

Restructuring the California State University: A Call to Action

by Teri Yamada

California's public higher education system has for a long time been lauded as one of the finest in the world. But for the last several decades, budget cuts and privatization have resulted in the steady erosion of this system, as well as K-12 education in the state and other public sector services.¹ Since the 1970s, we have been repeatedly told that public education is failing, though no one mentions the drastic defunding of public education, especially in California, as if the two had no correlation. Instead, we were told that privatization and choice—in the form of vouchers, charter schools, and online education corporations—would correct failing schools. Those who questioned this “logic” were accused of being obstructionist.

By 2010, reality has discredited this experiment. Privatization, choice, and the standardized test regime of No Child Left Behind failed to produce the promised results.² But the foundations and think tanks with their own political agendas and funding to back them, and education businesses who profited significantly from experiments in the privatization of higher education are not about to admit any mistakes. Yet another example of public education mismanagement began in 2009, when the California State University (CSU) chancellor invited Sir Michael Barber, discredited guru of Great Britain's deliverology management method—another failed privatization scheme—to give a workshop to the system's top administrators on the implementation of deliverology within the CSU.³

Teri Yamada is professor of Asian Studies and president of the California Faculty Association at California State University Long Beach. She is currently co-chair of CFA's task force on restructuring in public higher education and a founding member of the Southern California Education Coalition. Her two books on fiction and literary culture in modern Southeast Asia each received an ALA Choice Outstanding Academic Title award. She is currently a fellow of the University of Stockholm Collegium of World Literary History.

The following article recounts the California Faculty Association's (CFA) efforts to make sense of deliverology in the context of changes that have taken place in the CSU both prior to and after the 2009 Barber workshop and to connect these changes with those taking place in other university systems both nationally and globally.

The CSU is nestled in the middle of California's massive public higher education system, which consists of the University of California (UC), with 10 research universities and 220,000 students; the CSU, with 23 comprehensive state universities and 433,000 students; and 110 community colleges serving 2.9 million

The 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education envisioned public higher education as committed to equitable access for all who qualify.

students. The 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education envisioned public higher education in California as committed to equitable access for all who qualify. It provided that UC was to “select from” the top one-eighth (12.5 percent) of the high school graduating class and CSU was to “select from” the top one-third (33.3 percent) of the high school graduating class. The California community colleges were to admit any student capable of benefiting from instruction.⁴ These three segments were to be integrated, with the middle layer—the CSU—charged with training most of the professionals in the state: teachers, nurses, engineers, accountants, and so forth. Students could transfer credits from community colleges to the other two segments, while the UC and CSU allow for some credits to transfer between them.

For some years, higher education in the CSU, with no tuition and low student fees, worked reasonably well. But chronic underfunding of public education in general and the CSU in particular—which traces its origins to the 1978 passage of Proposition 13, the state's anti-property tax initiative—combined with draconian budget cuts since the 2008 recession, has altered the mission of public higher education that was envisioned by The Master Plan so much that it is now hardly recognizable.⁵

One indication of how the system has changed as a result of the reduction in state funding is that the CSU campuses have been encouraged to support themselves by forming private ventures known as “auxiliaries,” with each campus becoming hybridized into a public-private organization. Campuses may have a variety of private business ventures, although the revenue typically cannot be used to fund instruction.⁶

Concurrently, a new social force in public education—the accountability movement—began to demand relevancy and efficiency: measuring outcomes and

requiring schools and educators to do more with less.⁷ Accountability has ties to both national and extra-national educational reform efforts that are linked to privatization (the transfer of public wealth to the private sector and the transfer of tuition costs from the state to the individual), and a corporate management style for public educational institutions that eschews both faculty governance and faculty control over the curriculum, and includes the fetishization of outcomes. These ideas are the cornerstone of New Public Management (NPM), a business-style management philosophy for the public sector that promotes privatization and includes Barber's deliverology.⁸

Organizations like the World Bank complain about public higher education's inability to produce graduates with the right skill set for corporations.

At the local level, NPM privatization manifests itself as merit pay for instructors. Institutionally, it may take the form of curriculum designed by for-profit providers, which the instructor delivers, or for-profit education companies promoting online education, all using federal or state money for their lucrative private education business.⁹

At the extra-national level, public higher education in the U.S. faces criticism from organizations like the World Bank, that complain about public higher education's lack of relevancy for the "knowledge economy" and inability to produce graduates with the right skill set for corporations.¹⁰ The agents of change in this trend are not academics but national and international agencies, multinational corporations, independent think tanks, and business associations with their research, publications and seminars funded by wealthy foundations or federal largesse.

