

General Education Course Information Sheet

Please submit this sheet for each proposed course

<i>Department & Course Number</i>	Education 98T
<i>Course Title</i>	Consumerism and Commercialization in Higher Education
<i>Indicate if Seminar and/or Writing II course</i>	Seminar

1 Check the recommended GE foundation area(s) and subgroups(s) for this course

Foundations of the Arts and Humanities

- Literary and Cultural Analysis _____
- Philosophic and Linguistic Analysis _____
- Visual and Performance Arts Analysis and Practice _____

Foundations of Society and Culture

- Historical Analysis _____
- Social Analysis X _____

Foundations of Scientific Inquiry

- Physical Science _____
With Laboratory or Demonstration Component must be 5 units (or more)
- Life Science _____
With Laboratory or Demonstration Component must be 5 units (or more)

2. Briefly describe the rationale for assignment to foundation area(s) and subgroup(s) chosen.

Contemporary trends in higher education have encouraged a consumer mentality towards our thinking of colleges and universities. This course introduces students to the consumer dynamics and opportunities they encounter as they move through the college pipeline.

3. List faculty member(s) who will serve as instructor (give academic rank):

Instructor: Amy Liu, Teaching Fellow / Faculty mentor: Robert Rhoads, Professor

Do you intend to use graduate student instructors (TAs) in this course? Yes No X

If yes, please indicate the number of TAs

3. Indicate when do you anticipate teaching this course over the next three years:

2010-2011	Fall	_____	Winter	X _____	Spring	_____
	Enrollment	_____	Enrollment	16 _____	Enrollment	_____
2011-2012	Fall	_____	Winter	_____	Spring	_____
	Enrollment	_____	Enrollment	_____	Enrollment	_____
2012-2013	Fall	_____	Winter	_____	Spring	_____
	Enrollment	_____	Enrollment	_____	Enrollment	_____

3. GE Course Units

Is this an **existing** course that has been modified for inclusion in the new GE? Yes No X

If yes, provide a brief explanation of what has changed.

Present Number of Units:	Proposed Number of Units:	5
--------------------------	---------------------------	---

3. Please present concise arguments for the GE principles applicable to this course.

- ❑ General Knowledge

This course will provide students with a contemporary overview of social and cultural inquiry in the field of higher education. This knowledge will extend beyond facts and introduce students to theories, methodologies, and ways of knowing central to social science and educational research.
- ❑ Integrative Learning

Students will be encouraged to consider different approaches to the study of commercialization in higher education as informed by a range of critical, social, and cultural studies theoretical perspectives and that traverse education, economic, and social science disciplines.
- ❑ Ethical Implications

This course will inform students about important trends and problems in higher education, especially as they pertain to access, equity, and the public good of higher education.
- ❑ Cultural Diversity

Students will be expected to understand the issues discussed in this course with respect for the multiplicity of viewpoints that our myriad identities, such as race, ethnicity, gender, class, and immigration status, may engender when navigating the college pipeline.
- ❑ Critical Thinking

The readings for the course and the class discussions they will yield will help students develop their ability to make critical and logical assessments of research evidence, policy arguments, and contemporary trends.
- ❑ Rhetorical Effectiveness

The pedagogical discussions and writing assignments will allow students to develop their ability to frame and deliver a reasoned and persuasive argument.
- ❑ Problem-solving

The methods scholars draw upon to analyze and study the various topics of this course will help students to develop their own ability to conceptualize problems confronting higher education and to determine what knowledge and tools are needed to begin offering solutions.
- ❑ Library & Information Literacy

Students will be expected to search, select, organize, and manage relevant information from multiple sources. They will also be expected to differentiate between what serves as legitimate and credible sources and evidence in academic inquiry versus the general public domain.

