

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC
2006 Annual Meeting

Weapons of Mass Instruction

Nancy Smith Fichter

Florida State University

When I was invited to give this talk, it was suggested that I might address some of the critical issues currently characterizing the arenas of higher education and that I also might talk about art and art-making. That seemed a tad global to me, but the more I thought about it, it seemed the only way to proceed because to separate all those topics might be to perpetuate the very separations and schisms that we find in our institutional lives today and that I hope to address in these remarks. My comments grow from a deep concern about the damaging separations between the arts that we serve and some of the administrative practices to which we are often asked to conform. And I should make clear that I am usually referring to such practices and mandates that are handed down to all of us from forces often very remote from our own administrative areas, forces such as legislatures, corporate overseers, alien bureaucracies. Jaan Whitehead, whose discipline is theater, urges us to challenge and break out of the framework of institutional thinking “by asking how [our institutions] are affecting the ways we practice our art on a daily basis.”¹ So I’d like to offer some ideas about all of the above and will try to unravel some of the tangled threads as I go along. They are indeed tangled because the context in which the arts reside in academe today presents an unusually rich and complex and sometimes dense tapestry.

To put it plainly, the “damaging separations” to which I refer are often the disconnects that derive from current practices that are not compatible with the disciplines to which they are applied. There are multiple causes for these schisms, many related to our expansion into institutional megaverses (our megaversities). During the past few decades we have experienced previously unparalleled institutional expansion. In many cases we have sought and welcomed the growth. But there is a significant difference between growth, true organic growth that proceeds from a center, and metastasis, a rapid, often random proliferation. When institutional growth skews into metastasis, there often seems to be an institutional panic reaction that yields vigorous efforts to control, to label, to measure; and this can lead to a separation from center, from the very disciplines that are the components of the institution. Although we like to think that we are always open to change and to its new possibilities, we have found ourselves confronted by new models of operation and function that often seem hostile to the very nature of our disciplines and missions. Sometimes we learn to adopt and adapt the new models in ways that are truly helpful; but too often the new managerial models have continued to be alien suits of armor that do not fit, and we find ourselves in “word prisons” that are not compatible with the special languages of the arts.

The 500 lb. elephant that is often in the room of many academic councils these days is of course the old corporate models. At the uppermost regions of academic administration, there is a striking resemblance to the old Board Rooms of old Big Business. And I say “old” because, as you well may know, the real irony is that the new corporate thinking is looking more and more in the direction of what we might recognize as creative sensibilities. Big Business has discarded some of the old corporate models that academe is still clinging to. But those old models seem to have great staying power in institutions of higher education and they have yielded some of the weapons of mass instruction that we encounter on a regular basis. We are once again immersed to a greater degree than ever in the accountability craze that spawns futile reporting exercises that are

- attempts to quantify that which is unquantifiable
- attempts to give finitude to that which is infinite
- attempts to *account for* rather than *to value*

We are being asked to categorize with an improbable exactitude, to describe literally and to delineate that which (to use Suzanne Langer's words) "is virtually ineffable." Now we probably all know that it would not be the best strategy in some cases to go upstairs to our provosts, presidents, chancellors, etc., and say we just can't be accountable because we are dealing with that which is "virtually ineffable". It would all sound so vague. We might not even score if we quoted Mendelssohn, who said that music cannot be expressed in words, not because it is vague but because it is more precise than words.

It is often difficult to protest in any way the mandates for specified "outcomes", for "accountability". It can sound as though we don't think we should be responsible. It's like being against motherhood and apple pie. (Of course we know that in the practice of the arts that we profess, we are highly accountable. For one example, if we consider our carefully developed and articulated processes of audition, assessment, adjudication, jurying, examination... whatever terminology we want to use for the processes we follow to discern individual status and progress, we see ample evidence of our accountability.)

Of course we want to be accountable; of course we want outcomes, results. But we want real ones, not false surrogates.