NPM spread from the U.S. to Great Britain in the 1980s, from there to Australia and New Zealand, and finally to the European Union in the 1990s. Along with its growth internationally as a regime of discipline for public education reform, higher education itself was being commoditized as a tangible product or service to sell on the global free market. This transformation of higher education from an intangible public good to a profit-making private commodity required standardization.¹¹ Chris Lorenz describes this process unfolding through trade agreements and accords that were signed and developed from the 1980s:

So, all in all, the Bologna Declaration calls for the integration of all the national systems of higher education with the major aim of increasing its 'international competitiveness.' In order to achieve these goals the basic structures of the national systems must be made uniform, with the same cycles and degrees and last but not least the same mechanisms of control of the faculty.... The neo-liberal GATS

[General Agreement on Trades and Services] point of view will have far reaching consequences for the citizens of Europe: higher education, instead of being a right of citizens of nation states, laid down by law may be redefined as and transformed into a commodity—into an international service that must be sold and bought from any international provider.... the implication of the GATS-view may also surprise U.S. citizens, because GATS, among other things, prescribes the so-called ‘national treatment rule.’ This rule prohibits the national governments, that subscribe to the GATS-regulations concerning education, to treat providers of services inside the national borders differently from providers from outside the national borders. Although this rule also contains a few clauses for exceptions, it may easily induce future outside providers of higher education to sue national governments for subsidizing their institutions of higher education on grounds that subsidies are impediments for open market competition and therefore are frustrating the free and international trade.¹²

This standardization comes at the price of faculty traditions of free speech and governance. The radical free-market policy behind it causes faculty to lose control over the process of education and oversight over curriculum as knowledge is commoditized in the form of a saleable service in a completely deregulated global market.

An example of structural change is the Dutch reform beginning in the 1980s where higher education has been quantified in terms of credit points for “production” and “consumption” pegged to the amount of state support for an institution, pitting universities against each other for funding. Professors are judged by “loss of production” and “lack of efficiency,” leading to a form of deprofessionalization



while undermining autonomy of the faculty and “its professional criteria of quality in the traditional sense.”¹³ We can see a similar functionalism driving the restructuring underway in the UK, where NPM leaders now use the current budget crisis as the proximate cause for reform:

In these circumstances, painful choices have to be made. The Labour government’s priorities were clear. What must be defended at all costs, it said, are the so-called “STEM” subjects (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics). They are the most important, by virtue of their contribution to the “knowledge economy.” All publicly funded research at universities should have an identifiable

‘The Dean acknowledged the excellent research reputation of Philosophy at Middlesex, but said that it made no “measurable” contribution to the University.’

“impact” on our economy and society. In a document entitled “A Vision for Research,” the Prime Minister’s Council for Science and Technology recommended that “universities should seek to professionalize their capabilities and structures ... so that they operate more like consultancy organizations.”¹⁴

A particularly chilling example of this reductionism is the elimination of the prestigious philosophy department at Middlesex University:

The Dean explained that the decision to terminate recruitment and close the programmes was “simply financial,” and based on the fact that the University believes that it may be able to generate more revenue if it shifts its resources to other subjects – from “Band D” to “Band C” students... the Dean acknowledged the excellent research reputation of Philosophy at Middlesex, but said that it made no “measurable” contribution to the University.¹⁵

The philosophy department at Middlesex was disbanded despite rigorous protest from the international scholarly community. For scholars, it was unthinkable that an administration would abolish this distinguished department on the basis of revenue generation that it needed to support its own administrators.¹⁶ Administrative priorities trumped public good, revealing the flaws when narrow metrics are privileged over quality education.¹⁷ Similar trends have occurred in the U.S.

In an example closer to home, Texas A&M University has proposed an evaluation system for a professor’s worth “based on their salaries, how much research money they bring in, and how much money they generate from teaching....”¹⁸ This plan is rationalized by the administration in terms of accountability to the public. Kean University in New Jersey has just been restructured, providing another exam-

ple of “fiscal concerns.” In this restructuring, departments were consolidated into schools headed by “presidentially-appointed executive directors... dividing faculty members into new organizational structures they played no role in creating.”¹⁹ Another problematic path is being promoted for the State University of New York (SUNY) system, the largest public higher education system in the nation, through Governor David Paterson’s “Empowerment and Innovation Act,” which essentially privatizes the state’s public higher education system, allowing for campuses, with little oversight, to recoup losses in state revenues by independently raising tuition and developing private enterprises through public-private partnerships.²⁰

The consumer-driven commoditization of public higher education seems at odds with the traditions of the academy whose mission is to serve the public good.

