

PUBLIC POLICY IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION¹
Course Number EDUC 764/PUBPOL 732/POLSCI 734
Winter Semester, 2017

Location	2340 School of Education Building
Time	Thursdays from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 pm
Instructor	Awilda Rodriguez Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education University of Michigan 2117-F School of Education Building telephone: 734-615-9641 e-mail: awilda@umich.edu
Office hours	By appointment, to be arranged via email.

Course Structure and Objectives: This course is designed to introduce students to the debates, research, and frameworks that shape public policy in higher education. EDUC 764 is divided into three areas. First, we will examine factors that influence access to higher education and the various stakeholders who finance it – both from an historical and contemporary perspective. We will then review the contemporary practices, procedures, and protocols used to evaluate the effectiveness of higher education policies. This will be followed by an examination of the policy levers that hold institutions accountable, provide transparency, and evaluate policy objectives. We then situate the public policy process in the higher education context and explore the conceptual and theoretical frameworks used to understand it.

This course is crafted to provide students with foundational tools to study or work in higher education public policy through the combination of the assigned readings, lectures, classroom discussion, and writing assignments. Students will increase their understanding of the various tensions and tradeoffs made in order to craft policy; use the models that describe those processes; and examine the various structures and actors. Moreover, students will gain an understanding of the historical underpinnings of some of the most important higher education policies. In addition, they will be able to clearly articulate current policy challenges and proposed solutions from a variety of perspectives. Students will also become aware of the variety of sources used to discuss, debate, evaluate, and influence higher education policy. Finally, students will be able to succinctly discuss a variety of pressing higher education issues and gain experience presenting and defending their ideas.

The readings for EDUC 764 are in a variety of formats (e.g., scholarly journal articles, book chapters, policy reports) designed to cover an array of interests. As the field of public policy lends itself to debate, the readings and in class discussions are intended to represent a variety of viewpoints and interests. The resources provided alongside the weekly readings (demarcated “[Resource]”) as well as in the classroom allow students to further probe particular interests.

Policy on Accommodating Students with Special Needs: If you think you need an accommodation for a disability, please let me know at your earliest convenience. Some aspects of this course, the assignments, the in-class activities, and the way the course is usually taught may be modified to facilitate your participation and

¹ Segments of this syllabus are modified from Stephen DesJardin’s Winter 2013 EDUC 764 syllabus.

progress. As soon as you make me aware of your needs, we can work with the Office of Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) to help us determine appropriate academic accommodations. SSD ([734-763-3000](tel:734-763-3000); ssd.umich.edu) typically recommends accommodation through a Verified Individualized Services and Accommodations (VISA) form. Any information you provide is private and confidential and will be treated as such.

Policy on Diversity: The materials and activities presented throughout the course intended to be respectful of our diverse world. I encourage you to provide suggestions and feedback on how we can incorporate new materials to improve the course for all students. The University of Michigan has a number of affirmative action policies and these policies can be found at: <http://www.umich.edu/~hrraa/oie/>

Religious Observation: This class observes University defined holidays (such as Spring break). Because other days may be of more significance than a University-designated holiday, please inform me as soon as possible if a class day or due date for a class assignment conflicts with your observance of a holiday important to you. I will work with you to accommodate your needs.

Academic Integrity: Operating under the highest standards of academic integrity is implied and assumed. Academic integrity includes issues of content and process. Treating the course and class participants with respect, honoring class expectations and assignments, and seeking to derive maximum learning from the experience reflect some of the process aspects of academic integrity. Claiming ownership only of your own unique work and ideas, providing appropriate attribution of others' material and quotes, clearly indicating all paraphrasing, and providing the trail to the original source of any idea are key components to the content of academic integrity. Aspire to the spirit and highest representation of academic integrity. I would also encourage you to read the University's General Catalogue, especially the sections that detail your rights as a student and the section that discusses the University's expectations of you as a student. (See <http://www.rackham.umich.edu/StudentInfo/Publications>.)

