
Preface

Lorna M. Peterson, Five College Coordinator

In November 1999, some 150 people gathered for a conference on cooperation in higher education. Among them were presidents of colleges and universities, provosts and treasurers, trustees and foundation officers, deans and directors of consortia. If cooperation itself is an anomaly, this unprecedented gathering was doubly so.

The Five College conference on “Cultures of Cooperation: The Future Role of Consortia in Higher Education” was the culmination of a multi-year review of Five Colleges, Incorporated, one of the oldest consortia in the country. In over 30 years, the consortium had never undergone an outside review of the entire enterprise. Few, if any, other consortia have, either. So it seemed important to share what we learned in our review with other institutions and consortia and to learn from them about their successes and their frustrations.

We were extremely fortunate to have the help and support of a highly distinguished review team: Robert Edwards, President of Bowdoin College, who served as chair; Patricia Albjerg Graham, President of the Spencer Foundation and Professor of the History of American Higher Education at Harvard University; and Walter Massey, President of Morehouse. Sandra Glass, senior program officer at the W.M. Keck Foundation for many years and now an independent adviser on philanthropy, provided guidance to the review team and to the Five College Board of Directors as consultant.

The review process was complex and untested, although we tried to emulate as much as possible the goals and spirit of the reaccreditation process required of individual institutions. The review team came to Five Colleges for three days in March 1999. In the mornings they met at Five Colleges with groups of faculty and administrative staff who participated in one or another cooperative activity or program; in the afternoons, they divided into pairs and met at one of the campuses with the executive staff of that institution and then with a group of faculty and staff and, in some cases, students. We tried to ensure that we reached both those who already cooperate and

could make an evaluation of what that meant to them as faculty, staff, students, and those who had never experienced any form of inter-collegial cooperation or did not see it as central to their professional lives. In all the review team had an opportunity to visit each campus and meet with over 200 people.

Both the review and the conference were supported by a grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, two of whose officers—Betty Overton-Adkins and John Burkhardt—generously agreed to participate in the conference. Copies of the final program and list of participants can be found in the appendices at the end of this report.

What follows is a summary of the proceedings of the two-day conference, including the questions from the audience and responses from the panelists. We have not attempted here to present a verbatim transcript of the conference proceedings; rather, we have edited the presentations to highlight the main points made and to eliminate unnecessary redundancies. Since these were not formal, written presentations meant for publication, we have also done some mild tweaking of language in order to shape the spoken into the written word. For the most part, however, the words are those of the speakers, to whom we are enormously and gratefully indebted for their willingness to give of their time and wisdom in making both the conference and these proceedings possible.

I am personally indebted to the staff of Five Colleges, especially to Carol Aleman and Suzan Young who, throughout the review and the conference, dedicated themselves so graciously and diligently to guaranteeing that every detail was arranged and every need met. My colleagues—Carol Angus, Renee Fall, Nate Therien, and Tom Warger—contributed unstintingly to the success of the conference and to the production of these proceedings. We were aided by the fine editorial eye of Terry Allen and the final grafting of all versions into one by Lillian Johnson and Robyn Cutler. To them, to all Five College staff, to the participants in this conference, and to the extraordinary review team members, I extend my gratitude and appreciation.

Welcome

Joanne V. Creighton, President, Mount Holyoke College

We have invited speakers and participants from other consortia around the country, from major foundations, and from other colleges and universities that are engaged in a variety of cooperative ventures with other institutions and with the communities in which they reside.

Why have we invited you all here? What is the genesis of this conference and what do we hope to gain from it?

The idea was the brainchild of the Five College directors. It is part of a plan to interject into our stewardship of Five Colleges, Inc. the same kind of scrutiny and rigorous self-

The world is rapidly changing around us and we want to position this consortium in such a way that it is attuned to that world and indeed helping to shape it.

David K. Scott

assessment that is characteristic of planning on our individual campuses. We want to make sure we are purposefully planning, not just managing, this enterprise.

Five Colleges, Inc. is rather like Topsy: it grew. And now, as it approaches 35 years of age, it is a sizeable, complex and remarkably multi-layered operation. On the face of it, you might think we are an unlikely alliance, bringing together a large flagship state university with three small, private, long-standing liberal arts colleges, two of them for women, and a new experimental college conceived and spawned by the others. Yet Five Colleges, Inc. most decidedly exists and thrives and we want to make sure that it continues to thrive in the future.

Although we the directors meet regularly together, in the ordinary course of events we get absorbed by our roles

on our own campuses. We felt we needed a mechanism that would put the consortium front and center in our thinking, that would encourage us to sit back and reflect, to assess the consortium's strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities, and to challenge ourselves to be as bold and imaginative as our predecessors who founded and built this enterprise which is arguably the most extensive consortium in the country.

And so we imposed upon ourselves a comprehensive review of the sort you would do for a reaccreditation process. We did a reflective self-study and then invited a distinguished team of visitors to come and have a look at us and tell us what they learned. That they did on March 3-6, 1999.

We invited this visiting team back here today to share the lessons and the surprises that came out of that scrutiny. We open up their candid perspectives of us — warts and all — to you, because we believe there aren't enough opportunities to discuss and share models of institutional cooperation and the challenges and opportunities they afford.

We are convinced that bringing together so many thoughtful theorists and practitioners from a number of quite different cultures of cooperation from around the country is bound to provoke important questions and new insights about the role consortia can and should play in higher education.

After this conference, we the Five College directors intend to meet together in a retreat setting and think through what we have learned and to plot out the next stage of Five College development.

Of course, much that is good in our consortium has been generated from the grass roots, but we also want to be assured that we are offering direction from the bird's eye view as well. The world is rapidly changing around us and we want to position this consortium in such a way that it is attuned to that world and indeed helping to shape it.

All of us in the consortium are committed to Five College cooperation because we are aware of significant benefits

that redound from it to our students, our faculty, our staff, our community, and our place in the world. In your arrival packets is a summary of some of those benefits. (See Appendix C.) We are proud of our successes: our virtual Five College library of eight million holdings, our shared on-line catalog and student exchange, our numerous cooperative curricular programs, our extensive faculty exchange, our cooperative research and business ventures, to name only a few.

I believe that each institution has a somewhat different emphasis on what it values about the consortium — since we are quite dissimilar institutions, that is not surprising—and we have all struggled with the complexities and challenges of working together.

What can and should the future hold for us and for other consortia in higher education? That in a nutshell is the question we want to examine with you at this conference.

As that visionary futurist, our colleague David Scott said: “We are now entering a period best described as the Integrative Age, rather than the Information or the Knowledge Age. The times ahead will emphasize connections and collaborations across areas of knowledge, between institutions, and with society.”

Indeed, in the corporate and business sector, it is the age of mergers, acquisitions, conglomerates. Are there lessons to be learned? Paths to be taken or avoided? I want to assure you that you are unlikely to see any takeovers here, hostile or otherwise. Mount Holyoke and Smith are not about to merge, for example.

The review team has raised the question whether we have, willy-nilly, created a sixth institution, Five Colleges, Inc., in our midst. Is this what we want? How do we take full advantage of the benefits of cooperation without infringing on our individual distinctiveness?

These are not easy questions, but we are committed to answering them with as much wisdom as we can muster.

Lessons and Surprises from the Five College Review

Members of the Five College Review Team

ROBERT H. EDWARDS

CHAIR, FIVE COLLEGE REVIEW TEAM

PRESIDENT, BOWDOIN COLLEGE

Although we are supposed to talk about lessons and surprises in this panel, I must say that, although we were not surprised during our participation in the review, we were fascinated. My utility to this distinguished gathering is as a consortial comparativist. While I was at Carleton, I participated in the Associated Colleges of the Midwest. I am participating in a new consortium among colleges in Maine—Bowdoin, Bates, and Colby. And as a member of the review team, I helped scrutinize the Five College consortium—which can be called the mother and father of all consortia. My varied experience suggests some not-very-helpful generalizations. Consortia vary enormously and have few commonalities. But several forces are driving most consortia: the desire to economize, to accommodate more students, to develop programs in common, to provide a richer educational environment for faculty and students, and to share unique resources. These forces vary among consortia, over time, and with the interests of their presidents.

Yet consortia look to be increasingly important. Foundations and government agencies like partnerships, because consortia have an aura of efficiency, optimizing resources, creating economies of scale, and a generous suppression of institutional peculiarity in favor of commonality. And web-based technologies are raising the possibility of creating consortia among very distant places.

A variety of things can be done by consortia, and surprising things can be done by very different types of institutions. The Five College consortium is interesting for a number of reasons.

- It contains a mix of institutions: public and private, women's and coeducational, graduate and undergraduate, old and rich and young and poor.

- For 35 years, the consortium's members have done valuable things and have valued the consortium and one another's differences.
- Its creators have been succeeded, which brings interesting questions about the consortium's maturity and about its future, continuing vitality, leadership, and the appropriate balance between the institutions and the consortial office, new areas of collaboration and the iron law of bureaucracy.

The précis of the final report of the review team touches on policy, process, and content. (See Appendix D.) Our panel is organized around substance, which Walter Massey will address; how consortia are funded, and costs and benefits, addressed by Sandra Glass; and questions of vitality, renewal, and recommitment, addressed by Patricia Graham.

WALTER MASSEY

PRESIDENT, MOREHOUSE COLLEGE

There are lessons to be learned from all consortia. I note three conditions necessary to apply to the Five College consortium and perhaps to all of them. I want to say a bit about three other consortia to which Morehouse belongs to give some comparative perspectives.

The three conditions necessary for a successful consortium can be summarized as follows:

- There needs to be a clear appreciation and understanding of goals, mutual interests, and expected outcomes that derive from consortial arrangements.
- Consortia need the involved commitment of leadership—presidents, boards, and senior academic officers.
- There must be visible and readily apparent benefits—obvious to faculty and students—beyond what can be achieved by a single institution.

There are consortia and there are *consortia*. How these three criteria apply depends on the structure of a consortium, the mix of institutions, the geographic proximity, common traditions and missions, and common base of resources among institutions. I classify consortia into two types: (1) The *family* consortium; and (2) the consortium that comes about as a result of *marriage*.

Morehouse College belongs to three consortia that serve as clarifying examples:

The visible benefits are different, but the involvement of the leadership of the institutions is necessary for each [consortium], as is the clear understanding of goals.

Walter Massey

- Atlanta University Center (AUC) is older than Five Colleges, and it includes five institutions in Atlanta that are in close proximity: Morehouse College, Spelman College, Clark Atlanta University, the Morehouse School of Medicine and Morris Brown College. This is a “family” consortium because the schools have to cooperate because they are so close together, and there is no getting away from each other. This requires them to look for ways to make cooperation work. There may not be totally shared institutional goals or missions, but they have no choice but to try and work together. I think that applies somewhat to Five Colleges—you have to find your common interests because you are close enough that it doesn’t make sense not to work together. And in these kinds of arrangements, foundations, government agencies, donors, and boards of trustees demand, require, or at a minimum, encourage cooperation.
- Associated Colleges of the South (ACS) can be characterized as a “marriage” consortium because a school has to choose to belong. The member institutions range from Texas to Virginia, throughout the south and southeast. They are all undergraduate, small liberal arts colleges, but the institutions have to find a reason to work together and find programs that make sense consortially. By

looking for ways to collaborate, share resources, enhance academic programs, and promote their institutions, they can become successful. They develop workshops for faculty, technology training, language training; develop new methods for teaching; and create new programs that share resources, such as study abroad programs. They have received support from foundations for such mutually beneficial programs.