California has had this type of public-private alliance for public higher education since the 1970s, an example being for-profit hospitals associated with University of California campuses. Because revenue streams are restricted, these public-private ventures have not prevented a fiscal crisis, even in the profitable UC system, which gets only 13 percent of its total budget from the state.²¹ The CSU model of private auxiliaries provides case after case of bad business ventures and crony capitalism.²²

The CFA’s deliverology wake-up call in fall 2009 led to further research.²³ We discovered that NPM had infiltrated the CSU, most notably through Barry Munitz, who served as chancellor from 1991 to 1998 during another time of deep cuts. In his article “Managing Transformation in an Age of Social Triage,” Munitz identifies with the privatization ideology of the NPM accountability movement:

For better or worse, our institutions are going to be held to standards comparable to those that corporations apply to their business or that governments are beginning to apply to their agencies. We are not immune from the productivity pressures that already exist throughout the world and will have to be more market responsive in our publications and our offerings.²⁴

This consumer-driven commoditization of public education envisioned by Munitz seems at odds with the traditions of the academy whose mission is to serve the public good, not private profit. But now public good has been redefined to “the public not paying taxes for education.”

The NPM model moves the accountability for producing revenue from the state to campus presidents and college deans who must fundraise for their foundations, to faculty who must become entrepreneurs producing revenue for the

campus through course commoditization, patents, and grants, and to students in the form of higher tuition fees. This vision of privatization produces a clash in values within the “public” institution, by pitting management—whose goal is to increase revenue and production from instructors—against instructors who believe they were hired to teach and do research, to mentor students and serve the university governance system, not to become revenue generators for the administration. At the same time, NPM demeans and overrides faculty governance, defining it and faculty in general as a barrier to its privatization objectives.

As public institutions devolve into a corporate business regime, students are channeled through a pipeline like products on an assembly line.

As the public institution devolves into a corporate business regime, students are channeled through a pipeline like products on an assembly line, with fewer courses and majors to choose from and fewer opportunities to explore different disciplines or further their own intellectual development.²⁵ We have been warned about the consequences of “academic capitalism” through the research of Sheila Slaughter, Larry Leslie, Gary Rhoades, and Marc Bousquet since the late 1990s. The arrival of a repackaged academic capitalism as deliverology at the CSU in fall 2009 seemed an ominous consequence of several years of severe budget cuts.

In response to cuts in funding, CSU Chancellor Charles Reed, in 2008, mandated a system-wide enrollment reduction of 40,000 students over a two-year period; more than 2,500 faculty have been terminated as a result.²⁶ At the same time, the cost to students has nearly doubled in a five-year period, from \$2,520 in 2005–06 to \$4,429 in 2010–11, while thousands of courses have been cancelled across the system.²⁷ The result has been a stealth restructuring that moves costs from the state to the individual as fees increase each year, while the number of slots for students is reduced. No longer is the CSU open to the top one-third of California’s high school graduates, even if they could afford it. They will be lucky to find seats in overcrowded community college classrooms. Ironically, this situation is a boon for the private, online higher education industry that uses sophisticated and sometimes questionable recruiting methods to vacuum up students unable to attend overcrowded public colleges.²⁸

Adding to the pressure on CSU campuses, in late fall 2009, at a time when all employees volunteered for furloughs (a 9.7 percent salary decrease), Chancellor Reed introduced a “bold graduation initiative” to raise six-year graduation rates by eight percent by 2016 and close the existing gap in degree attainment by CSU’s

underrepresented students.²⁹ This plan is based on the Access to Success Initiative of the National Association of System Heads (NASH), where Chancellor Reed is currently the executive director.³⁰

The NASH report, *Charting a Necessary Path*, advocates for improving graduation rates by adjusting enrollment to reflect the ethnic demographics of each state. In contrast, Chancellor Reed's plan required a limited set of metrics to measure just the rate of graduation and retention outcomes and not the actual number of graduates, perhaps due to the fact that he was downsizing student enrollment in the CSU while implementing this initiative.³¹ The kick-off event for launching

There have been two more notable examples of bad decisions imposed by upper management against the protestations of knowledgeable faculty.

this plan was Barber's deliverology workshop mentioned earlier, a signal that the chancellor was promoting a "command and control," top-down management model. Although Chancellor Reed's initiative may be a laudable, reflecting both his support of President Obama's American Graduation Initiative and a commitment to accountability, there is a startling lack of recognition on his part that deliverology is a flawed model of management in a failed economy.³²

Subsequently, there have been two more notable examples of bad decisions imposed by upper management against the protestations of knowledgeable faculty: the restructuring of a development math course at CSU Bakersfield and the system-wide imposition of Mandated Early Start by the chancellor and the CSU Board of Trustees.

For spring semester 2010, the dean of the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics at CSU Bakersfield decided, against the advice of the math department, to assume "control of the Developmental Mathematics Curriculum . . . by establishing a separate budget line for the program, changing the format of the program from a combination of individual sections and large lectures to an exclusively on-line offering, and requiring the Developmental Math Coordinator to answer directly to his office."³³ This online course with more than 600 students under the direction of one instructor had a pass rate of 40 percent compared to 75 percent for the course format the previous semester.³⁴

The second example occurred in June when Chancellor Reed, with the approval of the CSU Board of Trustees, mandated the restructuring of developmental education programs in the CSU. Executive Order 1048, "The Early Start Program," called for the disenrollment for freshmen (reclassified as "early entrants"), "who have not demonstrated proficiency in mathematics and/or English," if they fail to take a summer course, now potentially moved to a private,

self-support system.³⁵ The Early Start Program was imposed in spite of the opposition of the statewide CSU English Council and without a recommendation from the CSU Math Council.³⁶ The plan may force the restructuring of already existing and successful developmental courses taught during the academic year. Plans from each campus are due on November 19, 2010.

