 2000, Horowitz, 198).

Step 2: Coding

I then read and coded the TJ21 policy. I tried to determine how the policy represented public education. What words, phrases and terms did policymakers use to describe public education, both its processes and benefits? The answer was exclusively neo-liberal terms. In fact, there was not one mention of any liberal or humanist notions of education. The link to the full policy is: http://lis.virginia.gov/cgi-bin/legp604.exe?000+cod+23-38.87C10, and the short title and summary appear in Appendix A. The short summary puts forth 10 aspirations of the policy. Consistent with the literature of neo-liberalism, I elucidated five general themes from the stated purposes of the policy. I grouped similar propositions together. For instance, there were numerous references made the "economic impact" of higher education, to the "revenue enhancement" fostered by higher education, to the fact that higher education is equated with "economic growth" and how higher education is equated with higher earning power. There is also an effort to measure the "economic value of individual degree programs." From these and related statements, I created five similar but distinct categories that the act can be classified into. These are:

a) Higher education will strengthen individual's economic earning power
b) Higher education will be a revenue enhancer for the state
c) Higher education should create more skilled workers
d) Higher education should foster business partnerships between corporations and universities
e) Higher education should stimulate profitable commercialization of products

Step 3: The Dialectical Transformation

The last step entailed the heart of the project, which was a dialectal transformation of the TJ21 policy. Here, I contrasted the information of the public matrix with the themes I elucidated from the text of the TJ21 policy by writing questions which drew on the ideas of the matrix and critiqued the information in the categories.

Results

Public higher education benefits every person in American society (Bowen, 1996). This is done in a number of ways. For one, institutions of public higher education produce both public and private monetary benefits and public and private non-monetary benefits (Lewis & Hearn, 2003). The public and private monetary benefits are familiar to policymakers, higher education administrators and the public at large; these include but are not limited to higher earnings for individuals, higher tax base for the state, and profitable scientific discoveries. Some private nonmonetary benefits are increased civic participation, increased tolerance of diversity, increased attendance at cultural events, better health and even happier marriages (Bowen, 1996). It is the public non-monetary benefits however that may be one of the greatest value for society. More than this, higher education has massive intergenerational effects (Bowen, 1996; Greenwood, 1997). Educated parents tend to raise better educated and better prepared children. In turn, these children tend to be happier and more successful in life. This may be the greatest benefit of all (Bowen, 1996; Greenwood, 1997).

In essence, public higher education is a social contract with society, society gives tax dollars and public education enhances society (Lewis & Hearn, 2003). Due to the multifaceted nature of results of public education, public education allows for the free flow of information (Washburn, 2005). Scientific information, cultural information, practical information etc., all information is (or should be able to) flow freely and be accessible to anyone in society. Institutions of public higher education deal with many forms of knowledge and products that the market would not otherwise be involved in. Many types of basic scientific research are not profitable, as well as almost all types of historical and cultural research, but all of these are vital and necessary (Washburn, 2005, Lewis & Hearn, 2003). Lastly, public higher education is multicultural, multiracial and democratic. Due to this, it is able to promote egalitarianism in society. Public higher education is accessible (or should be) to all strata of society, thus enabling all citizens, regardless of class, to live a better life (Newfield, 2008). As Newfield pointed out, the society being created by higher education from the 1950s to the late 1970s was egalitarian and able to change the status quo-thus the fear it engendered in the elites (Newfield, 2008). The changes wrought by public higher education may not be visible; rather, they may occur down the line, in ways not dreamed of. Small changes can set in motion larger chains of events, patterns of thoughts and larger societal changes (Bowen, 1996). In short, the greatest public nonmonetary benefit is the potential for social change.