It is a natural human impulse to try to give a category, a name, a label to everything. We're often scared of that which we cannot pin down. And of course it is part of our great human paradox that at the same time we are trying to organize and control everything, we are also seeking that which will take us away from the quotidian aspects of our lives--be it a spiritual quest, an art experience, a martini. It is part of our human condition that we seek clarity and definition at the same time that we ache for mystery and the explorations of mind and spirit. As human beings we swing back and forth between these two poles and our institutions reflect this; but in the attempt to clarify, label, control, we sometimes seize on what appear to be efficient remedies, quick fixes. They can turn out to be the miracle drugs whose side effects include (always at the end of the list) "and sometimes death." Some of the mandated measurement exercises in the name of accountability, some of the educational "reforms" that have been prevalent in the past couple of decades have turned out to be the "two aspirins and a band aid" that have had scant relevance to the real health of the organism. Let's consider for a moment some of the so-called "reforms". They have nomenclature that is doubtless familiar to you: "discipline-based arts education", "content-neutral" curriculum, "creative, cognitive restructuring", and so on. This was and often still is just re-minted jargon that purports to be the avant-garde of pedagogical theory... really about as avant-garde as the abacus, though frequently not as effective. Often the new spin that such terms put on educational concepts is just the spin of a wheel being reinvented, but the concepts they represent when put into practice often take us from the center which is the art itself. The practice of these "reforms", often so well-intentioned, can threaten real content and substance. They can result in a dilution of the art experience. We are also beginning to hear again some discussion of technique, of arts skills as being mere tools. And when we hear this, we must always remind such speakers that an art technique, be it in ballet or music or painting, constitutes language. Arts skills are shared symbolologies capable of the profoundest levels of abstraction and the most elegantly precise specificity.

The big problem is that these so-called reforms avoid the central passion. Isn't it ironic that in the American educational system, in which John Dewey (the great advocate of learning by doing) was one of our early icons, the *doing* can get subtly shifted from its central position. In dance, the discipline with which I am most familiar, we thought we got some of these issues all settled 30 or 40 years ago when dance departments were finally winning their turf. Many of us in dance remember the many skirmishes won that meant we were going to win the big ones. We remember the battles about academic credit for technique classes, repeatable credit for studio experience, the concepts of the necessary daily practice of the art, the notion that for the creative and/or performing artist, the thesis is the work itself, not a paper about the work (although that may also be another valuable experience to require). We learned to affirm that a thesis can be the artist's statement, and it is a statement made by doing and making the art. These positions have all been well articulated many times; but they will continue to need to be voiced again and with renewed power.

Quite recently I heard that a well-known dance program was being challenged about the legitimacy of credit given for studio experience. Everything old is new again.

Although we may be facing again a repeat of old issues to be dealt with, there are some new “wrinkles” in the old challenges. We are in a vastly changed technological universe. We are amazed and greatly helped by technological advances. We embrace them as great tools and even as mechanisms that can alter and inspire our envisioning and conceptualizing. But also (and this is my favorite cliché), we suffer from the defects of our virtues. Technology has greatly expanded our horizons but it has also opened up some problematic corners of Pandora’s Box. Although it has in so many ways given us the wherewithal to increase efficiency and to widen vision, it has also raised to iconic heights the prestige of precise, quantitative measurement; and such measurement can be attained with incredible speed. I believe we have been for some time in the process of being perceptually altered. In many ways this may be good, in most ways it is inevitable, and in some ways it is scary. We are developing speed-lust, and this poses some particular issues for the arts. We know that in addition to being often nonverbal and resistant to analytical quantification, an art frequently does not meet today’s imperative for instant gratification, quick-fix results. Its iconic powers are somewhat different from those of the computer. An art experience may move into one’s senses with direct and keen and seemingly immediate address, but its ultimate effects may be slow and gradual and eventual. Art sharpens the perceptions and invites contemplation, but this may happen over time and on various levels of consciousness. This is highly inconvenient for those who want dependably scheduled outcomes and accountability statistics.

The late Susan Sontag said that “All great art induces contemplation, a dynamic contemplation.”² What is missing in some academic managerial thinking today is acknowledgment of and provision for that dynamism, space for the mystery, and respect for the ineffable.

If the art experience is often resistant to exact verbal analysis, then it is perhaps even more so to quantification. Today often the number is more powerful than the word. The number is a signifier of a very different nature than the word and certainly it is different from the art experience. Currently it finds a very hospitable environment in the corporate contexts of both business and academe; and when accorded its appropriate place in human transactions, it can contribute significantly to our perceptions and considerations. Just think where we would be in music and dance if we did not have the quantifying tools with which to deal with time and value. So the number, the quantifying impulse, the need for measurement need not be considered evil siblings of the creative spirit, but when they are allowed to assume dominance over all other ways of assessing value, then we are indeed in “tail-wagging-dog” territory. Exactitude can at its best yield the elegance of which the physicist speaks, the perfection of Japanese Noh drama... but the price of superficial exactitude can be the loss of mystery. This doesn’t have to happen. Your discipline, music, proves this... where precision and exactitude can yield transcendence and transformational experience. *You* know that you may be able to measure much of what it takes to get to that experience, but you also know that you can’t really measure the experience itself.