This type of thoughtless restructuring will not serve the CSU system well in the long term. We are now in an historical moment of great complexity and contradiction: the demand for restructuring of the nation's universities, led by NPM, to do "more with less" and produce graduates as if the economic collapse of 2008 never happened

We must remind people that public higher education includes 'wisdom,' an intangible quality that cannot be bought and sold.

or doesn't have enduring consequences; the pressures of globalization leading to the commoditization of higher education as a free-market good; a knowledge economy whose businesses want universities to produce ideas for new products so they do not have to invest in their own research and development; the shift of the university from an intellectual commons for public benefit to an outsourced personal benefit whose costs can be moved from the state to the individual.³⁷ What can be done?

First and foremost, we must insist that public higher education be defined as a public good. This means advocating for the idea of a university that protects the "public commons of ideas and creativity." This commons is not on Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube or in Second Life, although all could certainly be used to enhance its effectiveness. This commons is a physical space: a college campus with trees, walkways, science labs, and music conservatories that allows for the free and creative production of art, music, theater, inventions, and intellectual discourse for the public good, not just for private profit.³⁸

We must remind people that public higher education includes "wisdom," an intangible quality that cannot be bought and sold.³⁹ It can be transmitted and fostered by a master teacher in the classroom or through a mentor-student relationship. Technology can be used in creative ways to enhance this interaction as we promote 21st century skills to assist in problem solving in a complex and connected world.⁴⁰ Although research is an important part of an educational process for students in an inquiry-based system, we need to correct the misalignment between the valorization of research over quality instruction at comprehensive public universities. Derek Bok, Ernest L. Boyer, Richard Hersh, Page Smith and many others have warned against the privileging of research over quality instruction in high-


er education. Just this realignment would produce increased graduation rates, as evidence suggests that student success is improved through excellent instruction and mentoring and through engagement of faculty in inquiry.⁴¹

We must strengthen faculty governance and encourage faster turnaround of thoughtful and fully considered decisions based on an independent faculty voice. We must mentor younger faculty so they begin to participate in governance and understand its significance for their future in the academy. Our faculty unions must be active; they are the best line of collective offense against panic restructuring. Coupled with union activity, we should advocate for local community involve-

*Students do not need to learn how to ‘Race to the Top’
but how to work cooperatively and live together
harmoniously in a swiftly changing, complex world.*

ment with our campuses. Faculty-community task forces may assist in solving an array of local issues, binding the expertise found on the university campus to the community surrounding it.

In the midst of our current economic and political instability, President Obama’s 2009 “American Graduation Initiative,” a No Child Left Behind plan for higher education, signals his belief that the nation requires an improved public higher education system if we are to maintain our preeminence in the global market place.⁴² We hear this message echoed everywhere: “In an increasingly competitive, globalized economy, nations with the most knowledge-intensive economic base, the greatest capacity for innovation, and the most educated population are the most likely to succeed.”⁴³ Meanwhile, thousands of qualified students are being turned away from the UC and CSU to seek their future in overcrowded community colleges, which have no courses to offer them due to state budget cuts.

This situation is the end result of 40 years of failed supply-side economic policy, a forced privatization of public education through defunding that may work for private corporations but not for the public good. No Child Left Behind, in spite of good intentions, has failed many of our children. Students do not need to learn how to “Race to the Top,” but how to work cooperatively and live together harmoniously in a swiftly changing, complex world. It is time to join together for genuine change that transforms our students and society through redefining the importance of quality education in the 21st century. Quality education is not the market-driven abandonment of philosophy and literature because such subjects do not sell in the global marketplace, but one that enhances creativity, critical thinking and technological literacy, one that includes music and the arts. We need to reclaim quality public education as a common good, a shared social value that transcends personal profit. If we fail, others will continue to define change for us. 

