

ROUGH DRAFT

MLE '86

6/86

K. Patricia Cross

Harvard Graduate School of Education

The premise of the paper you were asked to read "The Changing Role of Higher Education in the Learning Society" was that the Learning Society is changing the role of educational institutions. That premise is consistent with George Keller's estimate that three-fourths of all change in colleges and universities is now triggered by forces external to the institution--demographics, legislation, court decisions, technology, and the like.

Keller's point, made famous by his writing on strategic planning, is that managers in higher education are going to have to look at the changing world outside the ivy halls if they are to adapt to the Learning Society and to serve it well. Indeed, the most talked about external factor affecting higher education today is demographics--the size and characteristics of the various age cohorts. And for many colleges, their very survival depends upon their response to demographic changes in the external world that they can do absolutely nothing to change.

What I thought we might do today is to take a second look at the factors that I identified in my paper as changing the role of higher education in society. Which trends are continuing to play a role in forcing change within institutions of higher education, and how? In the article I attempted to sweep across the Learning Society with a broad brush pointing to many factors in the changing environment. Today, I would like to probe a

little more deeply into several factors that seem to be emerging as more significant and more immediate.

I think the class might benefit most from a brief update from the literature and research, which deal with general or national trends and are therefore inevitably inaccurate for some institutions in some states. I would like to keep this informal enough so that you can share observations about trends you see from your local perspectives, working in the trenches with the elements of the Learning Society that are most visible to you from the perspective of individual institutions.

The external pressures for change that I addressed in the assigned reading were basically 1) competition from other providers of adult education (corporations, community agencies, technology, etc.), 2) demographics (more older students, more minorities), 3) changing life styles of students (blended life-plan more women, more part-time, better educated), and 4) the need for the development of human capital as a result of the dependence of the economy on information and service workers.

There are other forces, of course, that were not given much attention in that article, but that we might put into the hopper this morning--legislation, the educational reform movement, court decisions, and perhaps others.

We can divide external pressures for change into two sets--those where the impact is felt rather quickly, i.e. five years makes a difference, and those that are less dramatic in their impact and occur gradually over the generations.

Demographics, competition among providers of educational services, and legislation are dramatic forces where the "prob-

MLE 6/11/86

Let me tell you why I'm here

Cliff - writing day - I'll be one day, one C. & V. do
take a look at article & see if I'm

sure - good idea - We'll keep up. Good ones
Cliff left copy of article & departed. I'll file
month ago - opened file (orderly)

What had I agreed to? - update the L.S.

Not a modest agenda, esp for the
the L.S. & the whole more synonymous.

Started to review systematically the elements of L.S.

1- There are Learners -

^{update} Demographics, ^{pop culture} changing life style, ^{Bob Keegan} A dec.

2. There are providers - There is a juicy topic

includes ^{community} C & S organization ^{So Cal & Y. Chow}

3- There are the new emphases of ^{economic growth} soc - human capital

4- There are the edict reform reports - ^{with Cabinet order}

^{do up project work} Nation at Risk - Carnegie on T.E.

5- There is ~~now~~ whole issue of policy - Fed to state.

^{Mondale -}
Plenty to update ^{if I'm going to organize all P, I} ~~specifically~~ ^{may as well C. & V. go on article - half}
But the theme of ^{traditional} ~~article~~ was how inst of h.e. are ^{done.}
being changed & forces in L.S.

Keller - 75% of all change triggered from external

Plenty to "update" surely.

If I'm going to C. how I call P, I may as well try to organize it & a think piece article -

So what I have is a half-done article & I invite you urgently solicit your perceptions & corrections. What is happening in research & the lit isn't it that "is local scene" - what happens at one rail & happens at the shore perspective.

There is article was what are forces L.S. C. to N.E?

^{strategic planning.}

George Keller - 75% of all change triggered by external.