This notion of societal change inspired by higher education is not simply rhetoric. Higher education has led to many societal changes; some positive and some negative in the course of American history (Finnegan, 2001; Geiger, 1998). A brief survey of some of the more notable changes produced in America society, at least in part by higher education, will illustrate this point. Higher education was one the contributing factors in the American Revolution (Thelin, 2004). Harvard, The

College of William and Mary and Princeton (at the time called The College of New Jersey) had schooled some of colonies most formidable revolutionaries whose ideas helped to guide the revolution; Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, James Madison to name a few. Similarly, Harvard and the College of William and Mary also provided for a milieu of foment and dissention. Not that every student and faculty member was an ardent revolutionary, but there certainly existed strong elements which helped to propel the revolution. South Carolina College, founded in 1805 to rebut the presumed tide of Jeffersonian republicanism (which espoused visions of egalitarianism which made Southern aristocrats shudder), went on to mold literally hundreds of Southern politicians, thinkers and leaders of the Civil War. Most notably, the ideas of succession and slavery were discussed, refined and employed in the defense of the Confederate States of America (Sugrue, 2000). A new brand of higher education developed during the latter half of the 19th century; that of practical education. Engineering, scientific education, agricultural education and medicine all assumed places at American Universities. This brand of practical education opened up new avenues for higher education and for its extension into mainstream American society, for example, cooperative extension (Gieger, 1998). Perhaps the most famous change brought on by higher education was the events of the 1960s. Racial, social, and gender changes ignited a seemingly docile society (Horowitz, 1986). Students and faculty demanded racial equality, gender equality, social equality, and an end to the exploitive conflict in Vietnam. At the same time, another change, a subtle change was brewing, which would come to fruition in the 1980s. These were was the doctrines of neo-liberalism, produced mainly at the University of Chicago. These doctrines, while considered radical in the 1960s, became mainstream during the 1980s and the presidency of Ronald Reagan (Overtveldt, 2007; Peet, 2009). While the above list of changes is by no means exhaustive, it does point to the power of higher education in promoting vast and far reaching societal changes.

Public higher education is not a simple concept. Borrowing from Adorno, we can see higher education as part of a much larger constellation of meaning. The majority of this meaning we cannot see in the present. As Bowen noted, higher education has the ability to inspire a vast array of social changes at various times in a students' life. At present however, the TJ21 act assumes that public higher education is merely economic. There is only the assumption on the part of administrators and policymakers of simple causality, namely that A (higher education as an economic entity) will produce B (profit for individuals and society). There is no concept of constellation thinking, far reaching causes, cultural impacts (or lack of them) or anything outside profit and capitalism. Adorno argued that a true dialectic can have no original ground, or no predetermined end point. Even the Marxian dialect had a predetermined endpoint, communist society and classless society. Adorno saw this as constraining and rigid (Adorno, 1973). There is no endpoint in negative dialectics, only a continual advancement and quest to name the unknown. The TJ21 policy has a predetermined endpoint: profit. But what comes after profit? It is a static notion, one that cannot account for the complexity of existence, for the constellation that is our reality. Profit and economic wellbeing are absolutely necessary to this prosperity, but not at the cost of everything else. We must progress further. However, as it stands now, the TJ21 policy has no other dimension but profit.

In accordance with neo-liberal theories, the public notion embodied in the legislation is purely economic. The only justice in a neo-

liberal state is negative freedom, of allowing individuals to pursue their own path, uninhibited, so long as they do not intentionally harm others (and intentional harm is interpreted very vaguely by neo-liberal scholars). For neo-liberals, market value is the measure of all success for individuals (Plant, 2010). Neo-liberals believe that the market is superior to any public ethics and to any government interventions (Plant, 2010). The TJ21 policy renders public education subordinate to the market. A college degree, as well as the products that colleges produce, must enhance market value of individuals and all outcomes of public education must have market value. Again, according to Bowen, as well as the articles, economic vitality is only one facet of higher education.

