
The Modern American University

Observations from the Field*

ROBERT A. SCOTT

Who is this observer?

It is a fair question to ask about the observer if you are to be subjected to his observations. I think my story helps illustrate some features that I consider are best about American higher education: opportunity for access; financial aid to help make college more affordable; and public accountability to help ensure its quality.

I was the first in my immediate family to go to college. I was awarded scholarships and worked two jobs at my *alma mater*, Bucknell University, one in the library and another as a student research assistant for the dean and also when he became provost. When I graduated my only (financial) debt was \$400, which I owed to an aunt.

My higher education history also includes Cornell University, where I earned my PhD, taught and became a dean; the Indiana Commission on Higher Education, where I was in charge of state-wide planning; Ramapo College of New Jersey, where I was president for fifteen years, including time as head of the newly formed New Jersey Commission on Higher Education; and Adelphi University in New York, where I also served as president for fifteen years.

What is it I admire?

There is much to admire about higher education in general, although I will focus my comments on the U.S. experience. Higher education, especially universities, includes these key features. It is curator of that which was created and is known, whether on paper, clay or discs; it is creator of the new, whether facts, interpretations, fanciful musings, or new professionals; and it is a critic of the *status quo*, asking “why” and “why not?”

A college receives a public charter and is more than information alone, like a library or museum; more than belief alone, like a church; and more than emotion alone, like a club. It is all of these and more. The vision of the university, and here I include four-year and two-year colleges, is dedicated to the search for truth and to the preparation of students to be able to distinguish between and among empirical evidence, epiphanies, and emotion or superstition. The goals of higher education have been to widen access, especially at the undergraduate level, to students of all ages and backgrounds, whether enrolled full-time or part-time, and to promote excellence in teaching and research for the common good.

In the beginning, it was thought that public higher education in the U. S. should be free, and for many years major systems of higher education such as those in California and New York City were free. State and federal student financial aid programs came later, although private institutions had been raising endowed and expendable funds to provide scholarship assistance for

the children of ministers, teachers and others for many years.

Excellence in graduate teaching and research have been priorities and we can think of the numerous ways in which university-based research in the life sciences, physics, history, and archaeology have advanced our well-being and our understanding of what it means to be human. I give much more attention to these features in a longer text*, especially to the four kinds of scholarship delineated by Ernest Boyer, discovery, integration, application, and pedagogy.¹

Higher education in the U.S. has a rich history of evolution and expansion, both in borrowing from other countries and in developing new models. Over the past 150-plus years alone, colleges and universities have responded to societal needs by creating, revising, expanding, and eliminating subjects of major study. There are numerous types of institutions and multiple categories of students. A distinctive feature of U.S. higher education is the great variety of student counselling and activities as well as academic support services that have been developed, all to support student satisfaction and success.

As elsewhere, U.S. higher education is distinguished by its founding characteristics, which were often influenced by population pressures, politics, and the public investment of both charters and funding. Colleges and universities were founded by visionaries and by visionary leaders to serve particular populations and priorities. Harvard was the first college, founded in 1636, with a mission to provide a “learned ministry” through the “transformative power of the arts and sciences.” Balliol, Merton, and University Colleges, by the way, were already 400 years old.

The University of Chicago was founded in 1890 to provide opportunities in all departments to students of both sexes. It was to be a modern research university with English style undergraduate education and German style graduate and research programs. Wellesley College was founded in 1870 with a focus on the liberal arts to prepare “women who will make a difference in the world, not to be ministered to but to minister”.

The first community college grew out of adult education programs at a high school in Joliet, Illinois, in 1901. The network of public two-year colleges blossomed in the 1930s, flourished still more following the Truman Commission in 1948, and developed still further in the 1960s. There are now nearly 1,200 of them. The City College of New York was started in 1847 as the Free Academy, where the founders said:

“The experiment is to be tried, whether the children of the people, ... can be educated and whether an institution of the highest grade, can be successfully controlled by the popular will, not by the privileged few.”

My own university, Adelphi, was conceived in 1895

by a group of suffragists, abolitionists, and free thinkers about religion who wanted to create a great university in Brooklyn that provided equal opportunity for men and women. There are many more stories, of course, of colleges started for different groups, especially women, Catholics, Jews, and African-Americans because they were generally excluded from the mainstream institutions.

I admire the vision if not always the courage of these founders, and the many others who started colleges in small towns and emerging cities across the country. The increasing number of students attending high school, the need for teachers, ministers and doctors, and the growing need for scientific agriculture, mining and manufacturing all fostered the creation of new colleges, just as in earlier times federal initiatives for population dispersal to the west had fostered new institutions.