- The Atlanta Regional Consortium for Higher Education (ARCHE) falls somewhere in between these two. It involves about 18 institutions in the greater Atlanta area, of all types—from Georgia Tech and Emory to Morehouse, Spelman, Agnes Scott and state institutions. We are close enough geographically that cooperation makes sense, but we are far enough apart that it is not mandatory. The institutions are different enough in missions, character, and level of resources that they wouldn’t be expected to need to cooperate. Yet the group looked for common goals and opportunities for sharing—such as student transfer, library sharing, and faculty peer groups. The major common goal, however, is to promote Atlanta as a center of excellence in higher education, in hopes of attracting more faculty, students, and support from local government, and the corporate and private sectors.

In each case, the three criteria I laid out above all apply, but apply differently to each of these consortia. The visible benefits are different, but the involvement of the leadership of the institutions is necessary for each, as is the clear understanding of goals. However, the central point that makes them all work is first-rate staff of the consortia to implement goals, policies, and expectations of the member institutions. One lesson we all carried away from the Five College review is the importance of Five Colleges, Inc. for providing the “glue” and implementation skills so that the goals of the institutions can be met.

SANDRA A. GLASS

**INDEPENDENT CONSULTANT AND PHILANTHROPY ADVISOR
FORMER PROGRAM VICE PRESIDENT, W.M. KECK FOUNDATION**

I want to speak about consortia as a vehicle for fundraising. We might compare a consortium to an SUV—it may not be the smoothest ride, but the whole family can fit in.

First, why do fundraising as a group? As we learned from our review of the Five Colleges, it works, especially

with private and corporate foundations and also with individuals. Five Colleges, Inc. gets about 30 percent of its budget from grants, and it has had grants from all the major national foundations. Key grants have come from Pew (for library collaboration) and many from Mellon, as well as grants from Kellogg, including the one that supported the review and this wonderful conference. Such grants have allowed the consortium to create original, creative, and innovative projects. The Five College Canadian and Near Eastern Studies programs started in this way. Grants have had a positive impact on faculty professional development, on administrative cooperation, such as in risk management, and especially on students, such as the Five College Foreign Language Resource Center. Foundations have provided start-ups that would have been beyond the means of individual colleges. Foundations look positively upon funding consortia because there's a larger critical mass of faculty and students, and these projects have cost-sharing benefits and exciting start-up implications. Many of your consortia are working on technology, distance learning, and sharing scientific equipment—and foundations love them.

One reason for success here at Five Colleges is that there is a central structure in place to do fundraising and to administer grants. Lorna Peterson and her staff can do research on foundations, cultivate them, and decide which president will visit a foundation. They assist in writing proposals, help faculty coordinate the ideas for proposals, and get the proposal out the door. They also help with reporting and

stewardship of past grants, which is almost more essential than getting the grants. They can invite foundations to the Valley. All of these help with fundraising. Most foundations wouldn't require a formal structure, as long as you cooperate and present a balanced plan, but the process is easier if you do have some of these structures in place.

Here are a few cautions, caveats, and potential difficulties—not really what we learned here, but some lessons to take away. First, is the proposal competing with individual requests from members of the group? I suggest you talk to the foundation and see if they permit the consortium to come in with a proposal even when individual members are applying. Don't spend time arguing about who goes in when, as the foundation will likely understand this dilemma. Second, remember that consortial applications take longer to prepare because they need to be reviewed by more than one group of faculty, administration, and sometimes boards of trustees. You need more lead time; if you generally need three months for a single-college proposal, allow nine months for a consortial proposal, and so on. It is worth the time and the effort.

Also note that foundations may want to give you less, but don't let them get away with it. They may not multiply a normal grant amount by the number of your members, but you should at least get more than one institution would. We need to say to foundations together, "Don't be cheap."

Another key issue is what will happen when the grant runs out? Many discussions we had at Five Colleges addressed this. Think this

through before you make the application. Will operating funds to continue the project come through the consortium? Will the project be taken over by one institution? The funding process and the follow-up are critical.

Let me add a few suggestions—in the ideal world of consortial fundraising. First, have a sensitive, secure development officer or academic administrator in charge of consortial fundraising, one who has empathy for and knows the units, but also who has clout—someone who can go to individual institutions, presidents, or boards and promote group applications. Second, spend special effort on the project budget. Be clear about who gets the funding, and how the money will be divided up among the institutions. Present this up front to the foundation. It is also helpful to have some internal funds for matching grants and costs that come up. Five Colleges, Inc. has a modest endowment, but the fact that it has some funding is helpful in going out to get other funding. Put some money aside in the consortium for that purpose. I also suggest having only one person be the contact with one foundation at any given time. It clarifies lines of communication for you and makes things easier for the foundation. Finally, you must keep a sense of humor and perspective.

PATRICIA ALBERG GRAHAM
PRESIDENT, THE SPENCER FOUNDATION
CHARLES WARREN PROFESSOR OF THE
HISTORY OF AMERICAN EDUCATION,
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

I will address issues of ensuring vitality and quality control in consortial programs, or renewal, for

Finally, and most importantly, the consortium provides the opportunity to innovate in curricular and academic programs that may get stuck in the bureaucracy of the individual institution.

Patricia Albjerg Graham

Five Colleges, Inc. Renewal in this context is not unlike the experience of an individual at mid-life—a successful adult who has come to question the routine of adult life. As a former junior high school teacher, I must have points, so my three points about renewal relate to recommitment, renovation, and removal.

Recommitment is here embodied in the leadership effort of the Five College presidents, who recognized they needed to take a close look at this enterprise, which was created by their predecessors. This conference is an example of it. Throughout the review, we often heard how valuable Five Colleges, Inc. is for the recruitment of faculty and students. A recommitment is necessary, however, not just to recruitment in the Five Colleges, but to the *actuality* of intellectual and student life in this valley.

When looking at renovation, the leaders must ask themselves what are the *real* benefits of Five Colleges? There are three vibrant examples of actual benefits. First, an increased cosmopolitanism, including the opportunity it presents for indi-

vidual members of minority groups to be less isolated. Sharing of services has already been mentioned and is another real benefit of the cooperation that takes place here. Finally, and most importantly, the consortium provides the opportunity to innovate in curricular and academic programs that may get stuck in the bureaucracy of the individual institution.

Now to the issue of removal. Organizations, like many of us, sometimes find that in mid-life you need to shed a few pounds. The time comes when you need to think about how to remove certain activities or programs that have been happening for years. This is a hard question, and it goes back to the issue of commitment.

When you make a strong commitment to an organization, you need a rigorous process of determining what to keep and what to get rid of. Some programs are inevitably stronger and more valuable than others. Making hard decisions about which programs to get rid of and which should be incorporated onto individual campuses is essential as the Five Colleges move into the pleasures of full adulthood.

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Q: How did you think of the inequalities of institutions during the review, and how those relationships among un-equals can work?

MR. EDWARDS:

We were astonished that it works so well. We didn't look at the issue of inequalities that closely.

MR. MASSEY:

When we asked about it, we heard that the faculty all saw the institu-

tions contributing particular strengths, so the issue of whether or not the resources were equal was not the determining factor, but rather whether there was something valuable brought to the arrangement from each institution. For example, we heard that Hampshire College, with the least financial resources, contributed a lot in the vitality and innovation of its students. And the state university brought other things, in terms of its relationship to the state. The private colleges brought their traditions, and so on.

Q: The review urged presidents to assume more responsibility for leading the consortium. Could the team elaborate on how they might proceed?

MS. GLASS:

The Board of Five Colleges, Inc. consists of the presidents of each of the colleges, the president and chancellor of the university, and the coordinator of Five Colleges, Inc. A consortium must be set up this way, so that when that group comes together at the table, everybody is equal, no matter the differences. You want to present this, as well, when you are going outside for fundraising. Some groups run into trouble when they take a "Lady Bountiful" outlook, with some perceiving they are helping out the others.

MS. GRAHAM:

The head of an institution is in a bind. The Five College commitment can't be seen as lessening commitment to the institution; it needs to be seen as an integrative part of the operation. So we come to the crucial role of the trustees. They need to communicate to the presidents that they expect them to take care of the

institution but also to maintain the viability of Five Colleges, Inc. The trustees of these institutions are an incredibly diverse group (especially if you consider the taxpayers of Massachusetts, of whom I am one). How do you build a constituency with that group?

MR. MASSEY:

It also goes back to the expectations and goals of the consortium. If the goals are primarily joint purchasing, joint use of technology, and so on, the inequalities may not matter so much. If the goals are joint appointments, and sharing students, then differences matter more. Articulating the goals and expectations upfront is very important in order to avoid a creeping consortialism that moves the group into areas that were not intended.

Q: What impact has technology had on the Five College consortium and its structure, delivery, and implementation?

MR. EDWARDS:

At the risk of being offensive, I must say I was surprised at how rudimentary those concerns were. Each campus is doing significant things. The difficulties in developing an on-

line catalog were more political than technological. There is an interesting technology group developing inside the Five College office. The extent to which it will be turned to—that there will be common programs to which technology will be a valuable partner—that seemed unclear and behind the curve.

Q: What progress is there at Bowdoin/Bates/Colby in that area?

MR. EDWARDS:

Each campus has been choosing its own software, and they are resistant to syncretism. We have found, with the driving interest of the Mellon Foundation, that the campuses can bring interest groups together around particular areas, for example, instruction in early levels of foreign languages. We are beginning to use teleconferencing. Although it is very labor-intensive and in its early stages, it seems technology, as much as anything, is driving the Maine consortium.

MR. SCOTT:

I must add that one of the outcomes of the review is that the Five College directors did move forward on the development of an on-line course catalog, which is now working well.

Q: What is the actual process for renewal at Five Colleges, for identifying new areas for cooperation, and so on?

MR. EDWARDS:

The “how-to” question is the key. It is a subtle and difficult relationship between the consortial office, that has to develop certain skills and bureaucratic capacity, and the academic deans and administrative leaders, who must determine a program’s salience at the beginning, and again at the renewal stage, and ultimately at the point of euthanasia.

Mature consortia should consider this: What is the point at which the consortium needs to be more than a collection of periodic, episodic collaborations, and needs an office and a staff and a set of procedures? Every consortium, even the European Union, struggles with the concern for sovereignty versus the establishment of an enhanced collective capacity. We saw the nature of the consortium as being desirably unstable. The minute you hit something that looks like total stability, you lose that necessary sense of excitement and criticism. Although these consortia are very easy to raise money for, at some point one has to decide whether all its programs deserve eternal life. We think there is a need for a kind of energetic instability.

Building Cultures of Cooperation: A Presidential Perspective

*Moderator: Tom Gerety
President, Amherst College*

**MARILYN CHAPIN MASSEY
PRESIDENT, PITZER COLLEGE**

I will begin our portion of the presentation by offering an overview of the Claremont College consortium. The Claremont College consortium is distinctive for two reasons: it was planned as a consortium, and the campuses are contiguous.

What they can offer their students as the “Oxford of the orange groves” is the opportunity to be part of an intimate educational experience while also having access to university-scale resources.

Marilyn Chapin Massey

At the center of the campus is the common library, from which no school is more than one or two blocks distant. The Claremont model grew out of a vision held by a former president of Pomona College, James Blaisdell, that “small is beautiful.” It was he who convinced his board to constrain the growth of Pomona and to build by adding new colleges. That vision was aided by the geographical site of Pomona, surrounded by orange groves and open land. The first of the new institutions was the Claremont Graduate School, founded in 1926. The newest campus is the Keck Graduate Institute of Applied Life Sciences, founded just three years ago.

Despite the fact that each was founded by the others, all members of the consortium are autonomous, and each has its own governing board and endowment. What they share are students, who can fully cross-register.

They also share campus security staff, and student services, among others. The cement of the consortium is the common library, the third-largest private college library in the state, to which each contributes support. The “dynamic instability” of the changing relationship among the member institutions is reflected also in the wide and growing range of joint academic programs at Claremont. Although the schools have different resources and strengths, they confront the same challenge facing all liberal arts institutions today. Their consortial mission is twofold: to prepare their students to be accomplished scholars and citizens of the world. What they can offer their students as the “Oxford of the orange groves” is the opportunity to be part of an intimate educational experience while also having access to university-scale resources.