Of course, even many neo-liberals argue that the market is irrational. The market cannot produce anything virtuous or moral; these must be done outside the market (Plant, 2010). The market provides necessary information regarding products. It also however, rewards sensationalism, swindling, avarice and unscrupulousness. Predatory lending, outsourcing, downsizing, the destruction of small business and the Great Recession of 2007 are all evidence of this. As wealth accumulates in the hands of the few, the market loses its rationality (Megill, 2002; Plant, 2010). While the market is necessary, the only "morality" in the market is profit. By calling for an impotent public subordinate to the market, a purely neo-liberal focus could lead to a sanctioned barbarism and the rule of the strongest. In negative freedom, all individuals are free from coercion, but all individuals have differing levels of ability and resources (inherited, accumulated, etc) are no longer equal. These unequal individuals are then free to accumulate profit at others expense (so long as they physically do not coerce or threaten anyone). About a century ago, the French sociologist Georges Sorel argued that capitalism had brought forth a new type of violence. Capitalism had made obsolete physical violence but replaced it with economic violence, fraud, trickery, corrosive lobbying for self-interest, bribery etc (Sorel, 1963). With no moral code or belief in social equality Sorel's notion of economic violence is not tolerated but accepted as the norm. Hobbes prediction is vindicated and society becomes a war of all against all. This is why a public ethics, or some form of morality or obligation to each other is a necessity in an advanced society.

Neo-liberals however object to the whole notion of what Plant calls the "public ethos" (Plant, 2010). In fact, at the time of writing this article, many neo-liberals and conservatives are railing at President Obama's speech on July 13th 2012, when he urged people to remember that no one accomplishes anything on their own, we all need each other. The public ethos can be described as a will to serve humanity and the public good that public servants embody (Plant, 2010). Instead, neo-liberals look at the public sector rather as animated by rationalistic self-interested individualism, the same as the private sector (Plant, 2010). Rebutting this claim is very important, not just for higher education but for all public entities. This is what sets public entities apart from the private sector. It is the fact that public servants are not pursuing profit, but rather the public good. Three objections can be made to the neo-liberal claim that the public sector is animated by the same motives of the private sector, namely profit maximization.

First, there must be a distinction made between ground level public servants and bureaucrats. To argue that ground level public servants, such as teachers, firefighters, social workers, public defendants and the majority of college professors (especially professors at community colleges, liberal arts institutions

and even adjuncts) to name a few are animated by the profit motive is absurd. Certainly there must be something of a public ethos, a desire to make the world better, for one to seek employment in the above positions.

This is not to say that market factor is not at work for some upper level bureaucrats. Yet it would be a grave oversimplification to label all bureaucrats and administrators as self-interested profit maximizers. There are many of administrators and bureaucrats who diligently work for the public good (Dare, 2010). What many neo-liberals, in their disdain for bureaucracy fail to realize is that public entities must compete in a capitalistic society? These entities are judged according to the rules of the market, not by any public ethos (Habermas, 1973). This is especially true in regards to higher education. Institutions of higher education across the United States are becoming more entrepreneurial (Slaughter & Rhodes, 2004, Washburn, 2005). Collegiate sports, patenting endeavors by college officials, the growth of R and D departments and administrators all speak to this growing entrepreneurial spirit. This entrepreneurialism is necessary in many ways for colleges to keep pace in an increasingly neo-liberal society, which measures all success by profit (Slaughter & Rhodes, 2004). As Washburn points out, these market endeavors have meet with limited success, and really the only big success has been gained by Ivy League and other already successful colleges (Washburn, 2005). The smaller colleges spend substantial amounts of money on R and D projects in hopes of striking it big with a profitable patent, but on the average, these colleges are losing money (Washburn, 2005). Further, this market driven behavior must also be seen in light of declining state revenues.

Lastly, the capitalist system itself necessitates the creation of many public entities, such as regulatory agencies, public assistance and welfare and even entities such as unions (Hobsbawm, 2012). So while many of these entities are overly bureaucratic, and while some of these bureaucrats may be animated by the profit motive, we cannot separate this fact from the pressures of the capitalist system itself. Indeed, to keep pace with its growing inequities, and to ensure that profit is still made, these functions are necessary. Growing bureaucracies are necessary to tackle large scale and complicated problems (Dare, 2010).