(A) STUDENT CONTACT PER WEEK (if not applicable write N/A)

- | | | |
|---|-----------------|---------|
| 1. Lecture: | 3 | (hours) |
| 2. Discussion Section: | <u> </u> | (hours) |
| 3. Labs: | <u> </u> | (hours) |
| 4. Experiential (service learning, internships, other): | <u> </u> | (hours) |
| 5. Field Trips: | <u> </u> | (hours) |

(A) TOTAL Student Contact Per Week 3 **(HOURS)**

(B) OUT-OF-CLASS HOURS PER WEEK (if not applicable write N/A)

- | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------|
| 1. General Review & Preparation: | <u> </u> | (hours) |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------|

- 2. Reading 5 (hours)
- 3. Group Projects: _____ (hours)
- 4. Preparation for Quizzes & Exams: _____ (hours)
- 5. Information Literacy Exercises: _____ (hours)
- 6. Written Assignments: 3 (hours)
- 7. Research Activity: 2 (hours)

(B) TOTAL Out-of-class time per week

12	(HOURS)
15	(HOURS)

GRAND TOTAL (A) + (B) must equal at least 15 hours/week

CONSUMERISM AND COMMERCIALIZATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Proposed Course Syllabus

Instructor: Amy Liu
Office hours: By appointment
Email: amy.liu@ucla.edu

Course Description

Contemporary trends in higher education have encouraged a consumer mentality towards our thinking of colleges and universities. Viewed and engaged as consumers, students moving through the college pipeline face an onslaught of commercial forces, the beginnings of which are accentuated during the admissions process. As national news outlets ostensibly feed into the conventional wisdom that admission to the nation's top-ranking colleges and universities has grown increasingly competitive, some students have sought to leverage their own opportunities by turning to an expanding for-profit admissions sector composed of test prep, private college counseling, and rankings. Once on campus, students transform from college applicants into captive markets to be further mined for revenue. Capitalizing on the potential of a captive market, institutions and interested external parties contribute to the commercial sphere of higher education with myriad opportunities for fostering a consumer attitude and promoting campus consumer capitalism.

This seminar explores the consumer dynamics and opportunities students encounter as they move through the college pipeline. From admissions and beyond, we critically examine what it means to buy and sell our way through higher education. Students enrolled in this course will have an opportunity to ground their experiential knowledge of higher education within the theoretical foundations of campus commercialization. Students will be challenged to analyze the underlying philosophical assumptions of what it means to be a consumer of higher education. Are we, as students, empowered consumers free to make our own choices or are we a captive audience that powerful institutions can take advantage of for financial gain? Further, what are the social, cultural, and political consequences of our consumer behavior and attitude toward higher education?

Course Objectives

The goals of this seminar are to:

1. inform you about the theories, methods, and research findings related to consumerism and commercialization in higher education.
2. understand key approaches to the study of student and campus consumerism.
3. help you recognize the broader impact of the consumer and commercial trends in higher education on other aspects of social life.
4. foster a positive classroom environment in which you are free to discuss, question, and debate class readings and topics.
5. develop your capacity for critical scholarly engagement through student-led pedagogical discussions.
6. improve your analytical and writing skills via semi-weekly thought papers and the process of developing a research paper.

Course Requirements

Class Participation and Pedagogical Discussion. Students are expected to complete all reading assignments in a thorough and critical manner prior to each class. Because this is a seminar, class discussions are an important part of the educational experience. Students should come to class with their readings, notes, and questions, ready to be active participants. Additionally, every week one or two students will lead a pedagogical discussion of the readings, to be selected during the first class meeting. Essentially, students will take a turn at facilitating a class discussion and/or activity during the first hour of class. Successful discussion leaders will give a brief overview of the readings, indicate what the author is writing for or against, and pose questions to the group and/or engage in an activity designed to spark discussion. Students are encouraged to be creative in their approach in order to foster an interactive and lively discussion. Students leading the pedagogical discussions for the week are required to meet with the instructor at least two days prior to the class.

Thought Papers. To aid in your preparation for class, most weeks will have a 1-2 page “thought” paper due 24 hours before the start of class. Please email these papers to me at amy.liu@ucla.edu and put your last name, followed by Thought Paper Week #1, 2, etc. as the subject line of the email (e.g., Liu Thought Paper Week #3). These thought papers should be in response to the weekly readings for the upcoming class. You are free to write your reactions, critiques, interpretations, or suggest unanswered questions proposed by the readings.