Administrators in higher education, much like members of the faculty, are trained as academics are, with little or no instruction in collaboration. Having learned infinite individuation, the challenge for presidents whose colleges are part of a consortium is how to lead and help colleges adapt to what they must become in order to enter the integrative age. Because the members of the Claremont consortium are different institutions, it is critically important to develop a cooperative model, not only to achieve financial economies and academic excellence but also to let students see how cooperation works. Although the common good has no legal existence for the Claremont Colleges, the presidents willingly meet monthly to qualify the paradigm of individuation for the common interest.

**STEADMAN UPHAM
PRESIDENT, CLAREMONT GRADUATE UNIVERSITY**

The Graduate University is the largest of the Claremont institutions, numbering over 2,000 students, 55 different

degree programs in 22 academic fields, and unique in the United States. To convey what it is like to manage a graduate school within this consortium, it's helpful to invoke the founding vision, the "Blaisdell Dream." The genius of President Blaisdell's dream was the idea of founding new institutions. Today, the expense associated with that enterprise makes it nearly prohibitive. Yet the founding of new institutions is what has always energized the Claremont Colleges. Because Claremont University Center was founded simultaneously with Claremont Graduate School, the latter emerged full-blown from Pomona. This made possible rapid growth.

But, on the negative side, it created a small graduate faculty and fed the perception of graduate education as another kind of central service provided by the consortium. As a consequence, since its inception the graduate school has grown less rapidly, offering only selective excellence in terms of its programs: relatively strong in the social sciences and humanities, but with fewer programs in the sciences.

The challenge today is how the University can work within the consortium to change the perception of graduate education as a separate, autonomous entity. As a first step, the decision has been made to separate Claremont Graduate University from Claremont University Center (CUC). Next year a new corporation will be formed to operate CUC. But other issues remain. With a core faculty of just 90, the University has too few faculty to operate the existing number of programs and must rely on the other institutions. Yet no formal mechanism exists to monitor

faculty exchange. And, as all the institutions have grown and expanded, deans find it more and more difficult to grant released time. The University has therefore launched a \$20-million campaign to fund faculty exchange for graduate education. It is also working within the consortium to create more opportunities for undergraduates to participate in advanced-level study at the graduate school and to explore 4-1 cooperative programs with the colleges.

NANCY Y. BEKAVAC
PRESIDENT, SCRIPPS COLLEGE

Scripps is the only women's college in the consortium today. Coordination of the curriculum across the campuses is managed by the deans, and through on-campus coordinating bodies. The development of the Claremont University Center has brought about good changes by highlighting the differences among our institutions as well as areas of common interest.

What Scripps brings to the consortium is first of all a focus on women and a certain style: a beautiful campus, one that is house-proud and grounds-proud. Why should a women's college be this way? Scripps is a model for its students of what a perfect place should be. It is a place where women are taken seriously, a place with an exciting environment, yet one heavily invested in tranquility and beauty. Students hold that up as a standard for later life. Reflective of those values, a walled garden is the heart of the campus.

Scripps shares a set of concerns common to other institutions for women: health services and mental health services are important

because higher percentages of women nationwide make use of these services; intercollegiate life, because Scripps is a single-sex institution. Scripps is unique in having a humanities core curriculum. Many Scripps students take their majors off-campus although that is decreasing. We are also the most nearly interdependent – that is, we are in a perfect balance with

Yet, what Scripps does could not be done in a different setting — that is, without being surrounded by the other Claremont Colleges. In fact, Scripps was founded as an example of how to be part of a consortium.

Nancy Y. Bekavac

respect to the number of students going out and coming in.

What Scripps strives to be for the consortium is much like what the U.S. women's soccer team means for women. A wonderful moment for women, no matter who they are. And that's what Scripps wants to be for everyone in the Claremont Colleges: the place where other students in the colleges feel they can come and a place they look to. Yet, what Scripps does could not be done in a different setting — that is, without being surrounded by the other Claremont Colleges. In fact,

Scripps was founded as an example of how to be part of a consortium. We contribute a great deal and get even more in return. All of our students have a family base at one campus but also feel themselves part of the others.

HENRY E. RIGGS
PRESIDENT, KECK GRADUATE INSTITUTE
OF APPLIED LIFE SCIENCES

I will be brief to enable us to hear from our Five College colleagues on the other side of the table. Just a few key facts about Keck: Founded in 1997, Keck will welcome its first class of students in the summer of 2000. We have already hired five faculty members and are now in the recruiting mode. Our primary degree is a professional master's degree of applied life science, which is an intersection of engineering and biology/chemistry (life sciences). We carry the proud name of Keck because the foundation provided a founding grant of \$50 million. We

We have had little in the way of graduate science or technology in the consortium, so for us it made sense to do that in a new college.

Henry E. Riggs

are now trying to raise an additional \$50 to \$60 million. Founding a college is an expensive proposition. I have been associated with the Claremont Colleges for many years, having served for nine years as president of Harvey Mudd College

before stepping down to take on this interesting challenge. In Claremont, when we think of doing something substantially new, we think about doing that within a new college. We have had little in the way of graduate science or technology in the consortium, so for us it made sense to do that in a new college. We think we know something about founding new colleges. We have done that four times since World War II, although 34 years intervened between the establishment of Pitzer and Keck. Based upon on my experience of the past three years, I think I know why.

One might say there is no easier place in the country than the Claremont Colleges to start a new college. The infrastructure is already in place; there is an open system of cross-registration and the ready assistance of the other schools to depend on. Keck benefited greatly from the assistance of the Graduate University, which made it possible for us to receive accreditation in a relatively short period of time. Normally it takes six years to be accredited. A new institution re-energizes the Claremont consortium. Keck is stirring things up both negatively and positively. Starting something new in a higher education environment is always both. There are real advantages to starting with a clean sheet of paper and I would urge you to think about that. In time, the Claremonts expect to add more institutions. The presidents discuss that a lot.

TOM GERETY

We will want to return to some of the issues you raise during later discussion. Now I will invite those at the other end of the table, the Five

Those of us here representing the three oldest of the colleges, and the largest of our institutions, feel that Hampshire plays a special role in the Five College consortium.

Tom Gerety

Colleges, to say a few words. Let me begin by saying that no doubt those of us here representing the three oldest of the colleges, and the largest of our institutions, feel that Hampshire plays a special role in the Five College consortium. Perhaps most remarkable is that the president of our youngest institution is now our most senior member: Greg Prince. It might be argued that Hampshire needs the consortium the most. But in my experience of the consortium in six years, and I think I can speak for all of us in saying this, Greg remains the most generous and fertile in ideas.

Greg, what is your reaction to what the Claremonts had to tell us about the challenges for consortia? And, in the realm of the Five College consortium, would you say the Hampshire College culture is more eager for cooperation than the others? If so, is that in part a function of Hampshire's newness being part of its identity?

GREGORY S. PRINCE, JR.
PRESIDENT, HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE

Whenever I meet alums of the other schools, I like to remind them that

Hampshire exists to be their most significant accomplishment. I will use that to lead into what I want to say about some of the issues our colleagues have raised. The most probing and profound issue for us all is that of building new institutions. This is particularly true in an age when this is not an accepted pastime. Few foundations will support it. The Claremont Colleges

... it is ironic that in some respects the four institutions that founded Hampshire did so in order to create a catalyst for change among themselves.

Gregory S. Prince, Jr.

are remarkable as institutions that exist to spawn new institutions in a society in which individualism is the active force at work. What our Claremont colleagues have brought out nicely is the critical question of what it means when in order to bring about change you have to found a new institution. And it is ironic that in some respects the four institutions that founded Hampshire did so in order to create a catalyst for change among themselves. When we at Hampshire look at ourselves we say we were created to help lead change; yet what will that mean for us 50 years from now? If we want to sustain change, will we have to found yet another institution? That is the fundamental national and cultural issue before us.

The second critical issue is that when the leadership changes

consortiums change. This conference is a direct outcome of rapid turnover in leadership among the Five Colleges after years of relative stability. The fact that we had three new presidents in just 15 months was a prime factor in moving us to ask ourselves some basic questions about the consortium and rethinking what we wanted to do with it. The two issues of building new institutions and leadership are, I think, related. New leadership brings new energy, new examination into the relationship, but it also raises profound questions about our purposes within ourselves and for the society at large. Do we really become different because we have new presidents? And is our mission different?

As for Hampshire's identity within the Five College consortium: The fact that Hampshire was conceived to be different makes the other institutions value our students. It is reassuring to hear faculty talk about how they value the diversity of the institutions and having Hampshire students and others in their classes. Conversely, when students come to Hampshire from the other campuses, they bring diversity to us, different perspectives. In courses I've taught, 25 percent of the students were from the other schools. Students bond with one another in taking classes together and in confronting different perspectives.

JOANNE V. CREIGHTON

How we plan together in a purposeful way is of great interest to me. I am intrigued that the Claremonts seem to plan by spawning new institutions. This strikes me as tremendously bold, though we did it once ourselves many years ago. The

... what has come out of the review is confirmation of the importance of the consortium to the five institutions as a valuable resource and extraordinary legacy.

Joanne V. Creighton

review team has identified three key issues for the Five Colleges to address: re-commit; renovate; and renew. Presidents are torn in so many different directions with respect to managing their own institutions. As a consequence, we often lack the focus and energy to direct towards the consortium. Yet what has come out of the review is confirmation of the importance of the consortium to the five institutions as a valuable resource and extraordinary legacy. Our responsibility now is to look critically at what we do and plan carefully for what we do in the future. So I am particularly interested to hear from our colleagues at the Claremont Colleges about how in a voluntary affiliation we make that relationship matter and make it a high priority for our institutions in our planning for the future as well as in our day-to-day work.

RESPONSE FROM THE CLAREMONT PRESIDENTS:

Monthly meetings are valuable and we have a code of honor about attendance in order not to hold up business. One current project suggests

our commitment to common action: we are going to adopt common software. In fact, we have been very successful at bringing together our registration and student services staff to think about this. It has created great energy across our campuses to think about how to serve students in new ways. And this will bring us together in new ways.

Also, now that we are separating the Claremont Graduate School from CUC, we are rethinking our common goals. The easiest to tackle are within the administrative infrastructure. There is unanimity within the presidents' council to eliminate unnecessary redundancy in our administrative systems in order to continue differentiating ourselves academically. All the other challenges can be met if this goal remains paramount.

higher education in society. While the quotidian issues of technology and others must be addressed, these are the not, I think, either the most important or interesting to talk about. It was surprising to me that the review did not raise the matter of how the Five College consortium might take on questions of national magnitude in order to define nationally some solutions.

There are common concerns. For example, each institution worries about the state of the professorate with respect to minorities. Each competes for appointments of minority scholars to its faculty. And each competes to attract more minority students. Yet we do virtually nothing together. At a recent visit to a foundation in New York, we were criticized for not taking on the issue of how to educate minorities for the future.

Ms. MASSEY:

At the Claremonts, we have joint academic programs in Chicano and African American Studies, and now an Asian American Studies Program. We also have joint appointments in these areas. Because we have an intense relationship, we talk hard among ourselves about these matters. Our points of view may differ, but the discussion takes place, at all levels. What also urges us on to joint action is the fact that we are perceived by others as a "whole."

DAVID K. SCOTT
CHANCELLOR, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST
PRESIDENT, FIVE COLLEGES, INCORPORATED

By virtue of his position, the chancellor belongs to three "clubs": that of the New England land-grant institutions; the five-campus Massachusetts University System; and the Five Colleges consortium. The latter is "the best club in town." A comparison is instructive. The land-grants are a set of independent institutions geographically separated that take on national issues of policy. Therefore they are influential in affecting educational policy for land-grants nationwide.