Notions of the public are seen by neo-liberals as coercive. Yet even the staunchest neo-liberal admits the necessity of public goods and services (Plant, 2010). As the public matrix makes clear however, benefits of public higher education are not necessary evils but positive benefits, and many are outside the "morality" of the market. Public higher education is not coercive, but transformational. It is able to lead to a richer, more diverse society which can enable all individuals to lead fuller lives and contribute back to society. This will enhance the individual –societal relationship. Of course this is directly opposed to neo-liberalism. Most neo-liberals do not believe that members of society have any obligation towards each other, or to any anthromorphic notions of society. Rather, the only obligation is to oneself. What neo-liberals fail to realize or do not want to admit is that any individual achievement cannot be achieved without society, that almost all individual achievements utilize to some degree public institutions (government, defense, infrastructure, science and medicine), culture (language, law, ideas) and the underpinning of all these notions, which make individual achievement possible, is public higher education. As Newfield argues, the potential is enormous (Newfield, 2008). Social existence, promoted by public higher education, is the foundation of the individual. Subsequently, if individuals retreat from their social obligations

as neo-liberalism would have it, the social may crumble, and all individual descend into modern barbarism and anarchy. Neo-liberalism is a perpetual present, with no obligation to posterity. True higher education, one grounded not just in economic vitality but in humanism contemplates the entire human condition, its past, present and future.

Public higher education also suffers from an internal self-paralysis as administrators try in vain to survive in an increasingly neo-liberal and market driven society (Slaughter & Rhodes, 2004; Washburn, 2005). This is the impasse which we are at. I contrasted the ideas of the public matrix with the five categories elucidated from the TJ21 Act and crafted questions to reflect this juxtaposition. It is the hope that these questions can light some aspects of the constellation of meaning of public higher education:

- If higher education is to remain a societal good, can there be a notion of the individual without society to sustain it? What is the role of higher education in the process of demarcating individuals from society?
- In regards to its transformative power, what will be the potential of higher education for social change if directed under policies of neo-liberalism and its success is measured solely by the market?
- Considering the social, public and intergenerational effects of higher education, do we, as a society and individuals have an obligation to aid one another and our posterity, and if so, what is the role of higher education in this process?
- Can information remain free and public if constrained by corporate interests? Does the restriction of information created by higher education (medicines etc) violate the social contract with society?
- What comes after profit? Considering the personal, societal and non-monetary benefits of higher education, how can an emphasis on economic prosperity be retained while broadening our view of the impacts of higher education?
- As Bowen notes, higher education has many different effects on many different types of people. Further, these effects manifest themselves at different points in one's life and in conjunction with other members of society. With this in mind, how can we move from simple causal apprehension of higher education to a more complex constellation perception of higher education?
- Can we begin to create and illustrate this ever changing constellation that higher education represents in contemporary society?

Conclusion

The TJ21 policy frames higher education strictly in private and public economic terms. This in itself is not a bad thing. Higher education policymakers and administrators have much to learn from neo-liberalism. Higher education is an economic investment for individuals and society. I am not denying this, nor am I trying to hinder this. A prosperous economy is one of the foundations to a stable and beneficent society. It is not however, the only foundation. As the research in this article has shown, higher education is a societal entity. It is a public good which has the potential to transform society. First I detailed the public nature of higher education. I drew on the various literature related to the nonmonetary benefits of public higher education and created the public matrix. Next, I coded the TJ21 policy

and condensed it into five relevant categories. The last step entailed the dialectal transformation of the TJ21 categories. I contrasted the information in the public matrix with the categories I created for TJ21. I was guided by Adorno's notion of negative dialectics. I sought to illustrate how higher education really entailed a web of meaning. Higher education should entail a narrow economic focus. This narrow focus will limit our understanding of higher education's potential to change society. I ended with a series of dialectal questions. They were dialectal because they integrated what was outside the current understanding of higher education, namely it's more humanistic and transformative elements.

The dialectical analysis in this paper is tentative and incomplete. And this is by design. There can never be a complete analysis; there will always be silences of the inexpressible that we must try, in vain, to understand. The significance of this work is not to make succinct recommendations for public higher education. Rather the work will hopefully begin a conversation, a dialectal action, to transform higher education and unlock its potential and illustrate the constellation of meaning. The questions are not meant to be answered in a straightforward or succinct manner. Rather the answering of these questions should engender more questions.