Final Paper and Presentation. Students will complete a 15-18 page research paper on a topic of their choice related to the themes of this seminar. The final paper should incorporate readings from the class, as well as include additional scholarly literature from outside this course. The final paper will be due in stages, beginning with a 2-3 page research proposal due Week 4, an annotated bibliography due Week 6, an 8-10 page minimum draft due Week 8, and the final 15-18 page paper due finals week. The final paper should be 12-15 pages and will be due finals week. Students will receive written feedback for each assignment submitted. Finally, students will also prepare a 5-minute presentation of their final paper during the last class meeting. Parameters for each component will be discussed as the quarter progresses.

**All writing assignments must be typed and double-spaced with 1-inch margins on all sides, size 12 Times New Roman font.*

Grading

Active Participation	10% (10 points)
Pedagogical Discussion	15% (15 points)
Thought Papers	10% (10 points)
Final Paper Proposal	10% (10 points)
Annotated Bibliography	10% (10 points)
Final Paper Draft	10% (10 points)
Final Paper Presentation	5% (5 points)
Final Paper	30% (30 points)

Course grades will be based on the following grading scale (based on points):

A	93+
A-	90-92
B+	87-89
B	83-86
B-	80-82
C+	77-79
C	73-76
C-	70-72
D	60-69
F	59 and below

**All assignments must be completed on time! No late assignments will be accepted!*

Course Schedule

Week 01: So You Want to Go to College

Guiding Questions

What does it mean to package yourself as a college applicant? Why is it important? What is the social and cultural significance of a college lifestyle?

Readings

Kimball, E. (2011). College admission in a contested marketplace: The 20th century and a new logic for access. *Journal of College Admission, Winter(210)*, 20-30.

McDonough, P. M. (1994). Buying and selling higher education: The social construction of the college applicant. *Journal of Higher Education, 65(4)*, 427-446.

Tokuhama, C. (2011). Consumption, a modern affliction: Branding culture, youth identity and college admission. *Journal of College Admission, Winter(210)*, 32-38.

Tyre, P. (2008, January 3). Getting in gets harder. *Newsweek*. Retrieved from <http://www.newsweek.com/id/83159>

Wang, P. (2007, September 19). They want to sell your kid: ...to Harvard or Stanford or wherever you think he should go. And it will cost you only \$45,000. *Money Magazine*. Retrieved from http://money.cnn.com/2007/09/19/pf/college/wang_college_sept.moneymag/index.htm

Week 02: For-Profit Admissions – Who Benefits? Who Loses?

**Thought paper week #2 due*

Guiding Questions

What role do commercial institutions play in college admissions? What influences do they have on the admission process? Who gets a leg up? Who gets left behind?

Readings

Gose, B. (2007, April 27). The rise of the essay coach. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(34), B11. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/The-Rise-of-the-Essay-Coach/21030>.

Liu, A. (2011). The admission industrial complex: Examining the entrepreneurial impact on college access. *Journal of College Admission, Winter*(210), 8-19.

McDonough, P. M., Korn, J. & Yamasaki, E. (1997). Access, equity, and the privatization of college counseling. *The Review of Higher Education*, 20(3), 297-317.

Walpole, M., McDonough, P. M., Bauer, C. J., Gibson, C., Kanyi, K., & Toliver, R. (2005). This test is unfair - Urban African American and Latino high school students' perceptions of standardized college admission tests. *Urban Education*, 40(3), 321-349.

Week 03: College Rankings

**Thought paper week #3 due*

Guiding Questions

What purposes do rankings serve? What information do they communicate? How are they structured? How do institutions benefit from rankings? How are they hurt?

Readings

Bowman, N. A., & Bastedo M. N. (2009). Getting on the front page: Organizational reputation, status signals, and the impact of *U.S. News and World Report* on student decisions. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(5), 415-436.

Chang, G. C., & Osborn, J. R. (2005). Spectacular colleges and spectacular rankings: The 'US News' rankings of American 'best' colleges. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 5(3), 338-364.

Ehrenberg, R. G. (2002). Reaching for the brass ring: The *U.S. News & World Report* rankings and competition. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(2), 145-162.

McDonough, P. M., Antonio, A. L., Walpole, M., & Pérez, L. X. (1998). College rankings: Democratized knowledge for whom? *Research in Higher Education*, 39(5), 513-537.

Meredith, M. (2004). Why do universities compete in the ratings game? An empirical analysis of the effects of the *U.S. News and World Report* college rankings. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(5), 443-461.