Course Conduct: The format of this course is designed to leverage the opinions, experiences, and knowledge of classroom participants in order to produce a safe and robust learning environment. In other words, we will all learn from each other. Therefore, students are expected to adhere to the following guidelines² for classroom participation:

- (1) **Confidentiality.** We want to create an atmosphere for open, honest exchange. (No live tweeting!)
- (2) **Respect others' rights to hold opinions and beliefs that differ from your own.**
- (3) **Challenge the idea and not the person.** If we wish to challenge something that has been said, we will challenge the idea or the practice referred to, not the individual sharing this idea or practice.
- (4) **Be courteous.** Don't interrupt or engage in private conversations while others are speaking.
- (5) **Support your statements.** Use evidence and provide a rationale for your points.
- (6) **Tone of voice and body language** can be intimidating, can silence others, provoke others, or hurt others. (No eye rolling permitted.)

Evaluation: Students will be evaluated on three different components – classroom participation, a policy report, and a presentation, described below. Final grades will be on an A-F scale.

Classroom Participation (25%): Class attendance is required. Frequent tardiness and/or absences will negatively affect your grade.

- **Canvas Postings (15 points):** Each week, by 8:00pm on the night before class, you will submit your answer to a question related to the week's readings through the

² Source: UM Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT)

Assignments tab. Your paragraph-length response should include a combination of in-depth analysis across and cite specific evidence from the readings. Some weeks I may ask that your contribution take another format.

- **Engagement (10 points):** Students are expected to come prepared to class by critically reading the indicated material in the course schedule, reflecting on the material using the guided questions, and having comments or questions prepared for class. While in class, students are expected to engage in classroom discussion and be respectful of presenters. Cell phones and other noise-making devices should be silenced and stored during class time.

Policy Report (75%): Policy reports are an important communication tool for examining policy problems and solutions. Throughout the course, students will work in research teams to address four different policy problems in college access, affordability, and success. The goal of this assignment is to produce a policy report of publishable quality that addresses one of the 4 topic areas discussed in class.

Team Assignments: Students will rank order their preferences on the first week of class, and will be assigned to teams accordingly. The instructor will craft teams based on student preferences and skill sets; students are not guaranteed their top choices. Assignments are final. This course relies heavily on teamwork. Students are expected to actively participate in all aspects of the report and will be asked to grade their teammates' contributions at the end of the term.

Schedule of policy report assignments:

Step 1: Understand the context. (Due February 2nd, 5 pages, at least 12 sources) **[5 pts]**

The purpose of this assignment is to understand the policy/the problem to be examined. This will be achieved by accessing the original legislation, reports, scholarly work, and media coverage surrounding the policy.

Step 2: Understand the data. (Due February 16th, 4-5 pages + table[s]). **[10 pts]**

The purpose of this assignment is for your team to demonstrate an understanding of the available data and the operationalization of measures. Much of this will become your Methodology section or appendix. While the suggested pagination is short, this assignment will take a lot of time. Students are urged to start as soon as possible.

Step 3: Analyze data + present findings. (Due March 9th, 5 pages + tables/figures) **[15 pts]**

Once your data is clean, you are ready to answer your research questions. In this section you will include a description of your analytical approach to answering your research questions and a presentation of your findings. Teams are expected to include at least one infographic and are strongly encouraged to utilize visual software such as: [Tableau](#) (free full student version); [Raw](#); [infoagr.am](#).

Step 4: Report Draft. (Due March 30th, 15-20 pages + tables/figures + methodology appendix) **[20 pts]**

This draft will combine edited versions of all of the steps above and add an implications/discussion section. This section should include a discussion on the implications for policy and recommendations for policymakers that should be grounded in extant literature or best practices (and cited appropriately).

Step 5: Policy Report Presentations. (on March 30th) **[10 pts]**

Students will have an opportunity to present their projects (in PowerPoint or similar software) to their peers and receive feedback.

Step 6: Final Draft (Due April 13th, 15-20 pages + tables/figures + methodology appendix)**[10 pts]**

Teams will turn in a final draft, with incorporated feedback.

Peer Grade [5 pts]: Because this assignment relies heavily on teamwork, students will be asked to score their teammates' involvement in the project.

Course Changes Policy: The instructor reserves the right to alter information in this syllabus as needed to accurately reflect the course coverage and to enhance the learning outcomes of the course. When or if changes are necessary, they will be announced in advance and students will have appropriate time to make adjustments.

Course Schedule & Weekly Assignments

Introduction

Week 1
January 5th **An introduction to the course:** This class will serve as an introduction to the course, expectations, and classroom participants.