By the time President Lincoln signed the Morrill Land Grant Act in 1862, there were some 200 colleges in the country, most of them private and church-affiliated. The “land grants” were sold and used by the states to start new schools or to fund existing state or private colleges in order to create more schools of agriculture and mechanic arts. Colleges and universities have been instrumental in the development and application of new technologies, probably second to the military, with which there were many contracts and partnerships over the years.

Colleges are “anchor” institutions for community development. Imagine if a local chamber of commerce wanted to set goals for strategic planning to attract a new enterprise: it would want one with a product or service of which everyone could be proud; it would want a highly educated work force that would become engaged in the community; it would want one that would generate payroll and other taxes; and it would want one that would be sensitive to the environment. Well, that describes a college or university. One can also add in the numerous cultural contributions of college campuses, from music, theatre, dance, painting, sculpture, speakers and sports to children’s programs. Some colleges even have nursery schools.

These and many other features are what I admire about higher education. It is the historic focus on expansion of opportunity, the commitment to high quality, the governmental policies supporting higher education for a public purpose, private philanthropy with a commitment to the advancement of the citizenry, and institutional missions to serve the growing nation that helped make higher education in the U.S. the gem that it is in so many ways – but not all.

What is it that causes me anguish?

The vision described above has not been fulfilled as fully as possible. For, in addition to the variable of population as an influence on higher education institutional location and growth, two other variables have been powerful. These are politics and public investment.

In the United States, as elsewhere, the original sins of racism and slavery, instruments of public policy and investment, denied African-Americans access to higher education. It is true that a few freed slaves and their children gained access to Middlebury in Vermont, Bowdoin

in Maine, Amherst in Massachusetts, and Oberlin in Ohio as early as the 1820s and 1830s. However, it was not until the second Morrill Act of 1890 that opportunities really grew, with federal appropriations to support predominantly African-American colleges in the seventeen still-segregated slave states which continued to exclude these students from the original Land Grant institutions.

When there is political support and public investment, access can increase, although much of this access was limited by the slave states to separate and unequal education. This is part of the 400-year legacy of racism and slavery that continue to this day in terms of African-American family income and wealth, housing choices, access to good schools, and a tradition of college attendance. Therefore, given my belief that higher education is an instrument for democracy, one of the features that causes me the most grief is the increasing evidence that legislators and their backers lack a commitment to access for those who come from less-advantaged backgrounds. For example, the federal Pell Grant program was designed to provide tuition assistance to families at the median household income or lower.

Yet today in the United States a child born into a family in the top 25% of family income has a nearly 90% chance of graduating from a four-year college, while a child with the same native ability born into a family whose income is in the lowest 25% has less than a 10% chance of earning a baccalaureate degree. The Pell Grant threshold is set at \$50,000 per annum and below. Yet when we look at the percentage of students receiving Pell Grants at our most prestigious universities, the proportions are quite low. For example, at the top 25 universities as ranked by *U.S. News and World Reports*, the University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) and the University of California Berkeley led the list with 39% and 35% Pell Grant recipients enrolled respectively.

Well, one might say, UCLA and Berkeley are state institutions and charge lower tuition. Yes, but they are highly selective institutions in terms of admissions and want to enrol the most promising students – just as well-endowed private colleges do. At Yale, with an endowment of \$2 million per student, Pell Grant recipients represent 12% of students. At Stanford, with \$1.35 million per student, Pell Grant recipients represent 15% of students. Yet Vassar, with \$406,000 per student has 25%, as does Adelphi with about one-quarter of the Vassar endowment. If we were really committed to educational opportunity, we would see remarkably different results and more examples of free tuition. Those examples that existed in California and New York are long gone and, it seems, policy makers do not want to be reminded of that history.

Another feature that causes me anguish is student loan debt. Federal student loans were started under the National Defense Education Act in 1958 and the program became the Guaranteed Student Loan Program in 1965. The latest version, Direct Lending, was introduced in 1992 and expanded under President Clinton in 1993. In 2007, following reductions in the use of Direct Lending and cutbacks to the federal program in order to increase funding for the Pell Grant program, banks and other non-bank lenders began offering variable rate loans with risk pricing. Some interest rates were up to 16% and more.