ENDNOTES

1. Known as supply-side or trickle-down economics, this approach calls for massive tax cuts and privatization of the public sector. It would later be rebranded as neo-liberal laissez-faire economics, essentially an ideology that free markets solve everything. This ideology persists despite the fact that, in 2001, Joseph Stiglitz won the Noble Prize in economics proving that there was no such thing as a free market.
2. For an objective overview of No Child Left Behind see Hess and Petrilli. For a critique of its effectiveness in Chicago see Bryk et al., *Organizing Schools for Improvement*; see also Meier, et al., *Many Children Left Behind* and Kohn, *The Case Against Standardized Testing*.
3. See his *Instruction to Deliver*. This is a command-and-control system of public sector transformation, also referred to as New Public Management (NPM). It actually started in the United States, in the government sector, under the name “entrepreneurial governance.” In higher education, this business style of management is traced to George Keller’s, *Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in Higher Education*. Thanks to Gary Rhoades for this observation about Keller.
4. *Master Plan for Higher Education in California*, “Access Provisions of the California Master Plan for Higher Education.” In late 2009, the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education was convened to hold hearings on the strengths and weakness of this plan 50 years after its implementation. For a synopsis of its history, see Johnson, “Higher Education in California: New Goals for the Master Plan.”
5. This proposition remains highly controversial and is known as the “third-rail” of politics in California. It also enshrined a two-thirds majority vote requirement to pass either tax increases or a state budget, making California the only state in the union with this type of requirement. For different opinions: Voegeli, “Don’t Blame Proposition 13”; O’Leary, “The Legacy of Proposition 13”; Cavanaugh and Walsh, “Sorting Out Prop 13’s Impact on Education.” Public higher education in California and other states has not been adequately funded even before the 2008 economic crisis with its 20 to 30 percent cuts. On this see Courant, Duderstadt and Goldenberg, “Needed: A National Strategy to Preserve Public Universities” which traces a rapidly growing funding disparity between public institutions and private research universities during those decades.
6. Many of these private ventures as reported in the press have been money losers requiring the specific university to be bailed out by the chancellor using ‘state general fund’ money that should have been used for instruction (faculty salaries and courses). See unpublished paper by Yamada, “The CSU Executives’ Incomplete Chronology of Questionable Practices.” In 2010, the scandal surrounding Sarah Palin’s speaking engagement at CSU Stanislaus implicated its foundation in deception about her speaker’s fee. The California Faculty Association, along with State Senator Leland Yee, has been actively involved in sponsoring legislation that would demand transparency for auxiliaries, whose financial statements remain closed to the public.
7. David Berliner and Bruce Biddle trace the accountability movement’s history and impact in *The Manufactured Crisis: Myths, Fraud, and the Attack on America’s Public Schools*, while Diane Ravitch in *The Death and Life of the Great American School System* decries her involvement in the No Child Left Behind policy she helped enact during the George W. Bush administration.
8. Although the accountability movement unquestioningly advocates the use of metrics to assess instructional quality, outcomes should not be used as the basis for a Scarlet-Letter type of public humiliation of educators but with a thoughtfulness that shows that student testing outcomes may be one of many measures to quantify teacher capacity so that improvement follows for society as well.
9. See the Frontline documentary *College, Inc.*
10. The World Bank, *Constructing Knowledge Societies: New Challenges for Tertiary Education*.
11. For further information on this see Hill’s “Foreward” in *The Developing World and State Education*; Cowen, “Performativity, Post-modernity and the University”; Bruneau and Savage, *Counting Out the Scholars*; Marginson and van der Wende, “Globalization and Higher

- Education”; Polster and Newson, “Don’t Count Your Blessings”; Roskam’s “Introduction” in *The Developing World and State Education*.
12. Lorenz, 126; 130.
 13. Ibid, 133.
 14. Thomas, “What are universities for?”, 13.
 15. The Third Estate, “Middlesex University Shamefully Cuts Philosophy Department.”
 16. Ibid. “... the University currently expects each academic unit to contribute 55 percent of its gross income to the central administration. As it stands (by the credit count method of calculation), Philosophy and Religious Studies contributes 53 percent, after the deduction of school administrative costs.” So the Center for Research in Modern European Philosophy was disbanded because of a two percent deficit.
 17. There is a somewhat happy ending: the Middlesex University’s Center for Research in Modern European Philosophy was invited to relocate to Kingston University where it should reopen in a somewhat diminished capacity during fall of 2010. See *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, “Middlesex U.’s Threatened Philosophy Department Will Relocate.”
 18. Mangan, “Texas A&M System Will Rate Professors Based on Their Bottom-Line Value.” Please note that Peter Hugill, who heads the local chapter of American Association of University Professors there, has determined this idea comes from a conservative think tank with ties to Gov. Rick Perry.
 19. Jaschik, “Departments without Chairs.”
 20. Wittner, “Dismantling SUNY, America’s Largest Public University System.” As of September 2010, the New York legislature had failed to vote on these proposed changes.
 21. Although 13 percent of its entire budget is state support, 50 percent of its instructional budget relies upon California general funds (U.C. Office of the President, “The U.C. Budget: Myths and Facts;” 2009-10 Projected UC Core Funds Revenue by Source). Private-public ventures do not want their funding streams to go outside their own business for the support of general instruction; see Newfield, “Avoiding the Coming Higher Ed Wars.”
 22. For example, see California Faculty Association, “CSU Auxiliaries and Foundations: Overview and Troubling Examples.”
 23. See Meisenhelder, “Michael Barber’s ‘Deliverology’ in the UK and in the CSU” and California Faculty Association, “‘Restructuring’ the CSU or Wrecking It?”
 24. Munitz, “Managing Transformation in an Age of Social Triage,” 39.
 25. On this development, see du Gay, “Organizing Identity: Entrepreneurial Governance and Public Management.”
 26. On the professional history of Charles Reed in the CSU, see Yamada “The Life and Times of Charles Reed: Reframing the Value of Efficiency and Accountability for the CSU.”
 27. California Faculty Association, “The CSU Graduation and Achievement Gap Initiative: Doing Our Part to Educate 1 Million More Graduates by 2025.” The CSU charges fees rather than tuition to California residents; only nonresident students are charged nonresident tuition as well as other fees. Each campus in the system can also assess special student fees, which vary by institution.
 28. See the 2010 Frontline documentary *College, Inc.* on issues of concern surrounding the for-profit, online college business model benefiting from downsizing in public universities at a time when more students want to enter college, or see Senator Tom Harkin’s report “Emerging Risk?”
 29. California State University, *CSU Leader* 9.2.
 30. NASH is a membership organization of 52 public higher education systems in 38 states represented by their Chief Executive Officers (CEOs). Charles Reed is currently the President of their Executive Committee (2010).