Appendix A

Summary of Top Jobs Act

This article may be cited as the "Preparing for the Top Jobs of the 21st Century: The Virginia Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2011," the "Top Jobs Act," or "TJ21." The objective of this chapter is to fuel strong economic growth in the Commonwealth and prepare Virginians for the top job opportunities in the knowledge-driven economy of the 21st century by establishing a long-term commitment, policy, and framework for sustained investment and innovation that will enable the Commonwealth to build upon the strengths of its excellent higher education system and achieve national and international leadership in college degree attainment and personal income, and that will ensure these educational and economic opportunities are accessible and affordable for all capable and committed Virginia students.

In furtherance of this objective, the following purposes shall inform the development and implementation of funding policies, performance criteria, economic opportunity metrics, and recommendations required by this chapter:

1. To ensure an educated workforce in Virginia through a public-private higher education system whose hallmarks are instructional excellence, affordable access, economic impact, institutional diversity and managerial autonomy, cost-efficient operation, technological and pedagogical innovation, and reform-based investment;

2. To take optimal advantage of the demonstrated correlation between higher education and economic growth by investing in a manner that will generate economic growth, job creation, personal income growth, and revenues generated for state and local government in Virginia;

3. To place Virginia among the most highly educated states and countries by conferring approximately 100,000 cumulative additional undergraduate degrees on Virginians between 2011 and 2025, accompanied by a comparable percentage increase in privately conferred Virginia undergraduate degrees over the same period, and to achieve these targets by expanding enrollment of Virginians at public

and private higher education institutions in the Commonwealth, improving undergraduate graduation and retention rates in the Virginia higher education system, and increasing degree completion by Virginians with partial credit toward a college degree, including students with ongoing job and family commitments who need access to nontraditional college-level educational opportunities;

4. To enhance personal opportunity and earning power for individual Virginians by increasing college degree attainment in the Commonwealth, especially in high-demand, high-income fields such as science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and health care, and by providing information about the economic value and impact of individual degree programs by institution;

5. To promote university-based research that produces outside investment in Virginia, fuels economic advances, triggers commercialization of new products and processes, fosters the formation of new businesses, leads businesses to bring their facilities and jobs to Virginia, and in other ways helps place the Commonwealth on the leading edge in the knowledge-driven economy;

6. To support the national effort to enhance the security and economic competiveness of the United States of America, and to secure a leading economic position for the Commonwealth of Virginia, through increased research and instruction in science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and related fields, which require qualified faculty, appropriate research facilities and equipment, public-private and intergovernmental collaboration, and sustained state support;

7. To preserve and enhance the Virginia higher education system's excellence and cost-efficiency through reform-based investment that promotes innovative instructional models and pathways to degree attainment, including optimal use of physical facilities and instructional resources throughout the year, technology-enhanced instruction, sharing of instructional resources between and among colleges, universities, and other degree-granting entities in the Commonwealth, increased online learning opportunities for nontraditional students, improved rate and pace of degree completion, expanded availability of dual enrollment and advanced placement options and early college commitment programs, expanded community college transfer options leading to bachelor's degree completion, and enhanced college readiness before matriculation, among other reforms;

8. To realize the potential for enhanced benefits from the Restructured Higher Education Financial and Administrative Operations Act of 2005 (§ 23-38.88 et seq.), through a sustained commitment to the principles of autonomy, accountability, affordable access, and mutual trust and obligation underlying the restructuring initiative;

9. To establish a higher education funding framework and policy that promotes stable, predictable, equitable, and adequate funding, facilitates effective planning at the institutional and state levels, provides incentives for increased enrollment of Virginia students at public and private nonprofit colleges and universities in the Commonwealth, provides need-based financial aid for low-income and middle-income students and families, relieves the upward pressure on tuition associated with loss of state support due to economic downturns or other causes, and provides financial incentives to promote innovation and enhanced economic opportunity in furtherance of the objective of this chapter; and

10. To recognize that the unique mission and contributions of each institution of higher education in the Commonwealth is consistent with the desire to build upon the strengths of the Commonwealth's excellent system of higher education, to afford these unique missions and contributions appropriate safeguards, and to allow these attributes to inform the development and implementation of funding policies, performance criteria, economic opportunity metrics, and recommendations in the furtherance of this chapter's objectives.