It was a combination of these loans, the fact that student debt may not be cancelled through bankruptcy, the dramatic increase in students attending private for-profit colleges by using federal and private loans, and the fact that the federal government did not reduce its interest rates on loans to the prevailing commercial rates, that caused a surge in total student debt which is reported to exceed \$1.2 trillion. In 2014, the average debt load for a recent graduate of a public college was \$25,550, 25% higher than in 2008; for a private non-profit college it was \$33,300, 15% higher than in 2008; but at private for-profit colleges it was \$39,950, 26% higher than in 2008.²

Therefore, media headlines about six-figure student debt do not tell the complete story. This is voluntary debt. There is no reason for anyone to graduate from an undergraduate program with \$100,000 or more in debt. Those who do, do so voluntarily, usually in order to pay the tuition and associated costs necessary to attend what they consider to be a more prestigious college than the one that is more affordable. In fact, only 0.2% of student borrowers have \$100,000 or more in debt. Of these, 90% are in or already graduated from a graduate school or an advanced professional school like law and medicine. Some 40% of all student debt is for these students, who average close to \$60,000 in debt per person.

These comments are not intended to diminish the negative effects of student debt on college-going, degree completion, employment choices, and purchasing decisions, such as for housing and automobiles. In fall 2015, some 58% of four-year colleges and universities reported that they failed to meet their enrolment targets, and many admissions officers cited concerns student debt as a major cause of the decline. For these reasons and more, I am glad to see some U. S. presidential candidates talking about the cost of going to college and advocating either a free community college education or some form of debt-free program.

Another source of anguish is found in the student loan default rates. Partly induced by unmanageable debt, and the fact that students may not discharge their debt through bankruptcy, as they can every other kind of debt, the default rate has spiralled upward because of the practices of some large private for-profit colleges. For example, this past summer, the average student loan default rate for public colleges and universities was 13% and for private non-profit colleges and universities it was 8.2%. At private for-profit colleges, it was 21.8%. This is not a good way for college students to start their adult lives. Again, this is a consequence of the heavy reliance on borrowing as a vehicle for paying for college.

Still another source of anguish is the dismal record on graduation rates. Of 100 high school graduates, about 70 will graduate—from high school; 49 will enter college; and 25 of these 49 will graduate with a four-year baccalaureate degree in six years. Some of the delay in average graduation rates is due to cuts in support to public institutions, and a subsequent decline in the offering of courses needed to complete degree requirements, and some is due to the number of hours average students work to pay for tuition, auto insurance and other payments. A large part is also related to the lack of adequate preparation of students to pursue a degree. According to the (U.S.) National Center for Education Statistics, “59% of first-time, full-time students who began seek-

ing a bachelor’s degree at a 4-year institution in fall 2007 completed the degree at that institution by 2013.” Furthermore, the six-year graduation rate was 58% at public institutions, 65% at private non-profit institutions, and 32% at private for-profit institutions, with females graduating at higher rates than males at public and non-profit campuses. (Table 326.10³). Note that students at private for-profit colleges have more debt, higher loan default rates, and lower graduation rates.

At two-year institutions, the rates are calculated differently, using 150% of the normal or expected time for graduation for first-time, full-time students. For two-year schools, the overall rates for the starting 2010 cohort were 19.5% for public institutions and 53.6% for private non-profit colleges. (Table 326.20³.) For community colleges, which enrol 45% of all undergraduates, it is not reasonable to talk about average graduation rates because large numbers of students enter degree and certificate programs with the desire either to leave before a credential has been earned, because they learned what they wanted, or because they leave early to enter another degree or certificate program. Nearly 50% of students in four-year colleges started at a community college.

Several caveats about graduation rates are worth noting. The data are for those who entered as first-time, full-time students, and we know that about 38% of students at four-year institutions are enrolled part-time. (Table 303.10³.) It is important to note, therefore, that the data are for a sub-set of the whole. The second caveat is this: the data are for those who “completed the degree at that institution,” i.e., the one where they started. Yet we know that about 12% of those who do complete a four-year degree complete it at an institution other than the one where they started.⁴

At public institutions, graduation rates are affected by declines in state funding. While historically the states provided more funds to institutions than the federal government, the declines in state funding since 2008 and the increase in federal support for Pell Grants and veterans’ education benefits have reversed this pattern. Between 2000 and 2012, when the number of students in higher education grew by 45%, state revenue per FTE student fell by 37%. One estimate is that government support for colleges and universities represented about 34% of expenditures in 2010, down from 60% in 1975. This decline is due not only to the economic downturn but also to a virulent anti-tax ideology that swept through the states and federal government. As part of the anti-tax and “starve the beast” themes, private sector groups adopted what I call “voluntary taxation,” whereby they use tax-deductible charitable donations to influence tax policy, promote alternatives to neighbourhood public schools, and advocate for more for-profit private colleges.