Administrative vision and practice can surely be aided by sensitive measuring. As an example, we are aided by both the processes and the results of the national accreditation associations of which NASM is a full partner. We can gain helpful data from the exercise of the annual reports and the HEADS data, because they do not purport to legislate the nature of the arts that they address; they do not define esthetic visions; they do not tell us how to practice our arts; and they do not ask us to quantify that which is unquantifiable. They stay close to center. Most of all, they are discipline specific and designed by those within the disciplines. In short they are sensitive tools, not scary mandates issued by a remote authority with scant acquaintance with how the arts work.

I remember feeling a real sense of satisfaction after completing the self-study reports but it was satisfaction of a very different order than what I felt from the experience of choreographing Bach cello suites. Jose Limon said that art making “is a lonely and aristocratic encounter”. Writing the self study was not that... well perhaps a bit lonely but not so aristocratic. But it offered the satisfaction of looking

through several lenses at that which I thought I knew everything about and finding new ways of seeing things. That happened because the instruments had been sensitively wrought and were aids to examine not to irrevocably define.

Today's accountability craze brings with it with what John Tusa (in a lecture entitled "The Language of the Arts") refers to as "this flood of regulatory, admonitory, minatory language".³ We are bombarded by the seemingly unending requests for generic reports of "outcomes" that all so often confuse random facts with truth. In our fields, we often know in a deep and intimate way when something is working in an art process, in a teaching moment. We recognize it. But we seldom can pin it down and measure it with exactitude. One is reminded of the Heisenberg principle: when we examine something too closely we alter that which is being studied. David Boyle, in *The Tyranny of Numbers*, says "The closer you get to measuring what's really important, the more it escapes you, yet you can recognize it sometimes in an instant... number -crunching brings a kind of blindness with it. When we measure life, we reduce it"⁴

Boyle reminds us that in academe we feel in serious ways the damaging results of trying to measure the wrong things. He cites the 1986 Research Assessment exercise as a prime example of this and says that it remains a device in wide use today as a tool by which universities are judged. Boyle's words:

"... it simply measures the number of articles... published in academic journals. The result? Narrower and narrower research, important articles cut into three, conventional research rather than bold, dangerous new thinking and what David Cannadine calls "a new and depressed professoriate... with all the frenzied energy of battery chickens on overtime, laying for their lives."⁵

If this has such impact on traditional theoretical research, then it is surely daunting to those in the arts.

We have recently learned that U.S. Education Secretary Margaret Spellings' Commission on the Future of Higher Education is recommending a bold new set of proposals that will include overhauling financial aid systems and holding colleges and universities more accountable for their students' progress. The Commission's report states that if these proposals are adopted they will produce "institutions and programs that are more nimble, more efficient and more effective."⁶ Well of course we all want to be more nimble and efficient but two of the reported proposals in particular raise some alarming red flags:

- "Create a 'consumer-friendly' data base so consumers and others can compare institutions"
- "Create a tracking system to collect and analyze information on individual student performance."

Of course we already collect data on student performance, before and after graduation. But do we attempt to analyze that "lonely and aristocratic encounter"? No, because we could not and would not do so.

One news story reported that although some panel members expressed hope that the recommendations would lead to legislation, one member of the panel (he is also president of the American Council on Education) said that the report's one-size-fits-all approach could be counterproductive, given the diversity of missions in higher education and that "Change in higher education is needed, but we need to get it right and above all do no harm."⁷ In a democracy, where individual excellence is a buzzword of widespread currency, the idea of one-size-fits all is anathema.