What are the major external factors triggering the responsiveness of h.e. to A. Lers?

lems" are quickly, and almost universally recognized and where the response is targeted, specific, and speedy. Legislation and court decisions are the most obvious, but demographics--although it takes eighteen years getting to colleges and universities--also calls for a targeted, speedy response.

The longer term pressures come from gradual changes that most people see coming, but the person or leader who responds to them is said to have "vision" or to grasp the big picture. Responding to legislation or the statistics of demographics, for example, is pragmatic and practical, but responding to changing life styles or the differences that women managers may make in the work place, is more subtle, less specific with respect to educational requirements, and requires a somewhat longer vision and more persuasive leadership style.

As I view the scene from a national perspective, I would observe that demographics has triggered the most immediate response from higher education to the needs of adult learners, (colleges have really gotten the clear message that the population of 18-24 year olds ^{declining, 25-35 year olds are} is the largest population group into the 1990s, and those 35 and older also constitute a rich and growing market for higher education). Colleges are also well aware of the increasing importance of women, especially 25 to 34 year olds, part-time students (who now make up almost half of all college students) and the predicted rise of minority populations. ^{certainly nothing that Bob H. has not said} There isn't much new to be said about demographics, and I am not going to belabor that influence.

The second most potent trigger for higher education to respond to the Learning Society is competition ^{among providers} or the opportunity

for collaboration with other providers of education in the Learning Society--primarily employers in the private sector and government. From community colleges to research universities, someone has been busy talking to and writing contracts with businesses for the education and training of employees and for sharing of faculty and state-of-the-art equipment. Where colleges have not been writing contracts, they have been worrying about whether they should.

The third most potent trigger is legislation--in states where long-range planning for the Learning Society is being addressed.

Since we can't cover the whole Learning Society in an hour and a half, I am going to spend most of my time talking about recent developments in corporate education and ^{if time} state legislation.

The paper you read is fairly recent--1984--but since that time two rather important books have been published on the competition that I pointed to in Premise Number One, i.e. "that institutions of higher education no longer enjoy a monopoly on the provision of educational services." That premise is the combined result of two forces--demographic changes and interest in the development of human capital. Since demographics are forcing institutions into serving an older, part-time student body, and human capital has replaced land and machinery as an economic force, colleges are pushed into competition with other providers of education for adults in the Learning Society. One could identify any number of alternative providers of adult education--government, including the military, community agencies, private

non-profit educators (which consist of coaching schools, proprietary care programs, free-standing adult education programs--usually of a social nature, financial planning seminars put on by brokers, insurance companies and the like). ^{Third party vendors} This may be one of the most invisible, yet rapidly growing group of educational providers.

The competitive/cooperative provider that seems to have gained the lion's share of the attention in the literature, however, is corporate education. Nell Eurich's 1985 Carnegie Report entitled Corporate Classrooms: The Learning Business is one of the more thorough descriptions of corporate education. She traveled throughout the country, looked at learning sites, interviewed corporate directors and executives, and tried to assess the impact of corporate education on the educational establishment and on American society.

The second book, The Missing Connection Between Business and Universities by Ernest Lynton is a synthesis of research and writing on corporate education with a critical analysis of the barriers to cooperation between business and universities and what can or should be done about it.

Let me just hit the highpoints of this new literature and then I would like to ask for responses from you regarding your personal experience with this particular form of competition and the potential for collaboration--which is where most authorities seem to think we should be heading.

There aren't very many in this room, I suspect, that have not heard the statistics that corporate education spends as much money and handles as many students as all four-year colleges

and universities combined. Estimates of expenditures start with forty billion dollars and move up from there, depending in part on whether or not you count employee wages when they are learning rather than producing.

The most dramatic examples of corporate education come from technology-based industries--ATT, IBM, Digital, but financial industries (Aetna) and even production and service organizations (MacDonalds, Hilton) are also into extensive, and according to Eurich, well designed and sophisticated alternative programs of adult education.