I think the proposed initiative for free public community college tuition should be encouraged broadly and funded adequately. On the other hand, the new “boot camps,” privately run 12-week and longer skills training for computer coding, should not be made free. They are another form of private for-profit schools seeking federal funds for support.⁵ Corporations should provide their own training, or pay taxes adequate to support public training.

For-profit colleges are one way that corporate interests intersect with public funding for education. Another

is in the push for so-called public-private partnerships. These can be good, but often divert the college from its core mission in order to gain a new source of revenue that is neither scalable nor replicable. The ATT-sponsored, low-cost, online master's degree in engineering at Georgia Tech is a good example. With millions of dollars provided by ATT, which gets "first look" at the students, this is not a replicable approach for reducing the price to students of graduate engineering degrees unless other companies provide the funding for students in this and other programs. The same can be said of community colleges that give more attention to contract training than to tuition-based instruction in order to offset cuts in public funding. The initiative benefits select programs and students but is not sustainable without external support.

A corporate mind-set can also influence higher education through the university boardroom. The goals of a business are for profits now, even when it means casting off products or services whose popularity has waned but whose potential for reinvigoration is known. This can be short-term thinking, as those of us in higher education have seen in the waxing and waning of popularity of various major disciplines. The mission-market balance must be kept in check, of course, with proper concern for standards and finances. Nevertheless, we have seen examples of boards of trustees giving undo influence to the market and short-term thinking, which then gain more importance than mission and the long-term in institutional strategic planning. Another source of influence is the private philanthropic foundation that through grant programs can encourage the development of select disciplines and programs about certain topics and areas of the world for particular segments of students that may be of priority one year and not the next.

Finally, although there is more that I lament about contemporary higher education, I must discuss tuition discounting and the rise of "merit" scholarships. Tuition discounting is used to give the illusion that the college or university is awarding the candidate a scholarship. Last year, the average rate for private non-profit colleges was 54%, thus reducing the net revenue needed to pay salaries and light bills, etc. Many university presidents and business officers think this is an unsustainable practice. Discounting is used because most colleges do not have sufficient endowment income to (1) provide the amount of money required to supplement state and federal funds to meet the financial need demonstrated by a family and (2) to provide an award in recognition of some talent or meritorious attribute in order to attract students. Such awards started with athletic scholarships, expanded in order to recruit students with other desired talents, such as playing the oboe, and increased in kind again to recruit students with special leadership accomplishments or high SAT scores. One of the unintended consequences of discounting and merit awards is that parents want to negotiate the amount of scholarship, using the award letter from one college to convince another that it should increase its award, thus turning college into a commodity, like a car.

There is more to be said about what causes me concern, especially about government intrusions, frequent references to the business model of higher education being broken or disrupted, the roles of trustees and faculty in what is called "shared governance," the ways in

which institutions balance teaching and research, the future roles of faculty and the reward systems in place, the potential hazards of corporate sponsorship of research, the working relationships between and among school districts and collegiate teacher education programs in the preparation of new members of the profession, public opinion polling and what students and parents say about the value of higher education, tenure, collective bargaining with faculty unions, big-time athletics, and the lack of inter-institutional collaboration on degree programs and community improvement projects, but those topics and more will be covered in the monograph on which this talk is based.

What is it that I anticipate?

The forces shaping the future of higher education in the U.S. are well known. Surely they include demographic shifts, especially with regard to the number of high school graduates, the age of potential college-goers, the number of students who will be first in their families to attempt post-high school education, the income and employment status of students, whether students will study full-time or part-time, and whether they will be in residence on campus, live off-campus, or attend online, and their career focus. There also are global forces, including the movement of students and faculty between and among countries, and institutions starting campuses and partnerships with universities in other countries.^{6,7}

Some forecasters have proposed varying models of institutional development for the future, including scaling back in size of enrolment, greater specialization and focus, becoming fully online, or becoming a hybrid college combining elements of all types. Another force with which to contend is in the changing priorities for public funding. With prisons and pensions squeezing the funding for higher education, we must find more effective ways to change the cost structure of colleges and universities, especially as we examine tuition discounting and merit aid, and do more to advocate the public benefits of higher education. We also must find new sources of revenue beyond that which students can bring without diminishing institutional commitments to purpose and mission.