William G. Durden, President of Dickinson College, vigorously protests the Commission's "suggestion that one test would be appropriate for all types of higher education institutions regardless of mission" and its implication that all areas of human knowledge and insight should be "subject to quantitative assessment". Durden suggests that by this specious reasoning, such standardized, quantitative testing could logically be applied to measuring people of faith and that such an effort could be called "No God Left Behind."⁸

It is this very one-size-fits all mentality, reflected in the Commission's report, that characterizes so many of today's accountability practices. Not only do we chafe under such practices but we feel threatened and rightly so by the growing disconnect between quick fix managerial strategies and cogent administrative vision, between instruments of facilitation and that which supposedly is to be facilitated. Again, quoting

Boyle: “The big problem with numbers is what numbers won’t tell you. They don’t interpret. They won’t inspire and they won’t tell you what causes what.”⁹

It is not really a new dilemma but one that like many a virus grows in an increasing number of versions. And why has all this happened? The origins are multiple and many are beyond my understanding or expertise; but surely the radical explosion of knowledge of previous decades has been a factor. We have experienced years of experiment, exploration and thought. We have experienced new ways of thinking about our very selves and our place in a universe which is now recognized as multiverse. We now have very altered concepts of such basic stuffs as time and space and energy. It is a wonder that we survived the previous century without severe collective existential panic. Well, we survived because frankly we had no choice, but in so doing we have sometimes found ourselves encumbered by methods and modes of accommodation that are radically different from those used before and these have had impact on all our human institutions. We continue to strive for a culture of learning and creativity but today that effort is in a corporate context. That’s how we’ve quelled the existential panic. We’ve incorporated it.

We are right to rue old corporate models and their intrusion into our work, but a sensitive and ever evolving corporate model is in itself not an evil thing. The human body, for instance is a good example of a corporate organism consisting of specialized components with a central administration directed by a coordinated intelligence operation; and when it breaks down it is often because the program has a virus that the central intelligence has failed to scan, not because the whole corporate idea was wrong. Very often it breaks down because of the loss of center.

In my view a loss of center is *the critical cause* of institutional malaise and dysfunction in higher education today. Its symptoms are manifold. This loss of center is both the cause and the result of the dangerous separations between measurement mechanisms and the true nature of that which is to be measured. It can also be manifest in rigid curricula in which turf wars erupt between specializations. It reveals itself in an unthinking adherence to a mandated syllabus: “If it’s Tuesday it must be cubism.” It is apparent in administrative practices that have scant relevance to the disciplines being administered. I know it is a common habit in universities to rail against the central administration. I rail against central administration not because it is administration but because it is not central enough. I fear it is having a demoralizing and schismatizing affect on faculty morale and colloquy. It all reflects a distancing from center.

Those of us who may still remember the 70s may also remember Robert Pirsig’s *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance*. It had many engaging notions that could readily be applied to educational issues and to the art experience, as well as to taking a trip on a motorcycle. One strong image in the book was that of the oak tree and its vital growth principle. Pirsig’s point was that the more the mighty tree grew, outward and upward, with a proliferation of increasingly complex branches, the greater was the necessity for the deepening and strengthening of its roots. Branch expansion necessitates root expansion. The branch expansion has certainly occurred in our educational enterprise, in our colleges and universities and in our own arts disciplines. The deepening of the roots has not always happened; and when it doesn’t, the health of the organism is threatened. Those who have lived through a big storm know that the top-heavy tree with shallow roots topples. The loss of center can be fatal. We need to remember a warning by Epictetus: “... take care that you do not harm your governing principle.”

This room is full of leaders who know well the growing complexity of disciplines and the many new pressures that come with such growth. When the inbox is many times fuller than the outbox, it is so easy to be distanced from our central purposes and for whom they exist. When I chaired the Department of Dance at FSU, the configuration of our facilities was such that I had to walk through several studios quite a few times a day in order to go to and from my office and other places in the building. It was a bit inconvenient for all concerned but I liked it because I saw classes and rehearsals in progress throughout the day. In other words by necessity I saw that which I was administering. It was almost impossible to be isolated from the ongoing life of the department. In addition to the fact that I loved watching what was going on (it was a

welcome break from spreadsheets and reports), I also felt that it helped a bit to keep me on track. It often served as a reality check. I had to see the results of some of my mistakes as well as enjoy the vitality of the program. Most of all, it kept me connected to the center. I have always been afraid of the Dr. Strangelove syndrome in administration, similar to the condition in which the push-button general presses the button in some remote chamber and wreaks havoc on some distant battlefield, or the legislator who seldom sees the “battlefield.” Bearing witness to the results of our action is real accountability.