No readings assigned.

I. Access and Affordability

Week 2
January 12th **The postsecondary pipeline: The demand side of access**

- Eaton, J. S. (2010). "The Evolution of Access Policy: 1965-1990" in Lovell, C.D., Larson, T.E., Dean, D.R. and Longanecker, D.L. (Eds.) Public Policy and Higher Education: Second Edition, Boston, MA: Pearson Learning Solutions.
- Glancy et al. (2014). Blue Print for College Readiness. Denver: Education Commission of the States. Retrieved from <http://www.ecs.org/ec-content/uploads/ECSBlueprint1.pdf> Pages 4-24 and 47-51
- Castleman, B. (2015). "Prompts, personalization and payoffs: Strategies to improve the design and delivery of college and financial aid information" in B. Castleman, S. Schwartz, & S. Baum (Eds.) Decision Making for Student Success: Behavioral Insights to Improve College Access and Persistence. New York: Routledge.
[RESOURCE] The College Board (2014). The 10th Annual AP Report to the Nation. New York, NY: Author. Retrieved from <http://apreport.collegeboard.org/>
[RESOURCE] ACT. (2014). The Condition of College and Career Readiness. Iowa City, IA: Author. Retrieved at <http://www.act.org/newsroom/data/2014/pdf/CCCR14-NationalReadinessRpt.pdf>
[RESOURCE] DesJardins, S. L. and Toutkoushian, R. K. (2005). "Are Students Really Rational? The Development of Rational Choice and Its Application to Student Choice" in J. C. Smart (Ed.). Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research Vol. XX. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
[RESOURCE] Callan, P. M., Finney, J. E., Kirst, M. W., Usdan, M. D., and Venezia, A. (2006). Claiming Common Ground: State Policymaking for Improving College Readiness and Success. San Jose, CA: NCPPHE.
[RESOURCE] Cabrera, A. F. and LaNasa, S. M. (Eds.) (2000). Understanding the College Choice of Disadvantaged Students. New Directions for Institutional Research, Issue 107. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Week 3
January 19th **Building the system: The supply side of access**

- Chapter 6 (Educational Capacity in American Higher Education) in Zumeta, W., Breneman, D.W., Callan, P.M., & Finney, J.E. (2012). Financing American Higher Education in the Era of Globalization, Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- New America. (n.d.). Higher education accreditation: A background primer. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from:
http://pnpi.newamerica.net/spotlight_issue_higher_education_accreditation
- Eaton, J.S. (2007). Institutions, accreditors, and the federal government: Redefining their "appropriate position." Retrieved from Change Magazine website
<http://www.changemag.org/Archives/Back%20Issues/September-October%202007/full->

- institutions-accreditors.html
- Carey, K. (2007). Truth without action: The myth of higher-education accountability, Retrieved from Change Magazine website <http://www.changemag.org/Archives/Back%20Issues/September-October%202007/full-truth-without-action.html>
 - Southern Regional Education Board. (2014). State Authorization: SREB and the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA). Atlanta: Author. Retrieved from http://www.sreb.org/page/1740/state_authorization.html
 - [SKIM] Carnevale, A.P. & Strohl, J. (2013). Separate & Unequal: How higher education reinforces the intergenerational reproduction of White racial privilege. Washington, DC: Georgetown Public Policy Institute, Center on Education and the Workforce. Available at <http://cew.georgetown.edu/separateandunequal>
- [RESOURCE] State Higher Education Executive Officers. (2011). SHEEO State Authorization Survey: Analysis of selected data elements for 50 US states and DC. Boulder, CO: Author. Retrieved from Survey Summary <http://www.sheeo.org/sites/default/files/project-files/Summative%20Analysis%20of%20Survey%20Data.pdf>
- [RESOURCE] Lee, M. (2014, January 15). New School: A plan for state-based accreditation of alternative higher education. Retrieved from the Federalist website: <http://thefederalist.com/2014/01/15/new-school-a-plan-for-state-based-accreditation-of-alternative-higher-education/>
- [RESOURCE] Posselt, J.R., Jaquette, O., Bielby, R., Bastedo, M.N. (2012). Access without equity: Longitudinal analyses of institutional stratification by race and ethnicity, 1972-2004. American Educational Research Journal, 49(6), 1074-1111
- [RESOURCE] The Chronicle of Higher Education. (2014, January 16). Details of college commitments to help low-income students. Available at <http://chronicle.com/article/Details-of-College-Commitments/144073/>