For industry, education is regarded as a "investment" in human capital--sometimes human salvage as in compensatory education, sometimes in efficiency and effectiveness as in management training, sometimes in the education of people with "idea power" which Kanter says is the most potent economic stimulus of all. Those goals are not basically different from those of higher education--remediation, career preparation and personal development.

Eurich found three basic types of corporate education--compensatory (compensating for the poor jobs schools have done in teaching basic skills), company oriented education (from orientation for new employees to strategic planning for executives), and recruitment and benefit education which is used in some cases to ward off unionization and in others to respond to the demands of unions for educational benefits.

Eurich estimates that 60% to 80% of corporate education is in-house. I think it is difficult to tell which way corporate education is moving at the moment--toward greater cooperation with higher education or toward doing it their own way for their

own purposes. Estimates are that 60% to 75% of all community colleges have one or more contracts with industry to provide educational services, and four-year colleges are increasingly interested in tapping into that market.

Perhaps you have a sense of direction from your own campus on trends toward competition, collaboration or cooperation. One or two examples of successful and unsuccessful collaboration and your perceptions on the issue of competition. Does it exist? Is it wasteful?

What factors will determine future directions?

1. Flexibility^{and aggressiveness} of colleges in meeting educational specifications.

2. ^{Public policy} Tax benefits to industry (as much as 50% is write-off under current laws).

3. Missions of higher education--as defined under the new educational reform report.

4. Costs and availability of equipment and faculty in technology. MIT says they will have neither faculty nor equipment to do it alone; community colleges need training of faculty in the latest technology plus updated equipment for training purposes.

What are the emerging issues in corporate education for higher education and the Learning Society?

Is corporate education any real threat to higher education? Eurich says "Yes." The perception of competition, however, is one-sided. Corporations have no intention of competing with higher education. They will use higher education wherever there is an advantage to them in doing so. Colleges, in con-

trast, view corporate education with some wariness--corporations have two things that colleges want: students and state-of-the-art equipment. Some critics maintain that colleges should want the more efficient and effective methods industry is developing in teaching and learning, but colleges are certainly not about to admit that, and in any case, it remains to be seen whether a business-like, cost-effective approach results in better learning.

Let's look at the threats and promises of corporate education issue by issue:

1. Is corporate education more innovative and efficient with respect to teaching methods? Will they show us a thing or two and force response from the educational establishment in educational innovation?

Corporate education probably has greater range--not as much lecture/discussion and more packaged courses, role playing, team projects, case studies, etc. Probably much more experimentation with technology which they see as one way to maximize returns. Not as locked into academic calendar. "Time is determined by purpose"--courses by objective. Teacher performance and student achievement are assessed.

Eurich says "New insights into the educational processes are coming from corporate classrooms--not from colleges and universities" (universities are not in the habit of improving their own performance through R & D; corporations are). Frankly, I don't know how to assess that charge. I think corporations are in a much stronger position to apply research findings to the design of programs. They are more likely to evaluate the impact

of method on learning, and more likely to drop methods that don't work. Whether they are likely to discover new effective methods is more doubtful, but at the moment they seem far more likely to experiment with technology-based learning.

2. What are the trends in corporate curricula? On this issue, I think I was on-target in the paper you read. Corporate education and higher education are moving toward one another. There is a blurring of purpose. Broadening markedly--more intention to develop the whole person in line with Peters and Waterman's formula for corporate excellence. Eurich identifies five functions of the curriculum--basic skills (75% of corporations do this), management training (clearest course sequence--"program" of learning), technical and scientific study, sales, service, and customer training.

What is the overlap with higher education? Two systems are growing in parallel. The mission of corporate education is the production of goods and services, but to do this well, they have been forced, sometimes reluctantly, into education. They respond almost blindly to their own needs--but this includes long-term education of employees as well as short-term training.

The key differences are in application. Critic: does it destroy a theory to apply it? Colleges moving towards vocational/career/application. Corporate moving toward "education of the whole person." I would say "blurring" continues--whether that is desirable or undesirable, I am not sure. One can hardly argue with alternatives and competition up to a point.