It is indeed alarmingly easy to become so involved in turning out the slick and perfect operational model that one becomes like the surgeon who says, “Well the operation was successful, but the patient died.” We do not expect the upper administrative officers of our institutions to make regular first hand contact with our individual units... although some make a mighty and laudable effort to do so. It behooves us more than ever to devise eloquent and clear means to communicate the uniqueness of our fields to them and to resist the one size fits all strategies that become mandates.

I suspect we have all noticed some changes in administrative personality at the uppermost institutional levels. Because there has been a widening chasm between those levels and the disciplines and programs themselves and because there has been the aforementioned rampant spread of reporting demands that attempt to force all responses into cookie cutter molds, the word *compliance* is heard more and more and the results of noncompliance are often punitive in nature. This can foster a climate of fear that results in a deep tainting of collegiality and sometimes a damaging rush to conformity, quite the opposite atmosphere to that in which creativity and experiment are fostered. The fear is sometimes evident in such things as promotion and tenure discussions, in faculty review processes, in most areas of assessment.

The issuing of mandates for compliance that not only have little relationship to a discipline but are sometimes actually hostile to it and that have implied penalties for noncompliance smacks of the bully pulpit in full power. It sometimes seems like governance by intimidation. This may get quick results (of whatever quality); it may get action. It may be quasi-efficient and yield sexy stats for fund-raising. It may be a lot of things. I’m not sure. But what it is not is leadership. It’s not that those who are issuing the calls for compliance are bad people; they’re just so far away and indeed are listening to different drummers. The drumbeats come from legislatures, corporate relationships, and perhaps from an imperial appetite to be bigger and better in both image and edifice. The walls of academe are covered with green but it is not the green of ivy; it is the green of money and it has grown all over those walls like kudzu. Harvard’s Derek Bok tells us that “Universities share one characteristic with compulsive gamblers and exiled royalty: there is never enough money to satisfy their desires.”¹⁰ The seemingly alien drumbeats cannot be ignored, not if we want to stay in the schoolhouse. But they can be acknowledged while maintaining at each discipline’s level our own coherencies and our own intimacies with the arts we serve.

We were warned almost a century ago by poets and playwrights and other artists that the managers would take over our lives and our public institutions--that the philosopher-king would become extinct. Implicit should have been the warning that the Groves of Academe would be invaded by number-crunchers and marketers, that managerial efficiency would take precedence over administrative vision. We have seen such things occur and we have let such things occur because as knowledge and our institutions drastically expanded, educational resources also often became scarcer, wasted, diluted and randomly distributed. So something had to happen. Enter, the Managers. They soon became the wunderkind of all our institutions. And frankly we have desperately needed them; well, what we have actually needed is managerial talent provided in tandem with a real understanding of the goals of the professoriate and the educational mission. In the worst scenario the managerial tail begins to wag the academic hounds of heaven. In the best outlook, the academic administrator who functions with both administrative vision and managerial savvy emerges as the saving grace in the current academic context. Ideally such an administrator has come up through an arts discipline and has experienced art first hand as well as having developed administrative abilities. There is these days however a new model reflected in the emergence of the arts administrator who has been trained and credentialed in administration without reference to a specific disciplinary neighborhood. This generalist managerial breed is often well versed in the logistics and practices of institutional structures, is alert to

demographic vicissitudes, and is often *au courant* regarding trends and policy shifts. This can be helpful. One has to wonder however if the expertise of the generalist manager can be sensitively calibrated to the unique natures of the specific disciplines to be served. It can perhaps but only if the skills of such management can function in close alliance with the administrative vision of one who knows the art, one “who has drunk at the well”, one who provides leadership that is discipline specific while at the same time being in touch with comprehensive educational mission. That is one of our best strategies for retaining our coherencies and diminishing the distancing that occurs within the University complex.

One of the things that has always struck me about the College of Music at my home institution is how close the administrators stay to the art. I know associate deans who have very full administrative responsibilities but who are also out there concertizing, performing, doing active research, and of course teaching. They continue to be an inspiration.

So, after all these considerations, what can be done?

There’s an old Southern saying that cautions us not to open a wound unless we have an ointment to put on it. So, enough of the rant; let’s consider some “ointment”... perhaps even some preventive medicine.

If we continue to safeguard the place of art at the center of all our operations, we may keep the advantage in the accelerating contest between expansion and authenticity. In this corporate world, this simply means that we must keep art at the heart of the business. It’s just that simple and just that hard.