Week 4 College Affordability: Tuition
January 26th

- [SKIM] College Board (2015). Trends in College Pricing 2015. New York: Author. Available at the College Board website <https://trends.collegeboard.org/college-pricing>.
 - Weeden, D. (2015). Hot topics in higher education: Tuition Policy. Washington, DC: National Conference of State Legislatures. Retrieved from <http://www.ncsl.org/research/education/tuition-policy.aspx>
 - Flores, S.M. & Sheperd, J.C. (2014). Pricing out the disadvantaged? The effect of tuition deregulation in Texas public four-year institutions. The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 65(1), 99-122.
 - Bennett, W. J. (1987). Our Greedy Colleges. New York: The New York Times. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/1987/02/18/opinion/our-greedy-colleges.html>
 - Mathews, D. (2013). The Tuition is too Damn High, Part V - Is the economy forcing colleges to spend more? Retrieved from Wonkblog website at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2013/08/30/the-tuition-is-too-damn-high-part-v-is-the-economy-forcing-colleges-to-spend-more/?utm_term=.ee397c998011
- [RESOURCE] DesJardins, S. L. (1999). Simulating the Enrollment Effects of Changes in the Tuition Reciprocity Agreement Between Minnesota and Wisconsin. Research in Higher Education, 40(6), 705-716.
- [RESOURCE] Flores, S. (2010). State Dream Acts: The Effect of In-State Resident Tuition Policies and Undocumented Latino Students. The Review of Higher Education, 33 (2), 239-

283.

Week 5
February 2nd **College Affordability: Financial Aid**

- Doyle, W. (2009). Access, Choice and Excellence: The Competing Goals of State Student Financial Aid Programs. In Baum, S., McPherson, M., and Steele, P. *The Effectiveness of Student Aid Policies: What the Research Tells Us*. New York: The College Board.
- Madzellan, D. (2013, June). The Politics of Student Aid. Paper presented at The trillion - dollar question: Reinventing student financial aid for the 21st century, Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://www.aei.org/files/2013/06/21/-kelly-madzelandan_085407140605.pdf
- Creech, J. D. & Davis, J. S. (2002). Merit Based vs. Need Based Aid: The Continual Issues for Policymakers in King, J. E. (Ed.), *Financing a College Education: How It Works, How It's Changing*. Westport, CT: American Council on Education, Series on Higher Education, Oryx Press.
[RESOURCE] Dynarski, S. & Wiederspan, M. (2012). Student aid simplification: Looking back and looking ahead (NBER Working Paper Series No. 17834). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
[RESOURCE] Baum, S., Little, K., Ma, J., & Sturtevant, A. (2012). Simplifying student aid: What it would mean for states. Washington, DC: College Board. Retrieved from <http://media.collegeboard.com/digitalServices/pdf/advocacy/homeorg/advocacy-state-simplification-report.pdf>.
[RESOURCE] Curs, B. R., Singell, L. D., Jr., & Waddell, G. R. (2007). The Pell program at thirty years. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research: Vol. XXII* (pp. 281-334). New York: Springer. Pp 281-297 only

Week 6
February 9th **Higher Education Finance**

- Thelin, J.R. (2004). Higher education and the public trough: A historical perspective. In *Public Funding of Higher Education: Changing Contexts and New Rationales*, edited by E.P. St. John & M. Parsons. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press. Chapter 2.
- Bell, J. D. (2008). Getting what you pay for: The nuts and bolts of the higher education legislative appropriations process. Washington, D.C.: National Conference of State Legislators.
- Wellman, J. (2008). The higher education funding disconnect: Spending more, getting less. *Change*, 40(6), 18-25.
- Jones, D. (2003). Aligning fiscal policies with state objectives. In *Policies in sync: Appropriations, tuition, and financial aid for higher education. A compilation of selected papers*. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.
[RESOURCE] State Higher Education Executive Officers. (2014). *State higher education finance FY 2013*. Denver, CO: Author. Retrieved at http://www.sheeo.org/sites/default/files/publications/SHEF_FY13_04292014.pdf
[RESOURCE] Desrochers, D.M. & Hurlburt, S. (2014). *Trends in college spending: 2001-2011*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. Retrieved from the Delta Cost Project website:
http://www.deltacostproject.org/sites/default/files/products/Delta%20Cost_Trends%20College%20Spending%202001-2011_071414_rev.pdf
[RESOURCE] The National Association of State Budget Officers. (2013). *Improving Postsecondary Education Through the Budget Process: Challenges and Opportunities*.

Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from
<http://www.nasbo.org/sites/default/files/pdf/Improving%20Postsecondary%20Education%20Through%20the%20Budget%20Process-Challenges%20and%20Opportunities.pdf>

II. Outcomes and Accountability

Week 7 Student Outcomes: Retention, Completion, and Learning

February 16th

- Bettinger, E. P. and Long, B. T. (2005). Addressing the Needs of Under-Prepared Students in Higher Education: Does College Remediation Work? Working paper, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Offenstein, J., Moore, C., Shulock, N. (2010). Advancing by degrees: A framework for increasing college completion. Sacramento, CA: Institute for Higher Education Leadership & Policy, The Education Trust. Retrieved from http://www.csus.edu/ihelp/Pdfs/R_advbydegrees_0510.pdf
- Hauptman, A. (2012). "Increasing higher education attainment in the United States" in Kelly, A.P and Schneider, M. (Eds.), Getting to graduation: The completion agenda in higher education (pp. 17-47). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Miller, B. (2014, August 13). Policy choices for measuring student learning. Retrieved from the New America EdCentral website: <http://www.edcentral.org/policy-choices-measuring-student-learning/>
[RESOURCE] Gallup, Inc.. (2014). Great jobs great lives: The 2014 Gallup-Purdue Index report. Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved from <http://products.gallup.com/168857/gallup-purdue-index-inaugural-national-report.aspx>
[RESOURCE] Shapiro, D., Dundar, A., Chen, J., Ziskin, M., Park, E., Torres, V., Chiang, Y. (2013). Completing College: A State-level view of student attainment rates. Herndon, VA: National Student Clearinghouse. Retrieved from http://nscresearchcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/NSC_Signature_Report_4-StateLevel.pdf
[RESOURCE] Obama, B. (2009, February 24). Remarks of President Barack Obama – As Prepared for Delivery. Retrieved from http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-of-President-Barack-Obama-Address-to-Joint-Session-of-Congress
[RESOURCE] Complete College America. (2013). The Game Changers: Are states implementing the best reforms to get more college graduates? Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://completecollege.org/pdfs/CCA%20Nat%20Report%20Oct18-FINAL-singles.pdf>
[RESOURCE] Dwyer, C. A., Millett, C. M., and Payne, D. G. (2006). A Culture of Evidence: Postsecondary Assessment and Learning Outcomes. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
[RESOURCE] Bosworth, B. (2012)."Certificate pathways to postsecondary success and good jobs" in Kelly, A.P and Schneider, M. (Eds.), Getting to graduation: The completion agenda in higher education (pp. 102-125). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Week 8 Accountability & Consumer Information

February 23rd

- Dougherty, K., Natow, R.S., Bork, R.H., Jones, S.M., Vega, B.E. (2013). Accounting for Higher Education Accountability: Political origins of State Performance Funding for Higher Education. Teacher's College Record, 115(January), pp 1-50
- Breneman, D. W. (2005). Are the States and Public Higher Education Striking A New Bargain? Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards.
- Introduction & Part IV: Quality and Accountability in Immerwahr, J., Johnson, J., Gasbarra, P.