3. Quality. Eurich says "A corporate classroom can be quite impressive if judged by the intensity of instruction, high

student motivation, well organized presentation, and course outline with clearly stated goals" (p.79). Twenty-two hundred courses from two hundred non-collegiate organizations are now acceptable for ACE credit which corporations want especially because of its prestige and its imprimatur of the university. Some corporations complain that although ACE offers PONSII, some colleges are becoming more resistant to accepting courses for credit (p. 80). To fight back, Mountain Bell published a list of colleges that accepted their courses for college credit.

A comparison of the curriculum of General Motors Institute with comparable programs at Illinois Institute of Technology, Arizona State University and others revealed general similarities with one surprise--"the unexpected breadth" of general education in corporations when compared with technical degree programs at traditional institutions.

Critics of the quality of corporate education center mainly around narrow focus and in-breeding. Need broader perspectives of less self-interested education.

4. Corporate colleges and degrees. Growth is impressive. Eurich predicts possibility of hundreds of corporate degree programs in the next fifty years (I think that is too far ahead to make any sensible prediction, and I think it may slow down rather than increase).

Newest entry, however, is a model of collaboration. National Technical University--NTU. Education is by satellite to corporate classrooms. Twelve contributing companies--IBM, RCA, Digital, Hewlett-Packard, Control Data, and fifteen participating universities, including MIT, Stanford, etc. Eurich comments on

the increasing trend--eighteen now, twelve since 1970, and plans in place for more. There is at least some trend toward cooperation, i.e. UCLA is now cooperating with Rand on a Ph.D. program.

5. Technology for delivery of Education. Corporations are much more experimental than higher education. Their tendency is to make education less labor intensive. Higher education has the opposite goal. Faculty, who make educational decisions, conscientiously or sub-conscientiously want to preserve the labor intensive nature of higher education. The threat is that delivery of education will change--and that would be a great competition to colleges. In fact, Eurich suggests that the greatest challenge to traditional education is what she calls "the learning business." Her view, after looking at corporate education, is that a whole new education industry is developing, and she cites Control Data Corporation as an example. Control Data is, according to its President William Norris, in the "knowledge business." That is a very direct challenge to education. One of the basic purposes of Control Data is to reform America's school system and by so doing to restore America's competitive edge in the international economy. There is no sense, he says, investing heavily in an outmoded educational system that makes little use of advanced technology.

Eurich sees technology as the catalyst that will bring education and corporations together. The Business-Higher Education Forum submitted proposals to the President in 1983 calling for a High Tech Morrill Act that would do for the United States today what the original Morrill Act did to assist agriculture and industrial progress in the 19th Century. The proposed High Tech

Morrill Act has four planks to its platform: 1) Sustain financial support to education, 2) Lifelong learning, 3) High school incentives, and 4) A global view.

6. What are the implications for higher education?

1. Colleges and universities should give more consideration to the skills needed in the work force, e.g. to multidisciplinary approaches, more practical application of theory, more team work approaches to the solution of practical problems. Colleges do not need to change structure according to Eurich; they need to search out people interested in adult education and offer the flexibilities for individuals to serve institutions in this way.

Ernest Lynton, in contrast, thinks that higher education needs a major restructuring to adapt to the Learning Society. His book, while purportedly a study--a very good one--of corporate education and its emerging role as a major force in the Learning Society, is really a criticism of university education and its failure to meet the needs of modern society.

Lynton takes the basic position that "the limited role of colleges and universities in the delivery of employer-sponsored education is symptomatic of a broader failure of higher education to meet the needs of society" (p.xvii). He criticizes universities for failing to move quickly enough to lifelong learning. If they do not, education for older students will be left largely to non-academic sources. He approaches his topic from the human capital perspective, maintaining that the development of human capital should be viewed as a national investment and that colleges and universities should contribute to this goal

in more constructive ways.