Week 04: Commercializing Colleges and Universities

**Final paper proposal due*

Guiding Questions

Who or what contributes to a commercial sphere in higher education? What is academic capitalism? How and why are colleges and universities responding to these trends?

Readings

Bok, D. (2003). The roots of commercialization (Chapter 1) and The benefits and costs of commercialization (Chapter 6). In *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education* (pp. 1-19 and pp. 99-121). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Fischman, G. E., & Haas, E. (2010). Framing higher education: Nostalgia, entrepreneurship, consumerism, and redemption. In J. A. Sandlin & P. McLaren (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies of consumption: Living and learning in the shadow of the "shopocalypse"* (pp. 108-121). New York: Routledge.

Good, M. L. (2004). Increased commercialization of the academy following the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980. In D. G. Stein (Ed.), *Buying in or selling out?: The commercialization of the American research university* (pp. 48-57). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Gumport, P. J. (2000). Academic restructuring: Organizational change and institutional imperatives. *Higher Education*, 39(1), 67-91.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). The theory of academic capitalism (Chapter 1). In *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education* (pp. 1-34). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Week 05: Students or Consumers?

**Thought paper week #5 due*

Guiding Questions

Are you a student or are you a consumer? How are the two conflated? How are they different? What is the value of taking a consumer approach to education? What is the harm?

Readings

Bok, D. (2003). Education (Chapter 5) and Preserving educational values (Chapter 9). In *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education* (pp. 79-98 and pp. 157-184). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Croissant, J. L. (2001). Can this campus be bought? Commercial influence in unfamiliar places. *Academe Online*, 87(5). Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2001/SO/Feat/croi.htm?PF=1>

Giroux, H. A. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(4), 425-464.

Usher, R. (2010). Consuming learning. In J. A. Sandlin & P. McLaren (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies of consumption: Living and learning in the shadow of the "shopocalypse"* (pp. 36-46). New York: Routledge.

Week 06: Captive Markets and College Marketing

**Annotated bibliography due*

Guiding Questions

What parties are involved in college marketing? Who benefits? What are the educational consequences? Who gets the most leverage from a captive market?

Readings

Boyles, D. R. (2007). Marketing sameness: Consumerism, commercialism, and the status quo. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. XXII, pp. 537-582). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Huber, S. (2000). Tough customers: Business' plan to corner the student market. In G. D. White & F. C. Hauck (Eds.), *Campus, inc.: Corporate power in the ivory tower* (pp. 106-118). Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

Morrison, D. A. (2004). Why college marketing ("What's all the fuss?") (Chapter 2). In *Marketing to the campus crowd: Everything you need to know to capture the \$200 billion college market* (pp. 9-24). Chicago, IL: Dearborn Trade Publishing.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). Undergraduate students and educational markets (Chapter 11). In *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education* (pp. 279-304). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Week 07: Student Union or Shopping Mall?

**Thought paper week #7 due*

Guiding Questions

What are the campus trends in consumer capitalism? How widespread is the matter? What is the value-added? What are the alternatives? Who or what gets displaced? What are the benefits and consequences of elevating cathedrals of consumption on campus?

Readings

Giroux, H. A. (2009). Democracy's nemesis: The rise of the corporate university. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 9(5), 669-695.

Levitan, T., & Osteen, J. M. (1992). College union activities and programs. In T. E. Milani & J. W. Johnston (Eds.), *The college union in the year 2000*. (pp. 11-26). New Directions for Student Services, 58. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Liu, A. (2009, November). *The marketiversity: Perceptions of campus commercialization*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Vancouver, BC.

Ritzer, G. (1996). McUniversity in the postmodern consumer society. *Quality in Higher Education*, 2(3), 185-199.

Ritzer, G. (2010). A tour of the new means of consumption (Chapter 1). In *Enchanting a disenchanted world: Continuity and change in the cathedrals of consumption* (3rd ed.) (pp. 1-22). Los Angeles: Sage.

Week 08: Big-time Athletics

**Final paper draft due*

Guiding Questions

What is the value of college athletics? Is it important for the community? Where and when did it stray from academic ideals? What are the opportunities for reform?