Finally, a major force for change is found in the technological breakthroughs that can support teaching and learning and back office processing functions, as well as prompt changes in policies for student course credit transfer, new forms of credentialing, and much more.

Online learning can be used for distance education or to support "blended" courses that combine online with in-class instruction, and "flipped" classes in which students use online and other resources prior to class time, which is the equivalent of the lecture, and then use in-class time for discussion and group projects. We already see how communications technologies can facilitate student and faculty interactions. I am confident that we will see further developments in the availability and uses of technologies, especially for ensuring the identity and integrity of students enrolled via technology and the timeliness of feedback to students, as well as in terms of professional development for faculty and academic policy for course credit acceptance.

United States President Obama, the Lumina Founda-

tion, the Gates Foundation, and others have expressed goals for increased college attainment, which they usually link to international comparisons and economic competitiveness, without mentioning education for more enlightened citizenship. The President and others are correct to advocate for more advanced education for more people because the correlation between college attainment, unemployment rates, and national economic growth are strong. To reach the President's goal, however, we will need to increase the number of people with at least some college attendance by 50%, and include adult student enrolment in campus planning to a much greater degree than we do now. It will not be possible to achieve his goal with high schools students alone without a major policy change about immigrants and immigration. If we know the forces for change, and know something about the history of American higher education, especially the visions and visionaries who started it, what is on the horizon? What do I hope for?

If we look again at the variables of population, politics, and public investment that seem to have shaped the earliest years of university growth in the United States, what might these variables suggest about the future?

We certainly face issues of population, but in this case not about the movement of populations to frontier territories. Today, it is about how to provide education for advancement to populations of low-income, minority and immigrant young people and adults, many of whom live in inner cities but others of whom live in pockets of rural poverty. Given their educational backgrounds, and lack of readiness for advanced education, it is unlikely in the near term that online learning approaches will either appeal to them or benefit them. Yet their progress is a public responsibility. We must acknowledge that these members of our society live in the conditions they inhabit and experience inadequate schools because of the lack of public investment in education, housing, nutritious food, and healthcare. These conditions are the result of public policies that more often than not benefit the wealthy and exacerbate the condition of the poor.

Politics and public policies will no doubt approve new forms of credentialing, especially for job skills, and foster more competition among colleges for students even as the state and federal governments add more laws and regulations to ensure minimum standards of quality.

We also may see the kind of politics that put what became New York's land-grant college, Cornell University, in Ithaca, instead of in Havana, New York, its first location, and put a college in southern New Jersey when the legislative report on higher education called for only one new state institution, to be located in the northern and more urban part of the state.

In order for the United State to increase the rate of post-high school attainment, five principal actors must work in concert.

- First, our society must ensure that all young people enter school ready to learn, following a good night's sleep after studying in a quiet place and having a proper breakfast.
- Second, the nation's schools, from kindergarten through high school, must ensure that all students learn to study and acquire the knowledge, skills,

abilities and values necessary to be active citizens as well as college and career ready.

- Third, state governments must adequately fund K-12 schools and public colleges and universities as well as need-based financial aid programs so that access and affordability represent promises fulfilled, not just slogans for a campaign.
- Fourth, the federal government must fund the Pell Grant program so that it covers the basic costs of a public university and make income-based loan repayment programs universal.
- Fifth, colleges and universities should not only be more rigorous in examining the campus cost structure, but also should ensure that institutional financial aid, even that which is provided through tuition discounting, is focused on the financially neediest students.⁸

As part of their responsibilities, colleges should also distinguish between education and training. To me, education is about questions, "What if," and not about, "How to," which is the province of training. Students are no longer bound by the answers imposed by their culture, but, in James Baldwin's phrase, learn to see the questions hidden by the answers, the assumptions of their past. This is an education for a life of questions, a life with purpose, an ethical education.

However, even education like this requires some skills development, not only in asking questions but also in critical reading, comprehensive listening, cogent writing, persuasive speaking, and proficiency in calculating results. This kind of education needs to include general and expert knowledge, skills as noted above, abilities such as reasoning and a second language, and values such as respect for other opinions and the balance of community and individual interests.

In addition to the so-called "hard skills," students need also to develop what are called "soft skills," such as disciplined work habits, time management, teamwork, leadership, and community involvement through voluntarism. I think of this combination of a focus on questions and the development of hard and soft skills as a "liberating education," liberating students from their provincial origins, no matter their age, national origin, or station. There is considerable evidence that many employers want graduates with particular skills such as accounting, but the vast majority of employers want employees with a broad set of skill and abilities, with more emphasis on effective oral and written communication, critical thinking and reasoning in multiple settings, and the ability to be imaginative across cultural borders.