The University system consists of five different campuses and is governed by a central superstructure whose actions are top-down and prescriptive; decisions are therefore more quickly implemented. Its focus is on matters of economy and efficiency.

The Five College consortium is a group of different types of institutions in geographic proximity whose focus is enrichment and enhancement of excellence, not policy. The movement in this case is consensually based, and comes

I'm looking for a way to imagine consortia helping to shape the national debate about the role of higher education in society.

Ruth Simmons

RUTH SIMMONS
PRESIDENT, SMITH COLLEGE

To what extent are the Claremont Colleges able to get beyond the more quotidian concerns to confront matters of broader consequence to California and the nation? I would also welcome your guidance on the degree to which you think your association with each other helps lend a stronger voice to some of these concerns.

I'm looking for a way to imagine consortia helping to shape the national debate about the role of

Ms. BEKAVAC:

The Claremont presidents discuss issues of broad social significance at our monthly meetings because they affect all of us. We also consult with one another on a more daily basis. But it's not just the presidents who meet and consult. Our admission folks travel together and share ideas, for example. We also have a number of joint programs that enable us to address together some of these issues—we do outreach to minority communities together, we do tutoring together.

The Five Colleges, I believe, have an opportunity now to design the model curriculum for the era of integrative knowledge, perhaps employing something of a more prescriptive approach.

David K. Scott

from the bottom-up. The question is, however, how adequate is the latter model for what lies ahead? To what extent are the Claremont Colleges more prescriptive than the Five College model?

Ms. MASSEY:

The presidents' impending decision to adopt common software constitutes an exception. Rarely are decisions taken top-down. Certainly in academic matters this would be unacceptable, and even in administrative matters it is rare.

Mr. SCOTT:

I find an irony in the fact that Hampshire College was created by the other four institutions: Did this represent an unwillingness on their part to bring about change on their own campuses? It seems to me not unlike the founding of land-grant institutions like the University of Massachusetts. Convinced that private colleges such as Harvard would not change to accommodate the coming industrial revolution, the federal government in 1863 created a land-grant institution in every state to meld liberal arts with specialized professional education. The Five Colleges, I believe, have an opportunity now to design the model curriculum for the era of integrative knowledge, perhaps employing something of a more prescriptive approach.

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Q: Can you comment on the relationships of member institutions to one another and on their willingness to give their allegiance to a common enterprise?

Ms. BEKAVAC:

The Claremont Colleges spend much time in differentiating ourselves from one another. At the early stages of forming a consortium, it's important to understand your own culture and development before you can make decisions about the amount of energy you are willing to commit to a consortial relationship. That decision must be made by each president, who must listen to his/her own campus, because the determinants vary for each institution. For the Claremont Colleges, the one big issue was what the consortium meant for each of us. And that involved a strategic decision.

Q: Do the Five Colleges want to move closer to a model in which member institutions might be free to pull out?

Mr. GERETY:

The Five Colleges would not want to pull out, that is a given.

Mr. PRINCE:

A constitutional exercise of this kind would divert energies that need to go elsewhere. The Five Colleges have

accomplished a lot in areas of administrative and academic cooperation. The question before them now is what is to be their governing purpose in the future. This might be the right moment for taking on one or two national issues, as Ms. Simmons has suggested.

Ms. SIMMONS:

The consortial relationship is important for each of us. My board of trustees gave me a charge to carry out in the interests of Smith College. This involved a host of things to do for Smith. Presidents have an enormous fundraising role, they must work to

The collegial relationship within the consortium informs me, challenges me, challenges us all to do things differently. And that is valuable in and of itself.

Ruth Simmons

make their institutions prominent more than ever before, and they must also work to ensure that their students and faculty are thriving. If the consortium had not come as yet another obligation, I might not have found time for it. The collegial relationship within the consortium informs me, challenges me, challenges us all to do things differently. And that is valuable in and of itself.

Q: How do presidents resolve matters of allegiance when an institution belongs to more than one consortium?

MR. SCOTT:

Geographic proximity in part shapes allegiances. Once technology becomes part of everyday life, this might change, but although mandated to be closer to the land-grants and the five-campus system of the University of Massachusetts, the University's

Amherst campus regards itself as closer to its neighboring colleges.

Some instructive comparisons can be found between the five-campus University system and the Five College consortium with respect to the matter of allegiances. In the former, the governance is all from

above with an active force to make them all the same. In the latter, governance comes from below, and they are encouraged to remain different but complementary institutions. Here the great strength of the relationship lies in the lack of any desire to create a monolith.

*Here the great strength
of the relationship lies in
the lack of any desire to
create a monolith.*

David K. Scott

Keynote Address: Collective Thinking and Collective Learning

*Adele Simmons, Vice Chair, Chicago Metropolis 2020
Former President, The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation*

I want to try to talk about three things: collaboration in the classroom, collaboration at the faculty level, and what globalization means for collaboration. During the conversations this morning about the culture of collaboration, I thought a lot about the time that the Rockefeller Foundation summoned me—and of course one went when one was summoned—to participate in a seminar on the transmission of values.

As I was leaving my house that morning in Amherst, I went to say good-bye to two 2-year-olds, each pulling at opposite ends of a teddy bear ferociously, each saying to the other: “Share.” We transmitted the language, but we hadn’t gotten the behavior right. It reminded me of something I learned when I was at Princeton. I said then to a colleague, “A lot of faculty members aren’t too wild about coeducation.” This very wise person said, “Focus on their behavior and not what they think.” And so I began to find ways to reinforce collaborative behavior—the behavior I hoped to encourage in every job I’ve had.

As I contemplate collaborative thinking and collaborative learning, I’ve come to believe that the culture of collaboration should be a part of every institution and system. The place to start, I think, is the classroom. We do a great job with collaborative learning in kindergarten through third grade, and then something happens. Third-graders read a story, or a story is read to them, and then the teacher sends a group of them off to figure out how to act out the story. They set up a problem and organize around a table for collective and collaborative problem solving. All that stops after third grade and, usually, the older students get the more hierarchical and authoritarian education becomes.

There are exceptions. I think of a University of Massachusetts professor who was interested in issues of democracy and set up some real incentives. First he assigned his

class an enormously complicated topic about which to write. Then he said, “If you write a paper alone you get four pages; if there are three of you, you get ten pages.” And guess what? There was no way in which you could talk about the subject and not get ten pages. That’s how he began to encourage collaboration.

Last summer when I was in Israel, everyone I met was profoundly concerned about democracy. Institutes to teach democratic behavior are springing up all over. However, they tend to tell what democracy is in a very

I also see at the Five College level some genuine collaborative learning going on. I start at the classroom because I think if you can get it right at the classroom level, and your undergraduates get it right, it’ll be easier for them to collaborate when they become college presidents.

Adele Simmons

authoritarian way. When I went into some science classrooms, I saw democracy in action. Students were asking interesting questions about the experiment they were doing: “What would happen if we add this?” The classes reflected a real interest in engendering collaborative, questioning learning. All ideas were welcome and no one was put down.

I also see at the Five College level some genuine collaborative learning going on. I start at the classroom because I think if you can get it right at the classroom level, and

your undergraduates get it right, it'll be easier for them to collaborate when they become college presidents. I also believe that the interaction between the student and faculty is at the heart of teaching and learning. Today you're going to talk a lot about technology and you should. But technology needs to be seen as a way of expanding and building on that very central interaction between a faculty member and his or her students. I suspect that in the Valley, the Hampshire classrooms are still more collaborative than those at the other institutions, and that a part of Hampshire's role is to bring greater diversity in teaching style to the Five College consortium.

Technology, I think, has increased the ways of organizing collaborative learning. The faculty member who is in e-mail contact with his or her students is not exceptional. But the best faculty use e-mail to extend their classroom and extend their teaching. A student sends in an e-mail question: "I don't really agree with what you said this morning Professor X, could you elaborate?" The professor answers, and that exchange is then shared with the entire class, and the class gets to comment on it. That conversation may take a 24-hour lifetime before another one begins, but the classroom is extended by technology.

I'm sure a lot of you have your own wonderful examples of how technology enhances student collaboration, but there are a couple that have struck me. At Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in Troy, New York, Jack Wilson uses an interactive studio format to teach introductory science and math. He has groups of 50 to 60 students attend lectures that include

a laboratory-session and computer-equipped classes. Teams of students sit together at computer workstations that feature full-motion video, audio, text, color photographs, graphs, and spreadsheets. Here they carry out science experiments aided by instructional software that asks questions and analyzes their responses.

Other software systems are equally wonderful. For example, the collaborative work at Indiana University provides students with group decision software and hardware. The software allows students to use computers to exchange ideas, and consolidate and refine those ideas and give them priorities, and then engage in group writing. The teacher is very much a part of that experience, and is interacting with them both personally and electronically, but the computer is really providing new ways in which students themselves can collaborate in the classroom.

Beyond students, I think the area for real exploration around collaborative thinking and collaborative learning is what happens among faculty. One really important aspect of this must always be place-based. Then you can extend beyond the place—beyond your own consortium, beyond your own universities—to much broader connections within this country and overseas. But you have to have a critical mass of intellectuals in one place over coffee. I think that's what mattered to William Julius Wilson when he decided to leave the University of Chicago where he loved living, to be at Harvard, where he would have day-to-day interactions with a group of colleagues. It mattered to another person who was offered a

tenured professorship at Harvard, but the people he needed to interact with to do his work were in Chicago. So he stayed. You can't underestimate, I think, or overlook the fact that these interactions matter. Technology provides a base for moving beyond them.

Knowledge is no longer confined to disciplines. And deans who want to put their institutions on the frontier of knowledge can no longer prescribe interdisciplinary interactions. The response to "Do you encourage interdisciplinary work on your campus?" can no longer be, "Yes, we have an environmental studies program," or "Yes, students can do history and literature." Rather, the answer needs to be much more about a process that encourages interactions that may be unlikely, and the ones that you could never have imagined in the first place.

I always have a lot of fun at MacArthur Fellows' reunions. At those reunions I would often say, "So and so, and so and so really should talk." But the most exciting conversations were among the people I never could have predicted. Who would have predicted that Jonathan Spence, a very distinguished historian of China, would find a true soul mate in Jack Horner, who is one of the leading paleontologists working on dinosaurs? I would not have put them next to one another at a dinner table if I were planning seating to lead to positive interaction. Yet they spent two days together, locked in conversation. We have to provide space for these unlikely interactions because that's where the real intellectual energy and discoveries will be.

I think of two examples. At Hampshire, a faculty member who is a

biologist interested in animal behavior and a cognitive psychologist discovered in the course of lunch conversation that the biologist was watching a bunch of his puppies learn to bark and the cognitive psychologist was trying to understand language acquisition among kids. They got up from the lunch table, walked out and went to look at the dogs. Out of that came a long-time research association. No one could have planned it and yet they had the space to pursue it.

The MacArthur Foundation sets up intellectual networks. One of them was among a group of economists. The group included some anthropologists. I had dinner with one of the economists last night and he said, "One of the most interesting

happened in that field before. That came about because the economists and the anthropologists were talking together.

The MacArthur Foundation was very interested in paradigm shifts in human development and in economics. We began with place-based interventions, that is, supporting teams of faculty members on two or three campuses. But that didn't work very well and they found that the best way to do this particular kind of intervention—which had nothing to do with institution building, and a lot to do with how we push some frontier of knowledge—was to support networks of faculty all over the country brought together in a two-year selection process.

als and clusters of individuals, but also to keep in mind the need for institution building. That again comes back to your consortia and the ways in which they provide the basis for institution building in a variety of fields.