He, like Eurich, criticizes university education for its focus on the acquisition of knowledge rather than on the competence to use it (p. 67). He uses as evidence the power of the disciplines, the perception of the university as its own labor market (no longer true), the faculty reward system--basic research directed at a single mode of scholarly activity: basic research leading to publication in scholarly journals directed to colleagues in the profession. All of this has created a considerable distance between the university and the rest of society.

Lynton calls for the total reform of higher education toward being responsive to external needs and to reducing its isolation from society. He identifies major issues as follows:

1. Colleges and universities are generally inflexible and unresponsive and tend to be too abstract and theoretical. Their primary goal, as they see it, is to prepare students for graduate study. Even the professional schools, whose mission is the application of knowledge, have shifted their concern from the development of the profession to an interest in its disciplinary components (p. 67).

Lynton's solution to this ivory towerism is that colleges and universities should become more active in employer-sponsored education because this would make faculties as well as administrators more aware of the practical needs and concerns of the workplace, thereby reducing the isolation of higher education from the society that it is supposed to serve. (This is an interesting argument--related neither to the desire to keep industry-based education honest, nor to provide students for

higher education, but rather to save higher education from its own blind spots. Later on in his book, Lynton does acknowledge the importance of higher education in balancing long-range considerations against short-range responses.

2. Ways must be found to increase faculty oversight over employer-sponsored instruction while reducing the length and complexity of the review process. Lynton feels that lifelong learning should become a major function of higher education and that faculty will not accept this mission until adult education becomes a central responsibility of the institution. He says colleges "act as if they were primarily institutions to teach the young. That self-definition is dangerous for the academy and in the long run, probably also detrimental to society" (p. 73). He claims that a paramount need is to "wipe out the dividing line between regular and continuing education" (p.74). And that "as long as continuing education is viewed as a distinct activity, it will be viewed as outside the mainstream and less important, less respectable, and less central than regular education" (p. 77). The division of continuing education should become an integral part of the central academic administration of the university and he recommends a vice presidency so that the office of continuing education becomes the "principal boundary-spanning mechanism needed to relate to clientele other than the traditional high school graduate" (p.78).

For all Lynton's support of centralization he would prefer to see the university adopt the missions of continuing education rather than for continuing education to be dissolved in the traditional university. He does not want to see continuing edu-

cation drawn into the present, long complicated faculty review processes of traditional education--which he sees as the principle reason why industry does not use higher education more frequently. Faculty oversight without faculty encumbrance is his goal.

3. Lynton is concerned about the role of faculty as independent entrepreneurs in the design and deliverance of employer-sponsored programs, either for industry directly or as third party vendors. If the university does not gear up to serve the needs that exist, universities will find themselves in competition with its own faculty members.

4. Finally, Lynton sees a primary mission of the university as what he calls Occupational Maintenance--OM. The problem with higher education now is that its curriculum is delivered as if it were a terminal program, "rather than the first stage of a continuing and recurrent process of learning. The basic premise shaping most of higher education today continues to be that it is possible to learn first and to do later...." (p.131). Occupational Maintenance must of necessity be a concern of the learning society with cooperation between higher education, industry, and governmental policies.

Conclusion:

What is the direction of trends with respect to competition?

1. The functions of higher education and corporate education continue to blur. I am not sure that I see any problem with this. It is a necessary response to the emergence of the Learning Society.

2. The most immediate danger to higher education lies not in corporate education serving students that might be served by higher education, but in the growth of the new "knowledge industry." Technology in particular may be better used and promoted by industry than by higher education. In addition, Eurich is convinced that technology will make possible a profitable and greatly demanded knowledge industry. Third party vendors will continue to serve as the connecting link between corporations and universities, but will place universities in competition with their own faculties.