One way to think about this question of what colleges should teach and what students should study is to reflect on contemporary crises in finance, industry, and politics, and ask what lessons we have learned. A quick survey of the past decade shows that too many people in even sophisticated roles lacked knowledge of history or historical analysis, and did not have the personal or professional memory in which to place contemporary issues. So, history is an essential subject, especially if we are to understand the different ways people "know" the truth and how they challenge assumptions and validate

assertions. In the study of history as I define it, we learn about the world we meet (nature or science); the world we make (culture); and the systems by which we mediate between them (law, morality and ethics). We learn about the past and present, science and technology, war and peace, poetry and prose. Without this broad background, we cannot distinguish cant from Kant. Students also need to learn in context—whether through fieldwork, profession-based placements, or internships—each of which can help reinforce theory through practice.

The second area to develop is that of imagination. It seems clear in retrospect that even high-profile people confronted new problems without the ability to see connections between and among different variables, could not visualize or forecast directions, could not approach issues with creativity. They had not developed the capacity to wonder, to inquire, to experience discovery, to look, see and ask. These are the benefits of an education that liberates students from prejudices masquerading as principles, no matter what their nationality, socioeconomic status, age or religion. They, and we, grow up in mostly isolated, two-generation, mono-cultural communities, and have little experience with those some think of as the “other.” They need to develop a global perspective.

Finally, college and university presidents should do more to tell the important story of higher education’s benefits to society as well as to the individuals who live and vote in it. This form of “risk management” for the enterprise is as important as risk management for the campus. Without such efforts and public investments, we will see more downscaling of campuses and more mergers and closures.

These investments we advocate are for the security of a democratic society, not expenses to be added and cut as the political winds dictate. If we do not prepare our children to be ready for school; if our public schools are not prepared, to the fullest extent possible, to ensure that all students are ready to learn; if our public schools, colleges and universities are not adequately funded to fulfil their missions; if the federal government does not fund student aid adequately; if our academic leaders do not embrace a “liberating education” for all students, no matter what their age; if our campus leaders do not support the central missions of our institutions and advocate for the support of student learning for life, not just for earning a living, we will further blunt these central instruments of democracy and witness the further decline in our nation.

Conclusion

These are my observations from the field, my “love story” about higher education. I have admiration in abundance for the policies supporting access, affordability, and accountability. I feel anguish for what I see as violations of the basic public trust bestowed upon institutions when integrity is put to the side. I not only have hope for changes that bear great potential for improvements in student access and learning, and therefore society as a whole, but also anxious anticipation for the potential destruction of essential elements of our education system and the undermining of the public purposes of our institutions.

Nevertheless, I believe that we can reclaim a culture of conscience and civic responsibility, of education for a purposeful life, for a university education that is as much about these goals as it is about jobs and economic development. Perhaps Gordon Davies, the long-time head of the State of Virginia Council on Higher Education said it best: “Education is not a trivial business, a private good, or a discretionary expenditure. It is a deeply ethical undertaking at which we must succeed if we are to survive as a free people.”

** Based on an invited address at the Rothermere American Institute, University of Oxford, October 23, 2015. © Robert A. Scott 2015. In 2010, I published an essay entitled, “The Modern American University: A Love Story”, in which I described what I admire, what I abhor, and what I anticipate about American higher education. This article is extracted from a forthcoming book-length study.*

¹Boyer, Ernest. *Scholarship Reconsidered*. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for Teaching, 1990.

²The Institute for College Access & Success. 20.14 Quick Facts about Student Debt. <http://bit.ly/1xjskr>.

³NCES “Fast Facts,” 326.10, 326.20, 303.10.

⁴“Completing College: A National View of Student Attainment Rates”. NCES Signature Report 4, November 12, 2012.

⁵Garcia Mathewson, Tara. “Ed Dept weighing aid options for alternative credentialing.” *Education Dive*, July 22, 2015.

⁶Dew, John. “Global, Mobile, Vertical, and Social: The College Campus of Tomorrow.” *The Futurist*, March-April 2010, page 46ff.

⁷“Perspectives in Higher Education.” PWC.

⁸Heller, Donald E. “Why the U.S. isn’t likely to meet Obama’s goal on college graduation rates.” *Hechinger Report*, October 2, 2014.

Not
the
Gazette

NB The *Oxford Magazine* is not an official publication of the University. It is a forum for the free expression of opinion within the University.