You all must have a huge list of intellectual areas that you think need greater attention. I've been working a lot on the area of globalization. The urgency for students in this country to actively engage the global agenda is clear. There are opportunities you can help make happen. Princeton now has a group of people throughout the world who advise Juniors on their required Junior paper. So what we all thought was going to be a requirement that would bind undergraduates to Princeton during a year in which most people go overseas, they've now turned into an opportunity by having a network of advisors at universities. Students can go to those universities, work with an advisor in that network, write their Junior paper and be in touch with their faculty members back at Princeton. It's a different kind of collaboration, but on closer examination it points out the ways interactions work.

Globalization has been accelerated by new technologies and everything is now less fixed. Area studies, which had a very clear sense of what was "here" and what was "there," what was ours and what was somebody else's to study, no longer can remain so confined. Events that are geographically distant may be culturally or economically linked. And yet place matters. Some scholarship really needs to be rooted in "place," where there are histories that matter and

Perhaps the United Nations offers an analogy, as one thinks about the complex interactions, yet with a single base of management, sometimes successful, sometimes not quite.

Adele Simmons

things is that I think we may be changing anthropology as much as the anthropologists are changing us." He had just come from a meeting where 12 anthropologists working in 12 totally far-flung parts of the world had been conducting the same experiment in cultures that had 300 people, cultures that had 1,000 people, one, probably the largest, with 10,000 people. The fact that you had anthropologists—think about this—the people who observe and never intervene, conducting experiments across the globe within one year has never

The work on aging that many of you are familiar with emerged from this approach. Some very exciting work on inequality is also now underway. At the same time, there were some areas where the institutions needed to be strengthened, particularly around international relations. So we funded consortia at the University of Wisconsin, the University of Minnesota and Stanford to look at issues of global governance. The funding was not to a random collection of individuals wherever they might be, but to the institutions. One needs to think about individu-

cultures that matter. If you miss the fact, you miss a lot of what's going on. So on one hand, we need to support work that is very place-based, and on the other hand you have to be sure that it doesn't get confined, and that you have people who are focusing on the far bigger, broader, global connections.

One area that's connected with global needs and technology is the teaching of language. As you know, language learning and training in this country is horrendous. I don't see it being properly addressed in the very early years of school, where I think it should be. Yet, a lot of questions and a lot of work on language teaching have gone on recently. There's an interesting experiment, I understand, in the planning or underway, at the Five Colleges, which deals with the least commonly taught languages. Using Hindi or Urdu as a pilot, the Five Colleges are proposing to combine elements of their own language self-instruction programs with classroom instruction through video conferencing. I think the use of video conferencing is much underestimated, and a lot of us who used it five to ten years ago may mistakenly think it is still where it used to be.

The idea is to have a master video conferencing center that would be on one campus, and a live Five College instructor skilled in the language teaching the class and also meeting individually with each student for an hour a week. This permits the students to stay on their campuses, and deals with the fact that you may have only one person on each campus interested in some of these languages. I thought my roommate's

boyfriend who was fluent in Serbo-Croatian after a lot of study was learning something pretty useless. Well, as it turned out, knowing Serbo-Croatian was pretty important if you have been working in the State Department in the last decade.

There are many instances in which thinking about connecting students globally has brought different skills and different resources into play. One wonderful place in Chicago is the Illinois Institute of Technology, where they have a very strong technology base and a lot of interesting legal work. The technology people and their legal colleagues at Chicago Kent law school began to talk to each other, which is quite remarkable. When they did, they began to dream up some pretty interesting things. For example, in Bosnia, a multi-disciplinary team of faculty and students from Chicago Kent designed and installed an Internet server at the international press club in Banja Luka. This enabled the media to publish uncensored articles. Students are now working on a new legal resources website based in Sarajevo to post Bosnian constitutional and statutory documents, court opinions and other legal information. A team at IIT is collecting a database of Macedonian laws, court decisions, and legal texts that will be enormously useful for people working in that country. And in Kosovo another team from IIT used the Internet to help refugees with the legal information they needed to return to their homes. Clearly, if you want to get students engaged, this kind of collaboration provides an extraordinary opportunity.

What I've talked about today is a very complex web of interactions based on your individual institutions and your consortia, but extending beyond those boundaries. Perhaps the United Nations offers an analogy, as one thinks about the complex interactions, yet with a single base of management, sometimes successful, sometimes not quite. The management requires structure, as I said, but also requires the space for people to explore and be creative on their own.

You'll be discussing technology next, in greater depth. I'm not an expert in the field, and I only have one concern, which is that sometimes people think about technology as the solution for every problem. I think you really need to think about what you want to accomplish, and then ask how technology might help accomplish that. Sometimes conversations start with the technology rather than the problem and then you're solving another problem or using a tool that doesn't work for the particular problem.

You have a challenge and an opportunity. You have a chance to manage, I think, complex interactions in a wonderfully exciting and new technological environment. The challenge to focus on is what you're really about, which is education—teaching and learning—and providing space for new things to happen in the classroom. It's important to realize that collaboration is a good thing wherever you are, whether the U.S. Senate or the White House, and that you can model it through the way you manage your own consortia. Good luck and thank you very much.

Redefining the Learning Community

*Moderator: Donal O'Shea, Dean of Faculty and Professor of Mathematics,
Mount Holyoke College*

JOHN C. BURKHARDT

PROGRAM DIRECTOR FOR LEADERSHIP AND HIGHER EDUCATION,
W.K. KELLOGG FOUNDATION

The Kellogg Foundation is committed to building a world in which individuals possess a strong sense of self-worth and are welcomed to a wide range of opportunities, but also a sense of responsibility to themselves, their families, and their communities. American society, and the

The Kellogg Foundation believes that higher education consortia are well-positioned to lead the institutional renewal it anticipates within higher education and other areas of society over the next 25 years.

John C. Burkhardt

societies of Latin America and South Africa—all areas where the Foundation is especially active—have not fully achieved this vision. Are contemporary institutions, especially institutions of higher education, well-constituted to help make this ideal a reality?

To help build societies of the sort we envision, institutions need to reinvent themselves. In particular, they need to lead in new ways: recognizing the value of interdependence, instead of struggling single-mindedly for autonomy; working with others to create the future, rather than seeking to arbitrate it; helping people (in cooperation with cultural and religious institutions) make new meanings for themselves, rather than seeking only to generate and transfer new information; reorganizing themselves along new lines, rather than those dictated by

old divisions, thereby creating possibilities for rich new partnerships with institutions throughout society.

Some of the possibilities created by these new approaches to institutional organization and leadership in higher education are suggested by the successes of academic consortia. But we need to find ways to measure concretely the real impacts of consortial organization on students and how they learn, on professors, and on communities. The Kellogg Foundation is especially interested in such measures as it seeks to pursue the work of transforming higher education elsewhere in the world.

Thinking carefully about how the organizational structures within which we pursue knowledge shape the kinds of knowledge we can achieve is crucial: If we work in divided ways, we may divide wisdom also. Today, knowledge of identity is an especially important kind of knowledge. It is important globally, given the crucial importance of identity concerns across the globe in a time of dramatic change. But it is also important to traditional age students, the bulk of the students we now serve. We must structure learning communities in ways that insure students are able to come to understand the true complexity and multiplicity of identity. We each possess multiple identities, and learning communities that allow us to experience this multiplicity—that model this multiplicity in the way many consortia do, by connecting different kinds of institutions and people in engaged learning communities—can offer a richer understanding of identity than those that don't.

The way organizational frameworks structure how we understand identity—and knowledge—is illustrated by the remarkable influence of the Carnegie model for classifying institutions of higher education. Promulgated 30 years ago, the Carnegie model shaped first the perception of institutions of higher education, then the institutions themselves, moving from a descriptive to a prescriptive role, essentially defining the nature, goals, and mechanisms of higher education in the United States. The

Kellogg Foundation is interested in exploring an alternative classification system for contemporary colleges and universities, based not on the research they do, but on their service to society and their relations to communities. An alternative model such as this, derived from observations of how higher education is being conducted today, could focus attention on the important issue of how to define education for the future.

The Kellogg Foundation believes higher education consortia are well-positioned to lead the institutional renewal it anticipates within higher education and other areas of society over the next 25 years. Consortia offer access to multiple perspectives, multiple communities of engagement, and multiple identities—all of which are vital to new forms of institutional leadership. And they offer new narratives—and new metaphors—for rethinking organization itself.

JORGE KLOR DE ALVA
PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF PHOENIX

Three sets of statistics will set in context the role the University of Phoenix is playing in redefining learning communities.

- In 1950 20 percent of U.S. workers were skilled, and 60 percent unskilled; by 2000, projections indicate that 65 percent of U.S. workers will be skilled, and only 15 percent unskilled (the percentage of the workforce classified as “professional” has remained unchanged over the last 60 years).
- 13 million people change employment in the U.S. every month; and 50 million (40 percent of the workforce) change employment each year.

- Between 1980 and 1999 the 10 largest U.S. companies (in terms of market capitalization) shifted from devoting the bulk of their capital investment from production of material goods to production of services.

And while average industry-wide graduation rates for on-line education are three to five percent, at the University of Phoenix the graduation rate is 65 percent—better than at most public institutions nationwide.

Jorge Klor de Alva

The mission of the University of Phoenix is to educate working adult learners—all its students must be 23 years or older, and employed. This large community, whose needs are illustrated by the statistics just cited, is largely underserved by traditional colleges and universities.

Those being served by the University—over 67,000 students taking courses in 15 states (most on-site, but some on-line)—are seeking to complete their educations while working full-time, without paying the extra costs associated with maintaining physical plant and the other features of traditional colleges and universities; they want a curriculum and faculty relevant to their professional needs; they want

education at convenient times and places; and they demand a high level of customer service. The University meets these demands by opening new learning sites as needed, so students need never commute more than 30 minutes. All courses are offered in the early evenings and on weekends. Classes are small: the average site-based class size is 14 students, while on-line courses are even smaller. Faculty have Ph.D.s or master’s degrees, and work full-time in the fields in which they teach (on average, most have five years’ experience in their present workplace in their teaching fields and more than 16 years’ total experience in those fields). They are carefully screened and trained; and their performance is assessed both after each course, and more formally every year. (Despite this constant review, faculty turnover is very low.)

All curricula are outcome-oriented and centrally developed under the direction of full-time master faculty. The resulting syllabi, very detailed and tightly structured, are then used by teaching faculty at all sites throughout the system. This guarantees uniformly high standards, delivering education useful to the students. Much of the value of this education is owed to the University’s commitment to collaborative learning within study groups. Faculty serve as facilitators of this learning, and do not lecture. All courses must include a collaborative project. The focus in class remains always on building communication and team-working skills that are useful in the workplace. Class attendance is mandatory; more than one absence will cause the student to be dropped from the course.

Students served by the University can be usefully considered as belonging in two groups: 90 percent take courses at various sites; 10 percent take courses on-line. Site-based students have an average household income of \$55,000, and are in their mid-30s, with full-time work experience averaging 13 years. This group includes slightly fewer men than women. Approximately 30 percent are members of racial or ethnic minorities. Most plan graduate work. Over 45 percent hold managerial or supervisory positions, and 55 percent are receiving some tuition reimbursement from their employers. On-line students have even higher household incomes (\$76,000) and more work experience. Seventy-five percent receive tuition reimbursement from employers. Over 76 percent in this group are planning graduate education. This group includes many more men than women. A much smaller portion of this group are members of racial and ethnic minorities.

The University's experience of distance learning may be of special interest. While only 10 percent of the University's students currently are taking courses on-line, our on-line program is growing even faster than our site-based program. The University's internal research demonstrates clearly that the University's on-line students learn even better than those learning on-site. Ninety-seven percent of students complete their courses, and the student retention rate is 75 percent after six months. And while average industry-wide graduation rates for on-line education are three to five percent, at the University of Phoenix the graduation rate is 65 percent—better than at most public institu-

tions nationwide. This success is due to the stringent discipline imposed in these courses—a cross between the training of Jesuits and the Marines. For example, students failing to log-on for course-related interactions five out of every seven days are administratively dropped from their courses. Institutional research and constant assessment are crucial to maintaining quality control in education, especially within a national institution like the University of Phoenix. This emphasis accounts for much of our success. It also explains why the University is becoming the model for a new kind of accreditation that measures “outputs,” not “inputs”—the true “value added” by education.

ALLAN WATSON
PRESIDENT, ALLIANCE FOR HIGHER
EDUCATION, TEXAS

While traditional site-based education—bringing together students and professors for face-to-face lectures and discussion at a residential campus—may offer an excellent way to learn, it is simply too expensive or too inconvenient for everyone who wants and needs to learn. The Alliance for Higher Education works to bring education and training to those people. A consortium composed of 34 academic institutions in Texas (with 47 campuses) and roughly 30 corporate members, including several major hospitals, the Alliance operates one of the nation's oldest distance education networks. The Alliance began 35 years ago as a pioneer in distance learning, when Cecil Green of Texas Instruments established it so that young engineers he had recruited from MIT and Stanford could pursue graduate training in electrical engineering

while working for him in Dallas. While facilitating some inter-institutional collaborations in language instruction—and one course in ethics—the Alliance at first focused its efforts on training engineers in the Dallas/Fort Worth area. Since then it has vastly expanded its activities. It now offers 25 degrees and hundreds of non-credit courses all over the state. A major challenge faced by the

The education offered by traditional residential liberal arts colleges is invaluable, and is unlikely to be displaced by distance learning.

Allan Watson

Alliance has been keeping current with new technology—and raising the funds to pay for it. At the beginning, the Alliance delivered instruction through one-way video, two-way “talk-back” audio, and a courier that physically transported hardcopy materials between professors and students. It now delivers courses in real time and interactively via a fiberoptic network. We are poised to offer courses by streaming video, permitting students access to “stored” audio-video course materials interactively at all times of the day, at home or the workplace or even on the road.

The Alliance's future will involve even closer interaction between corporate and academic partners, including direct instruction by

people from the corporate world, and shared applied research. These interactions will be facilitated by dramatic increases in functionality made possible by Internet 2, including real-time interactive transmission of three-dimensional images, permitting, for example, persons at distant sites to cooperate in the manipulation and inspection of virtual objects. The education offered by traditional residential liberal arts colleges is

However, even the best residential institutions will have recourse to new distance learning technologies, if only to bring ancillary materials to traditional classrooms.

Allan Watson

invaluable, and is unlikely to be displaced by distance learning. However, even the best residential institutions will have recourse to new distance learning technologies, if only to bring ancillary materials to traditional classrooms. Global connections between learning communities at different sites are one exciting possibility. Such institutions will probably welcome the opportunity to connect dispersed alumni more closely to one another and to the vibrant lives of their alma maters through “virtual alumni colleges.”

Consortial relationships are always fragile and always require careful attention. In periods of financial

pressure—and declining enrollments—the spirit of competition may lead consortial partners to neglect these relations. Such neglect would be a mistake. There are many ways cooperation can serve all partners. For example, the five institutions associated through Five Colleges, Inc., building on their present unique collaboration—and the opportunities afforded by new technologies—could create a “virtual university,” one that would showcase the “steeple of excellence” at each of the institutions.

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES FROM THE AUDIENCE

Q: How is affective learning being measured at the University of Phoenix, particularly in distance learning courses?

MR. KLOR DE ALVA:

The University has realized the importance of affective skills to employers, and has structured curricula accordingly, so that fully half of course goals relate to building affective skills. It is important to keep in mind, though, that the University’s studies focus on older students and their success acquiring affective skills related to their roles as professionals, not younger students of the sort attending residential liberal arts college, who are just entering adulthood and acquiring a different set of affective skills.

Q: Is the University of Phoenix associated with any consortia?

MR. KLOR DE ALVA:

The University is very interested in finding ways, through mutually beneficial partnerships and strategic alliances, of sharing its expertise regarding how to address the needs of

older students. Such partnerships would be particularly interesting to the University now that it is moving into the global arena in association with Apollo International. “Win-win” arrangements should be possible in which institutions share their expertise about particular areas—for example, in exchange for participation by their students in programs administered by the University of Phoenix.

Q: Could Mr. Burkhardt elaborate on his statement that colleges and universities should begin acting less as transmitters of information, and more as co-creators of meaning, and on his comment that consortia are well-suited to help lead this transformation?

MR. BURKHARDT:

The ability of new technology to gather and convey vast quantities of information quickly is decreasing the importance of information-based institutions, while highlighting the importance of institutions that can help people make meaning out of the information available. Information and meaning are very different things, as revealed by the many different ways the panelists interpreted the same written charge from the conference organizers. Meaning is always created in the context of community. And because consortia create a new sense of community, they can help create new meanings.

Q: Could Mr. Klor de Alva elaborate on his statement that research on learning at the University of Phoenix shows that students taking courses there on-line, outside communities, learn better than students taking courses on-site?

MR. KLOR DE ALVA:

On-line students at the University of Phoenix are in fact deeply engaged

with one another in rich learning communities. They work together in small cohorts, engaging with one another on-line over a period of two years. Furthermore, issues of meaning deeply engage the University of Phoenix. The University began with the mission of delivering courses in the humanities and liberal arts to policemen and firemen. But there remains considerable tension at the heart of the University's enterprise, because students themselves insist that courses should be immediately relevant to their work as professionals, and do not always understand the ways other kinds of learning can empower them, not only in their professional lives, but elsewhere as well.

Q: Could the panelists comment on the extent to which new technologies allow students to discover for themselves how they learn best, and instill in them a new self-consciousness about the learning process?

MR. BURKHARDT:

Self-consciousness of this sort leads to a kind of self-discovery, and it is very important, as it empowers students to become creators of meaning, not mere consumers of information. At the same time, to the extent information-based learning gives people the knowledge and skill-base to provide for themselves, as one can imagine happening, for example, in eastern Europe, thanks to the efforts of Phoenix University, information-based learning can also

free people to create meaning. In this sense, information-based learning and meaning-based learning are not necessarily exclusive. But we must think about learning in richer ways, to determine how these kinds of learning can be made to support one another.

Q: How does the participation of corporate partners affect, for better or worse, the operation of an academic consortium such as the Alliance for Higher Education?

MR. WATSON:

The Alliance's corporate partners bring valuable resources to the academic institutions within the consortium, including, in the case of Texas Instruments, expert instruction that was not available anywhere else.

Governance, Planning, and Assessment

Moderator: Lorna M. Peterson, Coordinator, Five Colleges, Incorporated

WAYNE ANDERSON, PRESIDENT,
ASSOCIATED COLLEGES OF THE SOUTH (ACS)

I'd like to focus on what kind of leadership can be provided in responding to issues of change in a consortial context.

- **Governance:** Organizational structure should be congruent with consortial aims and functions, timing, and the people involved. The structure can vary by changing roles and functions. The organization can be both decentralized and centralized. It is important to be prepared to restructure every few years. The role of the presidents is pivotal, not only in word, but in deed. Their support and that of the academic deans, in our case, is critical. Also one should consider a "strong mayor" system, so to speak – one that gives latitude to the chief executive within guidelines.
- **Planning:** It is important to link consortial plans to institutional planning. Incentives should be provided. Implementers and fundraisers must be part of the process. It is important to plan for transformational change, beyond-the-box, post-strategic planning. One should also think about supraconsortial planning (for example, playing an incubator role in trying to test new notions).
- **Assessment:** Howard Gardner's *Leading Minds* is a valuable resource for our topic. The leader, he reminds us, needs to (1) tell his/her story; (2) link the story to an audience (connect with students); (3) foster a solid organization to sustain the programs; (4) embody its aims and objectives; (5) provide and draw on available expertise; and (6) seek to be a direct influence for good.

JO ELLEN PARKER, PRESIDENT,
GREAT LAKES COLLEGES ASSOCIATION (GLCA)

I started thinking about issues of governance when I came to the GLCA. I realized the letters G-L-C-A were used to refer to three or four different objective correlatives. Some-

times GLCA meant the general community of 12 colleges that have a history of working together. Sometimes it meant the specific 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporation in the State of Michigan. Sometimes it meant the specific programs and activities in which people were engaged. The distinction is important and needs to be made for a public audience. A governance structure is how GLCA—a 501(c)(3) in the State of Michigan—interacts with GLCA—the 12-colleges community that has a broad and amorphous history of interaction—and the challenge is to see that the interaction between those two conceptual entities is really embodied in our governance structures.

The governance question is how do you build and maintain the box while continuing to think outside of it.

Jo Ellen Parker

The governance question is how do you build and maintain the box while continuing to think outside of it. You build a box to pursue a certain kind of consortial activity and then you think, What else can we do? What else can we fit in there? You begin to get proliferation of mission. When you begin to proliferate mission, you tend to proliferate governance structures. We bring people together as a collection of registrars, a collection of chief business officers, a collection of deans. Before long we tend to have replicated some of the governance structures that made institutions wish to found us in the first place: to achieve more flexibility, more nimbleness, more responsiveness to immediate need than campus structures permit.

As someone working in a well-established consortium, I bring questions, not recommendations:

- What kind of governance structure allows for flexibility, responsiveness, nimbleness of organization, while providing enough continuity and stability for the successful implementation of these ideas?

- What kind of process gets us from the governance structures we inherited to the kinds of governance structures that we think are more organically appropriate to the missions we want to carry out?
- How do we move from one form of governance structure to the other?

MARJORIE BAKKEN, PRESIDENT, WHEELOCK COLLEGE (COLLEGES OF THE FENWAY)

I begin with a quote from Sister Janet Eisner, President of Emmanuel College: “The active role the presidents played in imagining, creating, and developing the collaborative is clearly the single most important factor in the successful launching of the Colleges of the Fenway.” We established a steering committee, but it turned out to be too many people with too many different agendas. The presidents meet monthly and in retreats once or twice a year. We are also beginning to meet on a regular basis with the chief academic officers, the chief financial officers, and the deans and vice presidents for student development. Once or twice a year we meet with a group of trustees from each of the colleges. These have been some of our most successful meetings.

The first big issue for us was the name of the consortium – the Colleges of the Fenway or the University of the Fenway. The culture of individual colleges prevailed, and we became the Colleges of the Fenway.

Our colleges are in close proximity to one another. The biggest differences in the consortium relate to size—of enrollments, of endowments, of operating budgets, of property—rather than, in many ways, to function. Although the consortium

was created to enhance the quality of academic programs and faculty and student life, the overriding issue became the importance placed on it by some of the presidents for cost savings. During the past three years, those cost savings have materialized in some areas, never as greatly as the presidents have wished.

Information on the assessment of consortia is scanty and scattered. In the New England area single colleges continue to have accreditation visits. At this time accrediting organizations only note the collaboration in their final report; I can’t wait for the day when we are evaluated on our work as a unit. What we do now are self-assessments and self-reports that also tend to be self-congratulatory (not that that is bad).

We don’t evaluate students enough. I’d like to see questions devoted to the process of doing cross-registration and the experience of having students from other colleges in the course. I’d like to see evaluation of collaboration-based faculty development projects. We need more hard data. I think we will eventually be subjected to outcomes assessment and, therefore, we need to find new ways to document success and quality. To allow best practices to emerge, we must alter current operating practices that have become inefficient, or create new directions for practice. Assessment for the sake of assessment is not worthwhile.

ROGER CLARK, FORMER DIRECTOR, COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION (CIC)

The “C” in CIC stands for “committee.” The governing board consists of the provosts, who take it as a serious responsibility. CIC is also a consortium, an unincorporated association

We communicate, cooperate, coordinate, and compete among ourselves. Power in our institutions is decentralized; planning takes place at the program level.