31. California Faculty Association, “The CSU Graduation & Achievement Gap Initiative: Doing Our Part to Educate 1 Million More Graduates by 2025.”
32. On the failure of this management model, see Seddon, *Systems Thinking in the Public Sector: The Failure of the Reform Regime and a Manifesto for a Better Way* and *Freedom from Command and Control: Rethinking Management for Lean Service*; Middleton, *Delivering Public Services that Work*; Dent, Chandler and Barry, *Questioning the New Public Management*, and Hargreaves and Shirley, *The Fourth Way*.
33. The Academic Senate, California State University, Bakersfield, Proposed Academic Senate Resolution. “Over-enrollment in Courses, disregard of Furlough Agreement (Developmental Math).”
34. On some CSU campuses up to 80 percent of entering freshman fail to pass assessment tests for college readiness in English composition and math. They are placed in no-credit developmental courses, costing the CSU millions of dollars each year for classes that will not count towards their BA degree.
35. See Charles Reed. “The Early Start Program — Executive Order No. 1048.” These unprepared freshmen are reclassified as “early entrants” perhaps so their potential failure will not count toward the graduation and retention outcome statistics, part of the Chancellor’s “Graduation Initiative” used to measure campus success.
36. CSU English Council, “CSU English Council Position Statement: Mandatory Early Start (April 2010).”
37. See Fearn’s “Graduate Unemployment Rises” and Trigaux’s “The Job Hunt.”
38. Kumar makes this case in “The Need for Place.”
39. Cayton reflects upon the American propensity to commodify wisdom in the context of higher education, irrespective of that impossibility, in “The Commodification of Wisdom.” See also Nussbaum’s *Not for Profit*. On the biased valuation of objects in contemporary America and abroad, see Patel’s *The Value of Nothing*.
40. See Trilling and Fadel, *21st Century Skills: Learning for Life in Our Times*, which focuses on the use of technology for the development of critical thinking and creativity.
41. Tinto, *Leaving College*; academic mentoring and advising, available courses, cohorts and community learning are all methods shown to improve graduation and retention rates.
42. President Obama’s “The American Graduation Initiative” proposes that by 2020 we will again have the highest proportion of graduates in the world to regain our competitive edge. See the Office of the Press Secretary’s (White House) press release.
43. de la Fuente, comment from a speech at the Second Bologna Policy Forum in Vienna on March 12, 2010.

WORKS CITED

- Barber, Michael. *Instruction to Deliver: Fighting to Transform Britain’s Public Services*. London: Politico’s Publication, 2007.
- Berg, Elisabeth, Jim Barry and John Chandler. “The New Public Management and Higher Education: A Human Cost?” In Mike Dent, John Chandler, and Jim Barry (Eds.), *Questioning the New Public Management*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004.
- Berliner, David C. and Bruce J. Biddle. *The Manufactured Crisis: Myths, Fraud, and the Attack on America’s Public Schools*. New York: Perseus, 1995.
- Bok, Derek. *Universities in the Marketplace: The Commercialization of Higher Education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- Bousquet, Mark. *How the University Works: Higher Education and the Low Wage Nation*. New York: New York University Press, 2008.

- Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.
- Bruneau, William and Donald C. Savage. *Counting Out the Scholars: The Case Against Performance Indicators in Higher Education*. Toronto: James Lorimer, 2002.
- Byrk, Anthony S. et al. *Organizing Schools for Improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.
- California Faculty Association. "CSU Auxiliaries and Foundations: Overview and Troubling Examples." Unpublished report. Nov. 2009.
- . "The CSU Graduation & Achievement Gap Initiative: Doing Our Part to Educate 1 Million More Graduates by 2025." April 2010 DFA_WPApr10_Grad_Initiative.pdf.
- . "'Restructuring' the CSU or Wrecking It?" December 1, 2009 <http://restructuringcsu.wordpress.com/>
- California State University. *CSU Leader* 9.2 (January 28, 2010) www.calstate.edu/CSULeader/2010/01282010.shtml
- California State University, Bakersfield. "Over-enrollment in Courses, disregard of Furlough Agreement (Developmental Math)." Proposed Academic Senate Resolution, Spring 2010, unpublished.
- CSU English Council. "CSU English Council Position Statement: Mandatory Early Start (April 2010)." <http://csuenglishcouncil.wordpress.com/2010/04/21/psmandatoryyearlystart2010/>
- Cavanaugh, Maureen and Natalie Walsh. "Sorting Out Prop 13's Impact on Education." KPBS. March 29, 2010 www.kpbs.org/news/2010/mar/29/sorting-out-prop-13s-impact-education/
- Cayton, Mary Kupiec. "The Commodification of Wisdom." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 13, 2007. <http://chronicle.com/article/The-Commodification-of-Wisdom/12006>
- The Chronicle of Higher Education*. "Middlesex U.'s Threatened Philosophy Department Will Relocate." June 10, 2010. <http://chronicle.com/blogPost/Middlesex-Us-Threatened-P/24686/>.
- Courant, Paul N., James J. Duderstadt, and Edie N. Goldenberg. "Needed: A National Strategy to Preserve Public Universities." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 3, 2010. <http://chronicle.com/article/A-Plan-to-Save-Americas-Pu/63358/>.
- Cowen, Robert. "Performativity, Post-modernity and the University." *Comparative Education* 32.2 (1996): 245-258.
- de la Fuente, Juan Ramon. "Building the Global Knowledge Society: Systemic and Institutional Change." Second Bologna Policy Forum Keynote Speech, Vienna, Austria. March 12, 2010 <http://globalhighered.wordpress.com/2010/03/19/bologna-policy-forum-keynote/>
- Dent, Mike, John Chandler, and Jim Barry (Eds.), *Questioning the New Public Management*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004.
- du Gay, Paul. "Organizing Identity: Entrepreneurial Governance and Public Management." In Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London, Sage, 1996.
- Fearn, Hannah. "Graduate unemployment rises" in *Times Higher Education*. July 19, 2009 www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storycode=407431.
- Frontline. College, Inc.* PBS Documentary, May 2010.
- Hargreaves, Andy and Dennis Shirley. *The Fourth Way: The Inspiring Future for Educational Change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 2009.
- Harkin, Tom. "Emerging Risk?: An Overview of Growth, Spending, Student Debt and Unanswered Questions in For-Profit Higher Education." United States Senate, Health, Education, Labor and Pension Committee, June 24, 2010.
- Hersh, Richard, H. and John Merrow (Eds.). *Declining by Degrees: Higher Education at Risk*. New York: Palgrave, 2005.

- Hess, Frederick M. and Michale J. Petrilli. *No Child Left Behind*. New York: Peter Lang, 2006.
- Hill, Dave. "Foreword." In Dave Hill and Ellen Rosskam (Eds.), *The Developing World and State Education: Neoliberal Depredation and Egalitarian Alternatives*. New York, Routledge, 2009.
- Jaschik, Scott. "Departments Without Chairs." *Insider Higher Ed*, May 5, 2009
www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/05/05/kean
- Johnson, Hans. "Higher Education in California: New Goals for the Master Plan." Sacramento: Public Policy Institute of California, 2010.
- Keller, George. *The Management Revolution in American Higher Education*. Baltimore: John Hopkins, 1983.
- Kohn, Alfie. *The Case Against Standardized Testing: Raising the Scores, Ruining the Schools*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2000.
- Kumar, Krishan. "The Need for Place." In Anthony Smith and Frank Webster, (Eds.), *The Postmodern University: Contested Visions of Higher Education in Society*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1998.
- Lorenz, Chris. "Will the Universities Survive European Integration? Higher Education Policies in the EU and in the Netherlands before and after the Bologna Declaration." Free University Amsterdam/University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, 2009. Will the universities survive European Integration.pdf.
- Mangan, Katherine. "Texas A&M System Will Rate Professors Based on Their Bottom-Line Value." September 2, 2010. <http://chronicle.com/article/Texas-A-M-System-Will-Rate/124280/>.
- Marginson, Simon and Marijk van der Wende. "Globalization and Higher Education." Education Working Paper No. 8. Paris: OECD, 2007.
- Master Plan for Higher Education in California*, "Access Provisions of the California Master Plan for Higher Education." Sacramento: 1960, www.ucop.edu/acadinit/mastplan/mpaccess.htm.
- Meier, Deborah and George Wood, (Eds.). *Many Children Left Behind: How the No Child Left Behind Act Is Damaging Our Children and Our Schools*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2004.
- Meisenhelder, Susan. "Michael Barber's 'Deliverology' in the UK and in the CSU: A Cautionary Tale." California Faculty Association (2010)2: 19-20
[Deliverology_Book_Reviews_for_web_0410.pdf](http://www.cfaa.org/Deliverology_Book_Reviews_for_web_0410.pdf).
- Middleton, Peter, (Ed.). *Delivering Public Services that Work*. Vol. 1. Devon, UK: Triarchy Press, 2010.
- Munitz, Barry. "Managing Transformation in an Age of Social Triage." In Sandra L. Johnson, Sean C. Rush, and Coopers and Lybrand L.L.P., (Eds.), *Reinventing the University: Managing and Financing Institutions of Higher Education*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1995.
- NASH. "Charting a Necessary Path: The Baseline Report of Public Higher Education Systems in the Access to Success Initiative." Washington D.C.: The Education Trust, December, 2009.
- Newfield, Christopher. "Avoiding the Coming Higher Ed Wars." *Academe Online*. May-June 2010.
<http://chronicle.com/article/The-Commodification-of-Wisdom/12006>.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. *Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Office of the Press Secretary (The White House). "Excerpts of the President's remarks in Warren, Michigan today and a fact sheet on the American Graduation Initiative." July 14, 2009
www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/excerpts-of-the-presidents-remarks-in-warren-michigan-and-fact-sheet-on-the-american-graduation-initiative/.
- O'Leary, Kevin. "The Legacy of Proposition 13." *Time*. June 27, 2009.
www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1904938,00.html
- Patel, Raj. *The Value of Nothing: How to Reshape Market Society and Redefine Democracy*. New York: Picador, 2010.