References

Adorno, T. (1978). *Minima moralia: Reflections from a damaged life* (translated). New York, NY: Verso Press.

Adorno, T. (1973). *Negative dialectics* (translated). New York, NY: Continuum Press.

Adorno, T., & Horkheimer, M. (1969). *Dialectic of enlightenment.* (2nd ed). Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Bowen, H. (1996). *Investment in learning: The individual and social value of American higher education.* (2nd Ed). Introduction by Cameron Fincher. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Transaction publishers.

Dare, D. (2010). The state, bureaucracy and corruption in Nigeria. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 8* (3), 39-46.

Finnegan, D. (2001). Origins of the YMCA universities: Organizational adaptations in urban education. *History of Higher Education Annual, 21,* 47-77.

Fowler, F. (2009). *Policy studies for educational leaders: An introduction*. (3rd ed). New York, NY: Pearson.

Geiger, R. (1998). The rise and fall of useful knowledge: Higher education for science, agriculture & the mechanics arts, 1850-1875. *History of Higher Education Annual, 18,* 47-65.

Goan, S., & Cunningham, A. (2008). The Investment payoff: A 50-state analysis of the public and private benefits of higher education. *American Academic,* 2, 23-38.

Greenwood, D. (1997). New developments in the intergenerational impact of education. *International Journal of Educational Research,* 27, 503-510.

Habermas, J. (1973). *Legitimation crisis.* Translated by T. McCarthy. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Hobsbowm, E. (2012). Introduction to *the communist manifesto.* New York, NY: Verso Press.

Horowitz, H. (1986). The 1960s and the transformation of campus cultures. *History of Education Quarterly, 26,* 2-38.

Jay, M. (1996). *The dialectal imagination: A history of the Frankfurt school and the institute of social research, 1923-1950.* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Kellner, D. (1992). *Critical theory, Marxism and modernity.* (2nd ed). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.

Lewis, D., & Hearn, J. (2003). *The public research university: Serving the public good in new times.* New York, NY: University Press of America.

McMahon, W. (1997). Introduction. *International Journal of Educational Research, 27,* 449-479.

Megill, A. (2002). *Karl Marx: The burden of reason.* New York, NY: Continuum Press.

Newfield, C. (2008). *Unmaking the public university: The forty year assault on the middle class.* Quincy, MA: Harvard University Press.

Overtveldt, J. (2007). *The Chicago school: How the University of Chicago assembled the thinkers who revolutionized economics and business.* Canada: Agate Publishing.

Peet, R. (2009). *Unholy trinity: The IMF, World Bank and WTO*. (2nd ed). New York, NY: Zed Books.

Plant, R. (2010). *The Neo-liberal state.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Rhoads, R., & Torres, C. (2006). *University, state and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas.* Palo Alto: Stanford Press.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state and higher education.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Sorel, G. (1963). *Ethics of violence*. In *Varieties of classic social theory*, edited by Hendrik Ruitenbeek. New York, NY: E.P. Dutton & Co.

Sugrue, M. (2000). "We desired our future rulers to be educated men" South Carolina College, the defense of slavery, and the development of secessionist politics. *The American College in the nineteenth century*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Thelin, J. (2004). *The history of American higher education.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Vestrich, R. (2008). The academy under siege: Threats to teaching and learning in American higher education. *American Academic, 2*, 55-71.

Washburn, J. (2006). *University Inc.: The corporate corruption of higher education.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Wolfe, B., & Zuvekas, S. (1997). Nonmarket outcomes of schooling. *International Journal of Educational Research, 27*, 491-502.

About the Author:

Angelo J. Letizia is currently a doctoral student in the Educational Policy, Planning and Leadership Program at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia.