

**Chapter 1 : Lindgroup | Higher Education**

*Benchmarking Higher Ed AV Staffing Levels – Revisited As AV-equipped classrooms on campus increase in both numbers and complexity, have AV departments staffed up accordingly? A recent survey sheds some light on how AV is managed in higher education.*

On the eve of the Christmas holidays, it was announced that academic positions and professional positions at a sandstone university in Western Australia were to be cut. Now, as I write these words, a similar announcement has been released by another nearby university, where academics are expected to lose their positions. These events are linked by a joint statement, subtitled Embracing Future Opportunities, which was issued by four Western Australian VCs and, presumably, sent to all university staff in April. Along with presenting an overview of the economic importance of the university sector to the state and the nation, the two page statement observed that: In referring to these pressures and the responses that they call for, the VCs referred to a single report: Recently, Pricewaterhouse Coopers [PwC] consulted with stakeholders across the country and found that the University workforce of the future will need to be increasingly agile and flexible; that we will need to continuously and proactively develop the technical and professional capacity of our staff; and will need to enable greater role specialisation. While everyone I spoke to celebrated the event as an excellent networking opportunity, I met no other academics that day aside from those in the managerial elite. The report has also featured heavily in the open forums [1] that are held by the VC at my own university, which tend to be attended by high numbers of academic staff – and one can assume that, as each of the W. VCs have endorsed the report, the same might be said of similar forums at other universities. I here present some analysis of this high-flying report. The point of my analysis is twofold: Second, I want to consider the assumptions, omissions, and controversies of the report from a sociological perspective, in order to both explain and critique the report. The neoliberalism that suffuses the report is thus attended by the attempt to reimagine academe and its centrality within future universities – with the strategy being to preserve the symbolic clout of academe while gradually rewiring and replacing its innards with more flexible bits. While Universities Australia is not ostensibly designed to serve the interests of workers over employers or vice-versa, the fact that its membership is comprised of universities, which in turn are represented by VCs, makes it fair to say that Universities Australia is the voice for the organisational elite. Little wonder it was the only report mentioned in the VC joint statement described above. This was reflected in the engagement process: Students, targeted international universities, and employee representative groups like the NTEU were also included as university specific stakeholders. Significantly, and without including their proxy representation by the NTEU and the unnamed employee representative groups, no academics outside of the organisational elite were consulted. This means that most of the academic workforce, and especially those most likely to be affected by the recommendations made by PwC to Australian universities, were excluded from the report. The report was also rightly criticised for overlooking the growing body of research on the attitudes and experiences of academic staff. If this review was undertaken in earnest, then there is no way that PwC could have missed the fact that the preeminent trends affecting the workforce pertain to the conditions and consequences of casualisation. Literature that accounts for these matters was cited throughout the report e. While the NTEU claim to have pointed to all this during the engagement process, they were ignored. Andrews et al and many Universities Australia VCs have done the same e. Percy et al. With all of these resources in mind, it is clear from the outset that PwC engaged in very selective reading during the review process and selective deafness during the consultation process. All this is to say that there is every indication that the report was not undertaken in good faith. This is why the report, with its strategic top-down representations of reality and the ideal workforce of the future, provides an exemplary case study for sociological investigation into the university system. The first attribute that PwC note as vital to the higher education workforce of the future is agility and flexibility. Given that PwC refer to these two qualities as a single attribute, and given that the distinction between them is not always clear, I refer to them using the portmanteau, flexigility. The idea is that the supply of funding and the demand for services can shift suddenly, and universities need to be able to

respond to this quickly. This speaks to the mitigation of risk, the maximisation of efficiency, and the pursuit of advantages. As we shall see, this translates to casualisation in practice: By making flexibility a value, precariousness is recast as the opportunity to develop human capital. Flexible individuals are able to adapt and take advantage of new circumstances: Taking this to its logical conclusion, the most excellently flexible university would be one in which all employees can be relocated, casualised or simply removed from the pay role whenever they are not needed, with such needs and responses in turn being determined as quickly and efficiently as possible. The next key attribute is professionalisation. Someone who values professionalisation will be dedicated to keeping their skills up to date and to learning new things in anticipation of, and response to, new circumstances. This quality thus serves as the scaffolding for flexibility: While this can be cultivated through work-provided training, it can also be encouraged as a condition of precariousness and the imperative to be as competitive and flexible as possible. It is worth noting that this implies a shift away from the kind of academic excellence that comes from years of dedication to narrow scholarly pursuits. Rather, professionalisation encapsulates the old saying: The third key attribute is specialisation. The idea here is that universities will need to differentiate themselves from other universities and higher education provides, and this move will require their employees to in turn become more specialised. For instance, along with being experts in their own academic field, a university teacher might also specialise in digital learning technologies and online education, or the gathering and analysis of data regarding learning outcomes. On the one hand, this can go hand in hand with the organisational motivations behind flexibility, for it means that the employment relationship between staff and universities can be specified according to the requirement of such specialisations: On the other hand, this seems at odds with professionalisation, insofar that one notion requires the academic to develop a range of skills suited to a range of roles, while the other notion requires the academic to narrow down on a narrow skill set that can be used in a range of similar roles in a variety of contexts. Without needing to overemphasise the point, for PwC make it clear that they are dealing in abstract guidelines that are open for interpretation, it is worth bearing in mind that three attributes exist in a tension with each other, as well as with the established facts – which, to repeat, PwC overlooked and ignored. Still, just one example of how this tension is already playing out in Australian universities is provided by the fact that academics often teach in units that are outside of their own specialised academic area. This is largely due to the informal casual employment processes that currently dominate most universities. May et al. Increasing numbers of academics are casually employed for longer periods of time – which speaks to the emphasis on flexibility. The experience and expertise that academics already have are regularly overlooked – which speaks to and undermines specialisation. It is clear that these attributes are already subject to significant issues within Australian universities. That they should be presented as the three necessary qualities that future academics will need to internalise, speaks to the neoliberal ethic of ongoing atomised competition that underpins the report more on this soon. This emphasis on differentiation reflects the insights of systems theory, whereby social systems react to a complex and disruptive environment through fragmentation and specialisation, and thus become more complex in turn. For instance, growing competition requires universities to differentiate themselves through specialisation and the pursuit of long-term plans. Deliberate differentiation is articulated in the report in terms of the strategic development of value propositions on the part of the organisation and specialisation on the part of the individual workers. Contingent differentiation is articulated in the report in terms of professionalisation and flexibility. Contrary to what its title suggests, the PwC report is less concerned with the work force per se, and more with a system of semi-privatised organisations trying to survive in a disruptive environment. In contrast, the aforementioned critiques are essentially ethnocentric, in that they directly pertain to the views and experiences of human beings – that is, to the actual workers that make up the workforce. As I have shown elsewhere, this is but one way of formulating and analysing a social system, for some systems-theoretical approaches. Aakvaag; Luhmann; Rempel are not concerned with people per se, but with the abstract subjects of systems and their operative functions. From this perspective which is abundantly clear throughout the report, people are the occupants of constituent parts of the greater apparatus, the primary and impersonal purpose of which is to survive. It is an unpleasant perspective, but it is not without its own ostensibly consistent logic and advocates. Of course, the

fact that PwC make no explicit claim to such a disinterested theoretical perspectives means that this explanation no more than conjecture, while its contrast to the clearly partial ethos of PwC makes it an inadequate one at that. After all, even with its explicit concern for differentiation and complexity, the report and the future university that it presents is suffused with the homogenising spirit of neoliberalism image 1: Lack of alignment between university and people priorities, which, while its meaning was far from clear in the report, seems to concern the segmentation and relative-autonomy of university departments i. While report does little to clarify the hurdle to which I now turn, traditional and change averse culture, it describes it as follows University cultures have withstood the test of time, supported by the high degree of academic freedom inherent in the sector. However, a number of university leaders told us that cultural limitations are one of the most significant barriers to responding to, and anticipating, changes impacting the sector, to the detriment of the future competitiveness of Australian universities. In some respects, many in the sector are comfortable and do not believe that a burning platform exists which necessitates change. Student union representatives also supported the view that a top heavy governance culture is detrimental to innovation in teaching and research. The sector, of course, is the university system rather than higher education in general while the culture, broadly speaking, is academe. Such resistance is therefore not surprising, for academic freedom and institutional autonomy are often popularly seen and cited as fundamental to modern Western universities Bleiklie ; Collini including those in Australia Connell ; Hill Put bluntly, universities and academics have long been like pods and peas: University campuses are the symbolic and literal home of the academic profession, which university managers and the media alike have in turn capitalised on as a popular and prestigious cultural icon. What these relations have in common are the link between the ideal and sacred and the profane and pragmatic. Little wonder that those neoliberal elements of contemporary managerial practices suggestions which have been critiqued for holding nothing sacred “ save perhaps for revenue are so often resisted and received by academics as though they were profanities. But the report presents no reflection on this front, and instead presents what are ostensibly deemed to be unavoidable facts. The ideological thrust of the report is to frame the drivers of change like economic and technological forces of nature, occurring within the nigh-uncontrollable external environment of global knowledge economies. Within this narrative, the agents of change, as in the university and industry leaders and stakeholders, are the sober stewards of the future, while those who question such narratives are the impediments to progress. Thus still according to this narrative: In reality, the notion of academic autonomy and the self-determination of the disciplines engenders the potential for continuity as well as change, and thereby covers both the preservation of traditions and the pursuit of innovation. Indeed, the literature on neoliberalism that I have cited “ literature that have been penned by academics who critique both tradition and change “ makes it abundantly clear that the issue is not some general aversion to change itself, but rather a particular aversion or rather, resistance to reforms that undermine autonomy through managerialism and culture through economic rationalism. Evidently, this aversion extends to the reforms that are presented in the report, as well as the strategies used by PwC in its production. It is thus an oversimplification for PwC to reduce the issue to some generalised and non-descript form of cultural conservatism, especially when the significant conditions and consequences of the changes proposed and the ongoing discussions that surround them are not addressed. To be sure, there may well be culturally distinctive conservative elements in Australian universities: However, the literature on the prevailing trends in higher education and the academic workforce gives good reason to suppose that the hurdle noted by PwC is less a technical issue pertaining to reform i. In saying all this, my point is simply that, along with being far from impartial in its research and engagement process, the report is also embedded in a constellation of narratives and rationales that are heavily pregnant with economic and moral prerogatives “ as Forsyth In this respect, it can be helpful to consider an excerpt from the report pertaining to flexigility alongside another response issued by the NTEU: While universities are still responsive to both government and the public, they are forced to run more like a business. This includes achieving efficiencies, higher productivity, competitiveness, flexibility and agility. Like business, they need to respond faster, minimise overheads and change strategy and direction in response to markets, trends and opportunities. Considering the Hypothetical If we put all this aside, however, and take seriously the narrative presented by

PwC, then the question arises: The answer depends on how we conceptualise and locate this culture. Here we can take a cue from PwC and focus first on the thought-leaders, as in those seasoned academics of the professoriate, who have enough status and are secure enough in their employment to be of consequence to management. However, much of this Old Guard of the Ivory Tower are due to retire or accept redundancy within the year timeline presented by the report, and so, at least in terms of employment, cannot really be counted amongst the future workforce with which PwC is concerned. In other words, if the universities of today are to successfully transition into the future university envisioned by PwC, then they must address intergenerational transmission, and thus the institutional links between the old and the new. The Doctorate of Philosophy PhD is one such link.

**Chapter 2 : Indian Higher Education Revisited By K B Powar**

*The Australian Higher Education Workforce of the Future was released in February by the Australian Higher Education Industrial Association (AHEIA) in association with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Corporate (DVC) division of Universities Australia.*

In this thought-provoking piece, Collis focuses on consolidation and specialization, two very visible outcomes of the changes in healthcare. He concludes that the potential for higher education to move down a similar path is quite viable and perhaps even desirable. In the spirit of keeping this conversation alive, I also believe there are several similarities between the two industries and, thus, many potential lessons to be learned for higher ed. The trick is that healthcare is further down the path than higher education, and we need to temper our conclusions and speculations with that reality. Allow me to explain. In , healthcare across America was local; provided by local doctors who had only recently given up house calls for the comfort of their offices and, in prosperous communities, maybe a hospital that was usually owned by the community or possibly by a religious organization. The Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals JCAH was focused on hospitals and the use of emerging technologies was relatively new in the industry. Higher education was also largely local in , with institutions stratified “as Collis points out” into tiers and serving their defined territories. Private colleges and universities were scattered about the country and community colleges were settling into a niche focused on local opportunities. By , healthcare was firmly on the path toward its re-invention, driven primarily by none other than the insurance industry. Between and , the higher education funding model changed relatively little, with the possible exception of a growing interest in research dollars by schools that had formerly been quite content to focus on teaching. In , Congress was scheduled to reauthorize the Higher Education Act of The lobbyists lined up at the door and, as usual, extensions were passed because Congress was running a little behind schedule. Interestingly, it was not until early in that they completed their task, and “at the risk of oversimplifying a complex legislative process” their tardiness was largely due to the fact that many members of Congress had come to understand that the federal government was footing the bill for higher education. Just like in the healthcare industry more than 20 years earlier, the people paying the bills suddenly got very interested in how the money was being spent. This explains why comparisons between the two industries are difficult to make: Healthcare has a year head start on higher ed. But we just need to be patient. The rise of the University of Phoenix is cited by Collis as an early harbinger of change in higher education. And those changes continue today. The number of schools offering online courses and programs grows every year, and the role of technology in education is only going to grow in a similar fashion. Or, the University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio as just two recent examples of a growing trend. Indeed, there is enough activity in this area that venture capitalists are building significant war chests, and there is even a blog devoted to the topic of higher education mergers. This is the first of a two-part series by Terry Rawls building on a previously-published article by David Collis , exploring the lessons higher education can learn from the healthcare industry. To read the second part of the series, please click here.

**Chapter 3 : Higher Education Workforce of the Future, revisited | Sociology**

*Higher education is a very diverse enterprise, with institutions of all stripes. There is power in our diversity: All manner of viewpoints and worldviews are represented.*

This is a special edition of the newsletter , as the entire edition is devoted to an evaluation of the use of affirmative action policies in higher education institutions and its implications on law school admissions. On June 23, , the Supreme Court rendered rulings on two highly anticipated cases regarding the use of race as a factor in student admissions to higher education institutions. Petitioner alleged that her application was rejected because the Law School uses race as a predominant factor, giving applicants belonging to certain minority groups a significantly greater chance of admission than students with similar credentials from disfavored racial groups. Petitioner further alleged that the Respondents had no compelling interest to justify their use of race in the admissions process. The Law School admissions policy does not define diversity solely in terms of racial and ethnic status and does not restrict the types of diversity contributions eligible for "substantial weight. The Supreme Court granted certiorari, U. The OUA considers a number of factors in making admissions decisions including high school grades, standardized test scores, high school quality, curriculum strength, geography, alumni relationships, leadership, and race. She referenced two important messages from the Court: She indicated that the University would modify its undergraduate admissions process to be in line with the holistic process that the Court affirmed in the law school admission process. The following is not meant to be an exhaustive or definitive analysis, but rather a first-person perspective by the co-authors aimed at inviting readers to thoroughly review this compelling decision by the Court. As the authors are lawyers from different backgrounds working together in the representation of educational clients, we decided to provide our joint perspectives on this issue of national importance. Personal histories of the authors Vickie A. Gillio In reviewing a Supreme Court decision on the use of affirmative action in law school admissions, the perspective of this author in part comes from my own background. One grandfather had virtually no formal education and worked first in the coal mines of Pennsylvania and then as a day laborer in Chicago. The other grandfather attended New York City public schools and later became a world-renowned linguist. My father was the first child in his family to graduate from high school and his dream to become a lawyer was embraced by his daughter. I was raised in the Humboldt Park neighborhood in Chicago. I graduated from St. Norbert College majoring in sociology and proudly served as a student trustee. I attended law school at the University of Illinois, College of Law. I subsequently had the opportunity to serve on the Board of Visitors for the College of Law at a time when women comprised nearly one-half of the student body. It is from this personal perspective that I viewed with interest the legal analysis and underlying societal issues referenced by the Court. In the mids, I attended the University of Michigan as an undergraduate student. From my recollection, there were 15 African American students in my class. This article will review salient issues addressed by the Court, in particular, the notions of: The Court recognizes the concept of critical mass and the educational benefits that diversity is designed to produce such as promoting cross-racial understanding, breaking down racial stereotypes, and enabling students to better understand students of different races. The Court acknowledges that these benefits are "important and laudable" because a diverse background of students allows for "livelier, more spirited, and simply more enlightening and interesting" classroom discussion. The Court further discusses the benefits a diverse student body has on creating an increasingly diverse workforce and society. Major American businesses assert in briefs submitted to the Court that the skills necessary for a global marketplace "can only be developed through exposure to widely diverse people, cultures, ideas, and viewpoints. Briefs submitted by high-ranking retired officers and civilian leaders of the United States military assert that based on their experience, "highly qualified, racially diverse officer corps The dissent by Justice Scalia, with whom Justice Thomas joins concurring in part and dissenting in part, argues the plurality Opinion will lengthen controversy and litigation. According to Justice Scalia, "Tempting targets, one would suppose, will be those universities that talk the talk of multiculturalism and racial diversity in the courts but walk the walk of tribalism and racial segregation on their campuses--through minority-only

student organizations, separate minority housing opportunities, separate minority student centers, even separate minority-only graduation ceremonies. Justice Scalia asserts there may be lawsuits arguing that racial preferences are above or below the "critical mass. According to Justice Thomas, "The initial driving force for the relocation of the selective function from the high school to the universities was the same desire to select racial winners and losers that the Law School exhibits today. The Court held that its scrutiny was strict while taking into account complex educational judgments in an area, which the Court found, rested primarily within the expertise of the University. The Court recognized a constitutional dimension to the principle of student body diversity as a compelling state interest in educational autonomy grounded in the First Amendment. According to the Court, "The freedom of a university to make its own judgments as to education includes the selection of its student body. Justice Scalia argues "deference does not imply abandonment or abdication of judicial review. Justice Thomas questions the deference given to the Law School as inconsistent with the Constitution. According to Justice Thomas, " In that case, the Court held that a "State has a substantial interest that legitimately may be served by a properly devised admissions program involving the competitive consideration of race and ethnic origin. The Court asserts that reasonable time limits can be met by policies with sunset provisions and periodic reviews. The Court, after referencing that it has been 25 years since the Bakke decision and the number of minority applicants with high grades and test scores has increased, found "We expect that 25 years from now, the use of racial preferences will no longer be necessary to further the interest approved today. In her Concurring Opinion, Justice Ginsburg references statistical data demonstrating the current state of education is that many minority students encounter inadequate and unequal educational opportunities. She further asserts that as educational opportunities in lower school education for minorities improve, the number of qualified students for higher education will increase. As an underrepresented member of a societal majority group women , rather than an underrepresented minority group, attending law school in the early s, my experience was clearly not one of participating in a "critical mass. It also was a subset in the greater turmoil occurring on campus with student anti-war protests, the presence of the Illinois National Guard, mass student arrests on campus, and civil rights protests. Thus, as first-year law students, we were studying the rule of law in a greater university context of mass arrests and and protests, unprecedented on American university campuses. It was then that the sense of isolation began to diminish. However, in this context, we clearly were called upon to be the voice of women as part of our law school experience.

**Educational Deference** The deference given to a higher education institution by our Supreme Court is an awesome responsibility. It is certainly an important recognition by the Supreme Court that deference is given to the mission statements of colleges and universities in deciding how selective or elite their institution seeks to be and importantly that diversity is an essential element to the mission of educating lawyers and future leaders of our society. The plurality opinion has safeguarded possible abuses identified by the minority opinions. Justice Thomas certainly raises some hauntingly ethnic based decisions made by elite educational institutions as to how many individuals of one background were found to be "too many qualified individuals" in proportion to their numbers in society. In the present context, what if, for example, the K institutions in our country do a dramatically better job in educating and preparing underrep-resented minority populations and that results in more qualified applicants to elite law schools than the percentage of that underrepresented minority in the general population? Further, in the present context, what safeguards will be put in place to ensure that any constitutionally consistent policy is not applied inconsistently or abused by applicants? These are all significant challenges for our universities in tailoring policies consistent with the Constitution and reviewing them on a regular basis so that policy makers in our universities recognize the lessons of the past, the realities of the present, and the ever-changing landscape of our Nation. The faculty of the law school voluntarily met one-on-one or two-on-two with women law students. The changing nature of American society 25 years later was reflected in law school class compositions of near equal numbers of men and women. The unanswered question is whether those same assumptions can be made today in the context of current societal conditions as to the underrepresented minorities referenced in affirmative action admissions policies. The practical question arises as to what numerically constitutes a "critical mass. However, from my recollection, throughout my law school education there was an average of two to three African Americans in

any given course, which could range from approximately 15 to plus total students in a classroom. Therefore, the following questions arise: What is a meaningful number of minority students in a classroom? Second, our elementary education system needs to provide enriching substantive training for our youth so that children from diverse backgrounds have an equal footing to compete for the best higher education opportunities. Ensuring diversity and equality of education at the elementary and pre-kindergarten levels is critical, otherwise affirmative action may always exist as a remedial measure for continuing educational inequities. Educational Deference Justice Thomas asserts that the State of Michigan has "no compelling interest in having a law school at all, much less an elite one. Yet, is the measuring stick for a compelling state interest in having a law school based upon whether every state in our Nation has an ABA accredited law school? Simply because Alaska and other states do not have ABA accredited law schools does not equate to Michigan not having a compelling interest in having an ABA accredited law school for in-state and out-of-state students to attend. Can it also be argued that an elite public law school may serve the role of enhancing the quality of other public law schools within the state and nationally in order to maintain a competitive curriculum and training ground for future attorneys across the country? Furthermore, as the Court asserts, if law schools are the training ground for many of our national leaders, then arguably there is a pressing public necessity in ensuring that all students have equal access to the best legal education, whether at a public or private institution, as many legal opportunities are generated for law students based upon the quality or "elite" status of their law school. In the next 25 years, the issue of race as a factor in higher education admissions policies will surely be revisited in our educational institutions and perhaps in our courts. The more compelling national interest and challenge within the next 25 years is whether our nation will have evolved to a greater understanding of the diverse people that live within our country such that there will be substantial strides toward meaningful racial and ethnic equality. The answer to this challenge will determine when a sunset is needed for affirmative action policies in higher education institutions. Justice Scalia filed an opinion concurring in part and dissenting in part, in which Justice Thomas joined. Justice Kennedy filed a dissenting opinion. Justice Thomas filed a concurring opinion. Bollinger prior to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals rendering a judgment.

**Chapter 4 : Benchmarking Higher Ed AV Staffing Levels – Revisited -- Campus Technology**

*Extra info for Higher Education Revisited. Example text. Au contraire where that was not so, there was much more uncertainty. I suspect that, with the enlarged.*

This is the conclusion of a two-part series by Terry Rawls, building on a previously-published article by David Collis, exploring the lessons higher education can learn from the healthcare industry. In the first part, Rawls outlined the trends that link the two industries together and discussed how higher education is beginning to explore organizational mergers, as the healthcare industry did. Mergers and acquisitions are but one byproduct of this revolution, and while they are an easy target of our focus because of the drama they elicit, there are other, less obvious but no less important connections between the two industries we can watch. Technology Creates Efficiencies Just as in healthcare – where the investment in technology runs into the hundreds of billions of dollars – schools across the country have made relatively huge investments in new recordkeeping and course-delivery systems. A parallel with healthcare is in large-scale efforts such as The Common Application which, interestingly, has been around for over 35 years and the National Student Clearinghouse; two examples of early-stage attempts to leverage technology on a broader scale. Check out Degreed and Parchment for two interesting examples of the private sector looking at this challenge, and watch for many more in the coming decade. The Corporatization of Higher Education Will Continue In healthcare, mergers and acquisitions created the huge national entities we see today, but in the early stages of their transition, those local hospitals we discussed earlier began to function more as a business than as a charity. This is the process higher education is undergoing today. In healthcare, hospitals began buying local physician practices as they sought to control their market, which in higher education might look like the proposed merger between the College of Charleston and the Medical University of South Carolina, or the recently cancelled merger between Montreat College and Point University. Large-scale mergers and acquisitions are still over the horizon for higher ed, and some would argue the nature of higher education precludes such a path. Big Data Will Ultimately Be Transformative Healthcare invested heavily in the use of technology in every aspect of its operations, from finance to patient records to creating treatment plans based on experience. While there are certainly pros and cons in this movement, in the long run, it will certainly benefit patients. Higher ed is also investing in big data initiatives, although we are again in the very early stages of this effort with companies such as Pearson at the forefront. New Professional Groups Will be Created The changes of the past 30 years in healthcare saw an expansion of professionals engaged in providing care. Stemming from a physician shortage in the s, nurse practitioners and physician assistants – along with a number of other specialized professionals – came into their own during the recreation of the healthcare industry. Today, these well-trained professionals fill gaps in the industry, managing costs and assuring quality care. In higher education, we see early signs of a similar change as institutions seek to manage costs and assure quality instruction by using more adjuncts. Not wishing to create a firestorm here, my point is that our challenge is to provide training and support for these new, emerging members of the academy so that we, like healthcare, can make the best use of the benefits they bring to the table. Adjuncts and physician assistants are with us to stay. In the end, it really needs to be all about students. A Fall in Global Rankings Finally, here is the one that wakes me up in the middle of the night. More recently, Bloomberg placed us at number 46 of the 48 countries considered. Two points need to be made here: Those 77 top-ranked American institutions need to take on the challenges of our high schools, because failure to do so will result in the erosion of their raw material unless they want to get all of their new students from other countries. This will lead to precipitous falls of their own in future rankings; I certainly hope higher ed can find a way to not follow healthcare in this particular area, for all the obvious reasons. Conclusion The case, then, can be made that the higher education industry as a whole has many parallels with the healthcare industry, and that the odd-year head start healthcare has on higher ed can help us understand the lessons that might apply to the latter. Perhaps the biggest lesson to be learned, however, is that higher education needs to partner with the people paying the bills to work out compromises that benefit our students and society as a whole. Failure to do so could very well put higher education on the path to

mediocrity “ and that is not an acceptable outcome. Just as there was a trick to understanding the relationship between healthcare and higher education, there is a caveat to the conclusions above. Put that with the fact that Congress will almost certainly find ways to flatten the tuition-rate curve and increase the cost of running a higher education institution and we may very well see many, many more of those mergers and acquisitions and, I fear, closures over the next 30 years.

### Chapter 5 : Healthcare and Higher Education Revisited (Part 1) | The EvoLLLution

*Indian Higher Education Revisited: Continuing Concerns and Emerging Issues [K B Powar] on [www.nxgvision.com](http://www.nxgvision.com)  
\*FREE\* shipping on qualifying offers. I have had the privilege of being professionally involved with the Indian higher education system for a little more than 50 years.*

### Chapter 6 : Healthcare and Higher Education Revisited (Part 2) | The EvoLLLution

*This is a book that fills the void of insightful and thought-provoking literature on the state of education in India. It analysis all issues that impact higher education and offers a clear perspective on the shortcomings and ills that plague it.*