It takes constant monitoring of our own practices and policies at the discipline’s own level, as well as vigilance concerning actions and policies at upper administrative levels.

This means that we look at every decision we make regarding curriculum, promotion and tenure, budget, faculty and staff hires, fundraising, etc., to be assured that such decisions are consonant with the art itself and are in the best interests of the students and faculty whose artistic and intellectual interests we are stewarding. In short, we must continue to insist that our practices and policies keep the vital art experience at the center of all we do, whether it be in studio, performance arena, theoretical and critical research, etc. Such monitoring is a rigorous lens.

I am well aware that I’m probably preaching to the choir and that you may feel that such rigor is a “given” in your daily lives, but I have an ongoing belief that regular diagnostic exams are good for every organism.

Such vigilance requires us to exercise our imaginative responses in developing our own arts-centered models and paradigms for assessment, evaluation, and accountability; and this, of course requires us to develop the necessary political strategies with which to implement them.

We can so easily be coerced into mandated models that have no real relationship to our fields. John Tusa warns us against “becoming willing prisoners of words, concepts, ideas and phrases which have no connection with the real business of creating art.”¹¹ We must speak in our own language, the language of art. And we also know that that’s often easier said than done.

Due vigilance requires us

- to articulate in every forum that is available to us the primacy of art as language, as an intrinsic part of literacy.
- to demonstrate that the individual art act becomes even more important in a society that is becoming increasingly totalitarian, bureaucratic, and micromanaged, and that this act is critical for human beings of every age.
- to identify and nurture leadership that focuses first on the art and the learner and then develops the appropriate strategies with which to manage and administer.

Am I in despair about the arts in higher education and in today's society? Only at moments and never permanently.

During the many years of developing and administering a dance program, there were very few days when I did not feel keen discouragement and there were very few days when I did not also feel joyousness and gratitude at being in the midst of all that wonderful, untamed art-making mix.

I believe that the arts will survive because I believe that we have to do this art-making thing. I believe it to be a biological imperative. We've always done it. We have always felt the forceful need to reach into the inner hemisphere, the self inside of us, and take some bit of it, throw it outside, cast it into another form, into something *else*, something *other...* so that we, and perhaps others, can see it, can hear it... can begin to perceive what we may have glimpsed only dimly. When we make art we seize the power to transform thought and feeling and observation and make it into something else. We re-tailor our perceptions to fit another moment. I believe it is all part of that ache for fuller consciousness and I believe we all have it.

The real stuff, the actual art experience (actually doing it, making it, perceiving it) is demanding, essential (in that it deals with essences), fundamental, rigorous. It is often uncomfortable; it requires labor and generosity, discipline and the willingness to be free. It is profoundly selfish (in that it penetrates and excavates the stuffs of self) and it is stunningly selfless in that it exposes the self and the fruits of its labor to many diverse marketplaces. It creates intimacy, invites vulnerability. It is transformational power.

That's why the arts won't die. Ever.

Dancers know that dance lies between the steps. And Isaac Stern said that music lies between the notes. Potent, unquantifiable, infinite.

Do we need more art? Probably not. But we do need to go on doing it and helping others to have the experience. Yes.

Because as novelist Jim Crace writes, "There is no remedy for death---or birth---except to hug the spaces in-between. Live loud. Live wide. Live tall."¹²

Art is a way of hugging the spaces in-between. It is our best defense against the weapons of mass instruction.

ENDNOTES

1. JaanWhitehead, "Art Will Out," *American Theatre*, October, 2003,31.
2. Susan Sontag, Against Interpretation (New York: Dell publishing co., 1966), 35.
3. John Tusa, "The Language of the Arts", Ted Greenfield Lecture, March 7, 2002.
4. David Boyle, The Tyranny of Numbers (London: Harper Collins Publishers, 2000) 60.
5. Ibid., 216-217.
6. Mary Beth Marklein, "Panel Calls for 'urgent reform' of Higher Education", USA TODAY.
7. Ibid.
8. William G. Durden, "No God Left Behind".
9. Boyle, op.cit., 223.
10. Derek Bok, Universities in the Marketplace (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2003) 9.
11. Tusa, op.cit.
12. Jim Crace, quoted in John Banville, "A Rare Species", *New York Review of Books*, April 13, 2000, 32.