3. Almost regardless of what institutions of higher education do or what corporate education does, the education of adults is now an unstoppable reality. The world is increasingly dependent on a continually educated workforce and an educated citizenry. We all--organizations and individuals alike--are dependent on education to provide the grease for the Learning Society. *LOCAL PERSPECTIVES -*

My conclusion is still that the Learning Society has its own momentum. We can get on the train or try to restrain it by getting in front of it, but I doubt very much that we can stop it or deflect it. If that is the case, we really need to look at public policy. Ten years ago, I probably would have been talking about federal policy--the largely ignored Mondale or Lifelong Learning Proposals that were never really funded. Today it is fairly clear that any action that exists has moved to the States. And we need--and will soon have I think--some research information about what states are doing in this regard. WICHE has identified state educational policies as a major focus of attention

for the coming year, and among their specific concerns they intend to address the need for tools in the development of state policies relating to adult learners.

Meanwhile, let me talk very briefly about a conceptualization that I have developed with Anne-Marie McCartan in an ERIC Report also issued subsequent to the article you read in preparation for this session. This report came from a review of state initiatives in the early 1980s and was derived from reading state task force and committee reports. There was no attempt in our study to say which are the most prevalent policies or even what should be the policies, but rather to see what the range of possibilities is at present and to devise a scheme that will incorporate them into a framework for thinking about the possibilities.

We think this framework should accommodate almost any state policy, but perhaps you will see your own state in this framework and be able to illustrate any actions taken or any trends that you may observe. (Few states consistently fall into one approach. Rather particular policies may range across the four models. Thus the classification scheme is one of policy and practices rather than of states).

6/10/86

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR STATE POLICY ON ADULT LEARNING

1. LAISSEZ-FAIRE APPROACH *or Belief in hands off
Nothing happening to force action*
FREE MARKET PHILOSOPHY *providers - regulate h.e. but not he-indus
Access - Remove discrim but not AA
Quality - program review but stop sh credit
Economic Retitalization -*
2. ENCOURAGEMENT--STATE TAKES NO DIRECT ROLE, BUT SUPPORTS THE EFFORTS OF OTHERS TO GET INVOLVED -- *As + Learn Providers + respond.*
 - a. PLANNING AND GOAL SETTING - *N.Y. Regents 8 goals + 2000*
 - b. COLLECTING AND DISSEMINATING DATA - *Ohio annual survey of non-credit*
 - c. CREATING INCENTIVES for both *Levs + Providers.*
TUITION WAIVERS -
TAX INCENTIVES - *up to 50% tax deductible*
DEGREE-GRANTING AUTHORITY - *Mass*
 - d. PROMOTING LOCAL COOPERATION - *VT. should be done locally; Ohio industry.*
 - e. ESTABLISHING TASK FORCES - *Iowa Coord. Com on CE.*
 - f. SPONSORING CONFERENCES AND SEMINARS
KANSAS - Futures Invention
3. INTERVENTION--STATE INTERVENES, USUALLY TO PROMOTE EFFICIENCY OR PREVENT FRAUD *of off-campus*
 - a. DELEGATING RESPONSIBILITY FOR COORDINATION *Ky - state Us*
 - b. CENTRALIZING COORDINATION - *Freq. television CAL + ILL - CC*
 - c. REGULATING PROVIDERS *RE + Idaho ARIZ - voc ed + CC*
*off campus centers - Quality control
Tex - reduced funding for amt of off-campus.
Review - ALA. - reduced by 70%*
4. DIRECT SUPPORT AND SERVICES -- USUALLY TO PROMOTE EFFICIENCY OR EQUITY *distance delivery - ALASKA, KY, WIS.*
 - a. FUNDING PROGRAMS DIRECTLY
 - b. ESTABLISHING STATEWIDE PROGRAMS - *Telecommunications Okla.
PONS1 - Regional Learning centers
ERIC Ed Infr Centers - ULLing Act.*

SOURCE: CROSS, K. PATRICIA AND MCCARTAN, ANNE-MARIE. ADULT LEARNING: STATE POLICIES AND INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES. ASHE-ERIC HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH REPORT No. 1, 1984. I