- Polster, Claire and Janice Newson. "Don't Count Your Blessings: The Social Accomplishments of Performance Indicators." In Jan Currie and Janice Newson, (Eds.), *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1998.
- Ravitch, Diane. *The Death and Life of the Great American School System: How Testing and Choice Are Undermining Education*. New York: Perseus Books, 2010.
- Reed, Charles. "The Early Start Program—Executive Order No. 1048." June 11, 2010. EO 1048.pdf.
- Rosskam, Ellen. "Introduction." In Dave Hill and Ellen Rosskam, (Eds.), *The Developing World and State Education: Neoliberal Depredation and Egalitarian Alternatives*. New York, Routledge, 2009.
- Smith, Page. *Killing the Spirit: Higher Education in America*. New York: Penguin, 1990.
- Seddon, John, *Systems Thinking in the Public Sector: The Failure of the Reform Regime and a Manifesto for a Better Way*. UK: Triarchy Press Ltd, 2008.
- . *Freedom from Command and Control: Rethinking Management for Lean Service*. New York: Productivity Press, 2005.
- Slaughter, Sheila. "National Higher Education Policies in a Global Economy." In Jan Currie and Janice Newson, (Eds.), *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1998.
- Sheila Slaughter and Larry L. Leslie. *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- Slaughter, Sheila and Gary Rhoades. *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State, and Higher Education*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2004.
- The Third Estate. "Middlesex University Shamefully Cuts Philosophy Department," posted by Jacob on April 28, 2010. <http://thethirdestate.net/2010/04/middlesex-university-shamefully-cuts-philosophy-department/>.
- Thomas, Keith. "What are universities for?" *Times Literary Supplement* 7 (May 2010): 13-15. *Venture: Inside Tampa Bay Business*. Tampabay.com.
- Tinto, Vincent. *Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Trigaux, Robert. "The job hunt: Class of 2010 college graduates confront a mean employment scene." May 25, 2010. *Venture*, blogs.tampabay.com/venture/2010/05/wake-up-and-good-morning-may-is-both-the-traditional-month-of-college-graduation-and-articles-that-tell-grads-how-tough-it.html.
- Trilling, Bernie and Charles Fadel. *21st Century Skills: Learning for Life in Our Times*. San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons, 2009.
- U.C. Office of the President. 2010. "The U.C. Budget: Myths and Facts." University of California, 2010.
- . "2009-10 Projected UC Core Funds Revenue by Source." University of California, January 2010.
- Voegeli, William. "Don't Blame Proposition 13." *City Journal*, 20:2 (Spring 2010). www.city-journal.org/2010/20_2_prop-13.html.
- Wittner, Lawrence S. "Dismantling SUNY, America's Largest Public University System." *HNN* (George Mason University's History News Network). March 8, 2010 www.hnn.us/articles/123958.html.
- The World Bank. *Constructing Knowledge Societies: New Challenges for Tertiary Education*. Washington D.C., 2001.
- Yamada, Teri Shaffer. 2009a. "The CSU Executives' Incomplete Chronology of Questionable Practices." Unpublished paper.
- . "2009b. "The Life and Times of Charles Reed: Reframing the Value of Efficiency and Accountability for the CSU." Unpublished paper.