It takes a long time to build up the trust, to weave the consortium into the fabric of the institutions. It has to happen at a lot of levels, not just at the top. At the top we have a general understanding of what the consortium

A consortium can be a field of dreams. If it’s well designed and cared for, and if people are well-educated about its use and the rules governing the game, who knows what star players might appear and what marvelous games might be played.

Roger Clark

should be doing, but very little coordinated planning goes on at the provosts’ level. Like a board of trustees, they give direction and I think that’s good. Consortial cooperation works best when it is channeled and supported and encouraged by the institutional leaders, but not directed by them. In a sense, the governing body in an ideal consortium acts more like a board of trustees than like an executive branch, leaving the maximum autonomy to the units or peer groups within the consortium.

In the area of evaluation, we do one thing I haven’t heard anyone else mention. All of our funded programs—

those funded internally and those funded externally—have a sunset. The typical pattern for internally funded programs is three years with a review toward the end of the second year and a decision whether to review for another three years. In assessing consortial activity, I assume that:

- Cooperation costs money.
- Not all cooperative activity is good. There are only two reasons not to engage in a specific cooperative program or activity: unenlightened self-interest and enlightened self-interest.
- In your assessment you always have to account for the intangible benefits participants get from consortial action and consortial thinking – such as staff development.

Finally, the consortium should be about trust, empowerment, decentralization—nearly everything except control. A consortium can be a field of dreams. If it's well designed and cared for, and if people are well-educated about its use and the rules governing the game, who knows what star players might appear and what marvelous games might be played.

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Q: I'd like to ask the panel about the success—or lack of it—of sunset clauses in your consortial programs.

Ms. PARKER:

We have found the sunset provision to be very, very useful. GLCA is just now making evaluation mandatory for all programs. There are workshops, seminars, and programs that have gone on for 20 years without evaluation. If I were starting afresh, with the exception of real infrastruc-

ture things (for example, tuition remission or cross-registration), I would start with a rule of *Do nothing for more than five years*.

Q: Can you comment on the role of trustees and students in consortial governance?

Ms. BAKKEN:

When they have been well-informed, the trustees have been some of our most enthusiastic supporters. The issue really is to keep them well-informed about what's happening. The Colleges of the Fenway do not have a student group that meets regularly with our coordinator. Do I think we should? Absolutely, they are the reason we should all come together to make their academic and co-curricular lives healthy.

Mr. ANDERSON:

Trustees are not involved at ACS; students, however, are involved in all three governance areas — in organizational structure, in planning, and in assessment. Students have been a part of the planning process for the effort in environmental programs from the start. [With foundation support] we give them \$2,000 per year and we have a number of marvelous environmental interns on our campuses.

Ms. PETERSON:

For the past ten years Five Colleges has had joint trustee meetings of two to three trustees per institution about once a year. That same group of trustees has participated in the review process and several of them are attending this conference.

Mr. ANDERSON:

A quick footnote: At ACS, trustees are not involved. We've talked in the last couple of years, not so much about

uplifting trusteeship, so to speak, but to share information on the role of consortia. The overriding factor is a real concern about intrusion. It could be useful to share information with trustees and to bring them together and help them determine their roles—in particular, their role in the consortium—but there are a lot of caveats to bear in mind.

Q: Could the Five College review serve as a useful model for other consortial reviews? How was it done?

Ms. PETERSON:

The model Five Colleges used was created as we went along. Five College staff prepared a self-study and the institutions prepared a study of the impact of the consortium on their respective institutions. Then we had a meeting with the presidents and members of the boards of trustees, the deans of faculty and principal business officers. The trustees raised a number of issues that were incorporated into a collation of all the reports, which was sent to the review team.

Q: What do the panel members think of long-range consortial planning?

Mr. CLARK:

I'm not sure that long-term planning has a place in consortial planning beyond the high level of generalization because if we are about anything, we're about change. And long-term plans for change can't be very detailed.

Ms. PARKER:

I don't think long-term planning should have a place in our programming agenda. It would lock us into assumptions that may not hold true in three or four years, but I do know that our institutions are not dependent upon us for central functions in a way that some consortial organizations are.

Weighing the Benefits and Costs of Cooperation

Moderator: Sharon Siegel, Treasurer, Amherst College

MICHAEL S. MCPHERSON, PRESIDENT, MACALASTER COLLEGE

Economists have enough trouble figuring costs and benefits for an individual campus, let alone a consortium. One could work from thoughts on the “economics of cooperation” as it is understood in the corporate world, where firms in the same industry find reasons to cooperate. This approach might help weigh costs and benefits in the context of consortiums.

Such analyses generally begin by looking at economies of “scale” and “scope.” Similar firms combine resources to achieve economies or to develop specializations—that is, they cooperate in order to achieve some minimum efficient

Consortiums can provide some degree of relief by bringing the specializations of its members into the pooled resource.

Michael S. McPherson

scale. This pooling and sharing helps to meet common needs. In the academic setting, examples might be cross-registration of students or the consortial hiring of faculty. Economies of scope, on the other hand, take advantage of differences to bring the benefit of members’ individual specializations to all. There are different emphases and cultures in each institution that are the basis of strength in some scope of activity. Among colleges, examples would be the focus on women’s education or different takes on various academic disciplines.

These are the two main ideas from which economists would start. Three more can be drawn from the experiences of consortiums.

The buyers’ cooperative is still a powerful model. Here the goal is to gain economic power through joint purchasing. In the fields of software and network-provided services there are still good opportunities for cooperation of this type.

The production of “associative goods” is a second model of economic cooperation that has been successful in higher education and holds promise for future benefits. Athletic leagues are an example of this category. The “good” is the league itself—something that cannot exist except through cooperation.

Agreeing on standards and practices is a third model of cooperation among institutions, though it is probably more a function of larger consortiums. Prime examples would be the CEEB and the SAT or the agreements on principles of financial aid.

Thinking about those five, we would ask the question, Is economic and technological change increasing or decreasing the value of cooperation?

Computer networks and expanded bandwidth reduce costs and raise benefits of cooperation. In this setting, there are things that should only need to be done once and shared instead of being done many times in many places: slide scanning or the development of policy on intellectual property, for example.

Economic and technological change have an impact on minimum efficient scale, notably by reducing the need to replicate specializations. To quote Adam Smith, “Division of labor is limited by the extent of the market.” On this principle, it might not be necessary or desirable for small institutions to mimic the specializations of larger ones. Consortiums can provide some degree of relief by bringing the specializations of its members into the pooled resource.

The value of common standards becomes apparent when they break down and entail higher costs. To some extent, this is what has happened in student aid.

Institutions now tend to compete, and incur higher costs, on ground previously covered by those standards. It is hard to say whether the forces driving colleges to compete on financial aid can be outweighed by the potential for cooperation among those same colleges.

RICHARD W. KIMBALL, PRESIDENT, THE TEAGLE FOUNDATION

The Teagle Collaborative Ventures Program came into being in 1995 based on the willingness of a few presidents of colleges and universities, to ask: If government and business are going through downsizing, why should academic institutions be exempt from this development?

At that time it was also becoming apparent that the public would no longer tolerate tuition rising at a rate faster than that of inflation. There was increasing need for financial aid and investments in technology and the public's "demand for value" was beginning to assert itself. One subsequent expression of this pressure has been bargaining for financial aid by parents.

These sources of concern convinced The Teagle Foundation that the time had arrived for colleges and universities to cooperate and led to the formation of the Collaborative Ventures Program. This was a fund of \$4 million to be granted to institutions in the Carnegie Baccalaureate I and II and Master II categories as well as to theological seminaries, which are not integral parts of universities. Half of the applicants for each grant needed to belong to one of these categories but could be joined by partners outside them.

The grant criteria did not specify the purpose or the amount of the grants

that could be requested so that development officers could not respond to them. Teagle's goal was to promote fresh thinking by the presidents. The proposals had to come from the presidents and not from deans or other administrators and merely endorsed by the president. This was not to be another round of grants for already-proven cooperations, such as those that were by this time common among academic libraries. The implication was that two plus two had to equal five, or more, and it was important that the proposals strengthen the value of resources already available to the participants.

If there is to be a strategic coming-together, it must not be termed a "merger." Use of that word virtually guarantees an unsuccessful outcome.

Richard W. Kimball

Teagle wanted to fund cooperation for things presidents would or could not do on their own. Some of the initiatives would be too risky to the careers of presidents if undertaken with an institution's own funds or if the magnitude and nature of change were made explicit, projects for which you'd get strung up on the lamppost if you tried to do them with institutional funds. It was Teagle's intention to provide the "cover" that would permit presidents to think boldly. This was to be a program for presidents to "influence their institutions in a process for change."

The Collaborative Ventures Program is assisted by an advisory committee composed of people with experience in consortia. Its lifespan has been extended and is still open. To date, there have been 77 applications and 30 grants, totaling \$6.2 million. Those awards have ranged from \$20,000 to \$560,000. One example of a grant was to a group of three seminaries. Their objective was to create a shared student services office, and for this they received a planning grant. This successful cooperation led to wider discussions and eventually a second grant award to fund joint faculty appointments.

The lessons learned will be aired by Teagle in early 2000, but there are some preliminary impressions.

- These projects are complex and time-consuming, especially in the need to build trust. Presidential commitment and actual participation have been critical if real change is to occur.
- "Let form follow function." It is important to decide first what purpose is to be identified and then turn later to issues of form or structure.
- It is critical to regard all the partners as equals, especially where this is not the case. Making the participants equal by stipulation encourages the commitment of all to the project.
- If there is to be a strategic coming-together, it must not be termed a "merger." Use of that word virtually guarantees an unsuccessful outcome.

The Program is still open and looking for two kinds of proposals: new organizational relationships and collaboration for the rationalization of faculty resources.

KENNETH L. HOYT, PRESIDENT, THE OHIO FOUNDATION OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES (OFIC)

The Ohio Foundation comprises 35 college presidents and 70 corporate CEOs. The organization is 50 years old and has the mission of raising money for its member colleges. In 1995 it received a grant from Ameritech to support faculty development in the use of information technologies. From this project dates the Foundation's entry into joint programs.

In 1996, it began a pilot project in business process re-design involving six colleges working together. That work was aided by grants of time and participation by executives of Diebold Corporation and a monetary award from the Foundation for Independent Higher Education (FIHE). The result of this activity was the Process Transformation Model (PTM). Details can be found at the web site: <http://www.ofic.org>. In brief, the project brought outside resource people to work with college administrators at all levels to adapt and apply the principles of process re-design developed in the commercial sector. College functions covered included admissions, purchasing, financial aid, and procurement. There was an average savings and revenue enhancement of \$440,000 per project on just a small number of projects.

The Ohio Foundation then received a \$560,000 grant from the Teagle Foundation (the largest award in the Teagle Collaborative Ventures Program) to extend the process re-design project from the six initial participants to a total of 18 member colleges. We have two goals: to reduce administrative costs and enhance revenues to achieve a net

gain of \$8 million and to improve "customer satisfaction." The overall objective is to create a new model for change that can be replicated nationally. Working with the PTM framework, we are trying to develop a shared method of conducting process re-design while allowing each participating college to retain its independence. Ninety-six functional areas have been affected and nine "best practices" brought

If the president is not involved, the project will not succeed.

Kenneth L. Hoyt

into being. (Details of the Foundation's work under the Teagle grant are also on the web site.) With the help of a grant from CitiBank, the Foundation will continue to provide "best practices" at the OFIC website.

Among the many lessons OFIC has learned:

- If the president is not involved, the project will not succeed.
- A project leader is needed.
- Returns can be significant if there is a good investment of time and effort.
- Involvement of staff at all levels is essential.
- These changes can exacerbate personnel problems, and those need to be resolved.
- Objective and competent outside help is required.
- Many projects do not need a lot of money.

- Success increases as the participants feel they have modified the process and become empowered by the work.

PHILLIP DiCHIARA, PRESIDENT, BOSTON CONSORTIUM FOR HIGHER EDUCATION SERVICES

The Boston Consortium was started about four years ago by the CFOs of 11 institutions: Babson, Bentley, Boston College, Boston University, Brandeis, Harvard, MIT, Northeastern, Tufts, Wellesley, and Wheaton. What was initially a series of breakfast meetings became the source of collaborative efforts among these colleges and universities on administrative issues. A grant from the Mellon Foundation funded the study to form a consortium. A Davis Educational Foundation grant, in 1997, helped make the plan a reality.

These institutions had long collaborated on academic matters but not administratively. Only after the Davis-funded phase did they really begin to work together among their administrative offices. The Consortium is still at its creation stage and has been able to learn from the experiences of existing consortiums and to build on the foundation others have laid down.

Every consortium is unique and tends to emphasize one thing over others. What makes the Boston Consortium different is governance: Our Board consists of the member CFOs. They are philosophically focused on behavioral issues, with the aim to model the kinds of behavior that we need to adopt in the future. In terms of methodology, they have embraced "work-based learning," in which they start projects on a practical basis and then make the time to explore and evaluate what they are learning through engagement in the work.

Unlike most of the other consortiums, the Boston Consortium members subscribe for three-year terms during which they agree to provide the overhead costs. At the end of the second year of the first three-year cycle all the members have re-subscribed for a second cycle.

Our mission is to reduce costs and to enhance the quality of our schools. We believe that if our schools are world-class in terms of academics, they should be world-class in terms of their operations. We have a practical and pragmatic focus while trying to get at the “psychology” of the topics that are put on the table. Our major challenge could be put this way, How do you address “rust”? (the “exposure of systems to the atmosphere”). The Consortium is trying to create what Adele Simmons has termed “unlikely interactions.” Innovation is an important part of what the Consortium is trying to do. Consequently, innovations cannot be left to serendipity. Our hope is to cultivate as the core competency of the Consortium the ability to create dialog among members.

The Boston Consortium identifies three levels of cooperation:

- Communities of Practice, which are forums for dialog. The principal activities here are: benchmarking, minimizing redundant systems, broad-based participation, and support of early innovators. This is the level of traditional, incremental improvement. Examples have included shared recruitment, a job fair, a CIO conference, PC procurement, IT training, and dental insurance. We have learned that cooperation is hard work, even “messy” at times; member schools have more in common

than they first thought; and they get a more informed sense of each other as they gain experience working together.

- Collaborative Projects, which are exemplified by shared systems and inter-school development of collaborative values. This level emphasizes improving the systems that exist. It is a transitional step or phase of evolutionary change. Participation is voluntary, as it is in Level 1. Examples include a web-based environmental health and safety training program, fuel oil procurement (which turned into a point of entry for talking about assumptions behind procurement), and a facility managers’ conference on benchmarking.
- Transformational Change, which involves change across the schools and national demonstration projects. Administrators are asked to nominate staff to take part in this level of collaboration. The first clear result at this level is the environmental health and safety training, which we are preparing to make available nationally. Other topics identified for attention at this level are retreat meetings and e-commerce.

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Q: We heard about two of the Teagle collaboratives this morning. What were the most radical of the proposals?

MR. KIMBALL:

The Albright-Penn State proposal was probably the most radical in that it involved collaboration between public and private institutions in a state where governmental

support for public colleges and universities has worked to the disadvantage of the privates.

Also, four West Virginia private colleges are planning to pool their computer operations in an outside company and will then contract with that company for services. They will most likely sell spare capacity to other private and even public institutions in West Virginia.

Q: Are there states in which the governors are working to promote public-private cooperation?

MR. MCPHERSON:

There is clearly a lot of competition even among governmental units. But there are also some examples of synergy in economic development, as in the Boston-area alliance of public and private institutions with the commercial sector. Consortia might have a role in helping to build market strength.

Q: To what extent does our educational system continue to promote the same kind of thinking that we need to reform in our institutions?

MR. DICHIARA:

Where we continue to promote the command-and-control approach to management and give precedence to hierarchical organization, we are perpetuating our problem. It would be better to promote more flexible thinking.

MR. MCPHERSON:

A lot of elements of liberal education promote more open thinking and enrich intellectual flexibility. But there is still a way to go. It has been said that “In American education there is a word for collaborative learning; it is called ‘cheating.’” There’s plenty of room to go further.

Thinking About the Future

Moderator: Ruth Simmons, President, Smith College

**BETTY J. OVERTON-ADKINS, DIRECTOR OF HIGHER EDUCATION,
W.K. KELLOGG FOUNDATION**

I appreciate the opportunity to join you in this discussion of the Five Colleges and your willingness to open up this discussion to others as well. Kellogg agreed to fund this conference because we felt we had things to learn.

Funders are increasingly interested in and insistent on collaboration. Yet we also understand the complexity of these relations. We were therefore pleased to see this long-standing consortium willing to be reviewed. Consortia need that scrutiny from time to time. This kind of conference, we felt, would also provide an opportunity for us to evaluate what we do and how we might do our work better. We were pleased that the review panel brought such insight and rigor to its evaluation, although understandably its results did not bring great surprises. But it did leave us with important messages about the leadership roles presidents must exercise within the consortium, and re-emphasized to staff the importance of their position. It also focused attention on the need to scrutinize programming: renovation and removal are key aspects of the message.

This panel has been asked to look to the future and use our discussion to say what we see from our differing vantage points. I would like to offer my perspective and also raise questions about some future needs. In the foundation world, we are likely to want to see more collaborative programs and consortia. These new multi-campus collaborations are indeed the wave of the future. I am struck by metaphors of families and marriage that have appeared in many speakers' remarks. Drawing on those metaphors, I would suggest we may see more families of the Claremont type — planned collaborations, interdependent and with built-in connectivity whose various components contribute to the strength of the whole. We are less likely to see new institutions being built than institutions in proximity discovering interdependence. And we are likely to see more marriages of the kind represented by the institutions here today. Some will be "shotgun" marriages

sometimes created by foundations: that is, if you want our resources, we require collaboration. All that is in the future of the consortial world.

Technology will afford opportunities for many more marriages—commuting marriages—with less frequent interaction but more discrete roles necessitating new kinds of structures. More collaborative efforts will take the form of mixed marriages, bringing together private and public institutions, professional and liberal arts, etc. These must give careful attention to mutual respect and the need to be clear about how each gains and how each

I would encourage presidents to consider how many of their constituencies would benefit from assessments of programs.

Betty J. Overton-Adkins

will contain institutional as well as presidential egos. Foundations will continue to fund consortial arrangements because from our perspective they offer "more bang for the buck" and have the potential for greater impact on learning across a variety of institutions. But funders are likely to make more demands on consortia with respect to assessment. Institutions do not pay enough attention to outcomes and an external review process such as that done by Five Colleges. I would encourage presidents to consider how many of their constituencies would benefit from assessments of programs. Data-driven outcomes need to become part of new assessment plans of consortia. This is difficult yet increasingly important as consortia seek resources.

In conclusion, I would like to raise several questions about the future for your consideration.

- **Getting beyond project mania:** Ruth Simmons has urged this group to think beyond quotidian issues. Is it possible that consortia might be used to help institutions grapple with important issues? I am thinking here about consortia becoming that “hospitable space for disciplined reflection” that one speaker has referred to. To the issues of affirmative action and the future of the professorate, I would add high-stakes testing and models of lifelong learning within these kinds of institutions.
- **Leadership:** What kind of leadership will be needed for effective consortia? I am struck by a point made here that those hiring presidents often do not have consortial considerations in mind. I would hope trustees would look at the ability of presidents to come together in an intentional way to think about the direction and goals of consortia.
- **The purpose of consortia:** Do consortia sometimes insulate institutions from change? I worry that institutions may create consortia to do all the good things we heard about, but also use them to try to avoid doing others they find distasteful or more challenging.
- **Technology:** I am intrigued by the idea of using consortia to incubate technology nodes across institutions, creating techno-scholars, and sharing a cadre of professionals.
- **Overcoming barriers:** Adele Simmons asked about having

consortia help us “unfreeze” one barrier and enable our institutions to unfreeze others. As part of assessment, how can we use consortia to help push our institutions to open up even more?

These are some of the questions I will have in mind as I see proposals come in to foundations.

**ROBERT EDWARDS, PRESIDENT,
BOWDOIN COLLEGE, CHAIR, FIVE COLLEGE
REVIEW TEAM**

Schools within a consortium don't have to be all things to all people if they have complementarity.

Robert Edwards

I would like to carry on with Betty's metaphor of the family. All happy families, as Tolstoy has said, are happy in the same way and all unhappy families are unhappy in their own way. This is true of consortia also, I suspect. I derive from discussion of the last two days that the succession of presidents is one key factor in the success of consortia.

The consortia exist in the minds of their creators, and when they leave this creates difficulties in defining “the family” unit. In this context, the question of whether one needs a “marriage” contract is interesting. We have had two views on this from the Claremonts and the Five Colleges. Do you need a binding contract? The Claremonts apparently feel “love is enough.” The Five Colleges have an agreement. But the real question is what creates a binding alliance. And third, within consortia, the idea of procreation may be important. One expression of consortia may be the

creation of new entities, as it seems to be for the Claremonts. What lends force and strength overall, however, is that family members can be different. Schools within a consortium don't have to be all things to all people if they have complementarity. Here we have the notion of being what you are because of the safety and freedom provided by “the family” unit.

I have a sense that ultimately it's the core idea more than the shotgun-marriage model that forges a consor-

tium. It was not merely economy that drove the Five Colleges together but the issue of how to accommodate and serve an increasing demand for higher education. For them the key question was how to provide this expanded public service without sacrificing their individual identities and missions. The matter of structure, staff and governance is an important question, too. In some instances this is solved by a kind of instability that requires regular involvement of deans and presidents with equally strong vitality in something like a Five College office. Once you delegate to a central office, however, there is also the danger of losing vitality and making collaboration peripheral. Yet without that strong central office, the consortium is subject to the vicissitudes of change.

On the bright side of consortia is their ability to attract funding. And their flexibility. Many faculty believe it's easier to get a Five College program going than a new one at

their own campus. But how are consortial programs to be sustained? Once they come into being, whose programs are they? Winnowing is a tricky but important issue. Renewal with respect to management is also important: how do these consortia manage to renew themselves? Finally, I was struck by something Ruth said about getting beyond *quotidiana* and I am prompted by that to quote from the report of the Five College Review Team: “The Review Team hopes these choices will not be driven entirely by the dictates of efficiency and cost-sharing—although these are not trivial. There is simply too inviting an opportunity for this distinguished consortium also to be exemplary, and to use its collegial program successes as ‘bully pulpits’ for higher education” I think it’s possible to identify four issues for that purpose:

- Mrs. Simmons’ point concerning minority education is

surely one of them. The Five College consortium is well-positioned to take a stand in this matter and be heard.

- **Technology:** What the Five College office is beginning to do in this area is crucial. Our concern is not that technology is going to happen but that it could happen badly. We need to create standards by which technology is to serve the needs of teaching and learning. For that we need skilled people who understand pedagogy as well as technology.
- **Administrative work** has been handled well by the consortium. The Five College group has been exemplary in areas such as risk management and this is likely to continue.
- **Globalization:** Within Five Colleges, little attention has been given to the issue of globaliza-

tion. The internationalization of Five Colleges is still uneven yet very, very important. The consortium has done something well about teaching foreign languages, and has established centers for the study of Africa and Asia, developed a program in East Asian Languages, and Latin American Studies. But given the role this nation must play in this world we have a level of citizenry understanding that is horrifying, and yet we are responsible for producing leadership for the world. The fourth potential area for the consortium to take on in a bully pulpit, I would suggest, is standing for globalization of the curriculum, and Five Colleges can do this kind of thing so well.

Consortia should stand and speak out for these kinds of things.