- (2008). The Iron Triangle: College Presidents talk about costs, access, and quality. San Jose, CA: The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. Retrieved from http://www.highereducation.org/reports/iron_triangle/IronTriangle.pdf
- Supiano, B. (2015). What Actual High Schoolers Think of the New College Scorecard. The Chronicle of Higher Education.
[RESOURCE] Kelly, A.P. & Schneider, M. (2011, February 2). What parents don't know about graduation rates can hurt (Education Outlook No. 2). Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.aei.org/files/2011/02/08/EduO-2011-02-g.pdf>
 - [RESOURCE] Kirp, D. L. and Roberts, P. S. (2003). Mr. Jefferson's 'Private' College in Shakespeare, Einstein, and the Bottom Line: The Marketing of Higher Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
 - [RESOURCE] Bergeron, D. (2013, February 27). Guidance on implementing the Net Price Calculator Requirement [Letter]. Retrieved from <http://ifap.ed.gov/dpccletters/attachments/GEN1307.pdf>

Week 9 Spring Break – No Class
March 2nd

III. Public Policy Process and Theory

Week 10 Through the lens of public policy theory
March 9th

- Chapters 2 (Equity) & 3 (Efficiency) in Stone, D.A. (2001). Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making (Revised Edition). New York: W.W. Norton.
- Kingdon, J. W. (2010). Wrapping Things Up in Lovell, C.D., Larson, T.E., Dean, D.R. and Longanecker, D.L. (Eds.) Public Policy and Higher Education: Second Edition, Boston, MA: Pearson Learning Solutions.
- Pages 6 to 14 in Richardson, R. & Martinez, M. (2009). Policy and Performance in American Higher Education. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
[RESOURCE] DesJardins, S. L. (2001). "Understanding and Using Efficiency and Equity Criteria in the Study of Higher Education Policy" in J. C. Smart (Ed.) Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, Vol. XVII. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Week 11 Influencing Postsecondary Public Policy
March 16th

- Pages 1-15 in Ness, E. (2010). "The Role of Information in the Policy Process: Implications for the Examination of Research Utilization in Higher Education Policy" in J. C. Smart (Ed.). Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research Vol. XXV. New York, NY: Springer Science+Business Media.
- Immerwahr, J. & Johnson, J. (2010). Squeeze play 2010: Continued public anxiety on cost, harsher judgments on how colleges are run. New York, NY: Public Agenda, The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. Retrieved from <http://www.publicagenda.org/files/SqueezePlay2010report.pdf>
- Parry, M., Field, K., & Supiano, B. (2013, July 13). The Gates Effect. Retrieved from The Chronicle of Higher Education website: <http://chronicle.com/article/The-Gates-Effect/140323/>
- McCann, C. & Laitinen, A. (2014). College blackout: How the higher education lobby fought to keep students in the dark. Washington, D.C.: New America Foundation <http://newamerica.net/sites/newamerica.net/files/policydocs/CollegeBlackoutFINAL.pdf>

[RESOURCE] List of Higher Education Organizations
'<http://www.ihep.org/Resources/organizations.cfm>

[RESOURCE] Oliver, P. E. (1993). Formal Models of Collective Action. Annual Review of Sociology, 19: 271–300. PAGES 271-277 ONLY

Week 12
March 23rd **Evaluation of Postsecondary Policies**

- Gill, J.I. and Saunders, L. (2010). "Conducting Policy Analysis in Higher Education" in Lovell, C.D., Larson, T.E., Dean, D.R. and Longanecker, D.L. (Eds.) Public Policy and Higher Education: Second Edition, Boston, MA: Pearson Learning Solutions.
 - Chapters 1-3 in Schneider, B., Carnoy, M., Kilpatrick, J., Schmidt, W. H., and Shavelson, R. J. (2007). Estimating Causal Effects Using Experimental and Observational Designs. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association. Retrieved from http://www.aera.net/publications/Default.aspx?menu_id=46&id=3360&terms=causal&searchtype=1&fragment=False
 - Brock, T. (2010). Evaluating programs for community college students: How do we know what works? Paper presented at the White House Summit on Community Colleges, Washington, DC. Retrieved from <http://www.mdrc.org/sites/default/files/paper.pdf>
- [RESOURCE] Adelman, C. (2009). The Spaces Between Numbers: Getting International Data on Higher Education Straight. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Higher Education Policy.
- [RESOURCE] Irwin, L. G. (2010). "The Scientific Method, Social Science, and Policy Analysis" in Lovell, C.D., Larson, T.E., Dean, D.R. and Longanecker, D.L. (Eds.) Public Policy and Higher Education: Second Edition, Boston, MA: Pearson Learning Solutions.

Week 13
March 30th **Class Presentations**

Week 14
April 6th **Contemporary Issues in Postsecondary Education**

TBA

Week 14
April 13th **Wrapping it up / papers due at 5pm**