Readings

Bok, D. (2003). Athletics (Chapter 3) and Reforming athletics (Chapter 7). In *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education* (pp. 35-56 and pp. 122-138). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

King, S., & Slaughter, S. (2004). Sports 'r' us: Contracts, trademarks, and logos (Chapter 10). In S. Slaughter & G. Rhoades (Eds.), *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education* (pp. 256-278). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Mitten, M. J., Musselman, J. L., & Burton, B. W. (2009). Commercialized intercollegiate athletics: A Proposal for Targeted Reform Consistent with American cultural forces and marketplace realities. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 2009(2), 202-232.

Sperber, M. (2004). College sports, inc.: How big-time athletic departments run interference for college, inc. In D. G. Stein (Ed.), *Buying in or selling out?: The commercialization of the American research university* (pp. 17-31). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Week 09: Institutional Consumerism

**Thought paper week #9 due*

Guiding Questions

How are institutions consumers? What is their bottom line? What are the shortfalls? Who is running the show?

Readings

Geiger, R. L. (2002). The competition for high-ability students: Universities in a key marketplace. In S. Brint (Ed.), *The future of the city of knowledge: The changing*

American university (pp. 82–106). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hossler, D. (2006). Students and families as revenue: The impact on institutional behaviors. In D. M. Priest & E. P. St. John (Eds.), *Privatization and public universities* (pp. 109-128). Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.

Kniffin, K. (2000). The goods at their worst: Campus procurement in the global pillage. In G. D. White & F. C. Hauck (Eds.), *Campus, inc.: Corporate power in the ivory tower* (pp. 36-50). Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

Priest, D. M., Jacobs, B. A., & Boon, R. D. (2006). Privatization of business and auxiliary functions. In D. M. Priest & E. P. St. John (Eds.), *Privatization and public universities* (pp. 189-202). Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.

Week 10: Wrap-up and Final Presentations

**Final presentations due*

Guiding Questions

How do we recapture the public sphere of higher education? Where do we go from here? What might the future of higher education look like?

Reading

Farahmandpur, R. (2010). Teaching against consumer capitalism in the age of commercialization and corporatization in public education. In J. A. Sandlin & P. McLaren (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies of consumption: Living and learning in the shadow of the “shopocalypse”* (pp. 58-66). New York: Routledge.

**Finals Week: Final paper due*

Required Reading List

Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bowman, N. A., & Bastedo M. N. (2009). Getting on the front page: Organizational reputation, status signals, and the impact of *U.S. News and World Report* on student decisions. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(5), 415-436.

Boyles, D. R. (2007). Marketing sameness: Consumerism, commercialism, and the status quo. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. XXII, pp. 537-582). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Chang, G. C., & Osborn, J. R. (2005). Spectacular colleges and spectacular rankings: The ‘US News’ rankings of American ‘best’ colleges. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 5(3), 338-364.

- Croissant, J. L. (2001). Can this campus be bought? Commercial influence in unfamiliar places. *Academe Online*, 87(5). Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2001/SO/Feat/croi.htm?PF=1>
- Ehrenberg, R. G. (2002). Reaching for the brass ring: The *U.S. News & World Report* rankings and competition. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(2), 145-162.
- Farahmandpur, R. (2010). Teaching against consumer capitalism in the age of commercialization and corporatization in public education. In J. A. Sandlin & P. McLaren (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies of consumption: Living and learning in the shadow of the "shopocalypse"* (pp. 58-66). New York: Routledge.
- Fischman, G. E., & Haas, E. (2010). Framing higher education: Nostalgia, entrepreneurship, consumerism, and redemption. In J. A. Sandlin & P. McLaren (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies of consumption: Living and learning in the shadow of the "shopocalypse"* (pp. 108-121). New York: Routledge.
- Geiger, R. L. (2002). The competition for high-ability students: Universities in a key marketplace. In S. Brint (Ed.), *The future of the city of knowledge: The changing American university* (pp. 82-106). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Giroux, H. A. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(4), 425-464.
- Giroux, H. A. (2009). Democracy's nemesis: The rise of the corporate university. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 9(5), 669-695.
- Good, M. L. (2004). Increased commercialization of the academy following the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980. In D. G. Stein (Ed.), *Buying in or selling out?: The commercialization of the American research university* (pp. 48-57). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Gose, B. (2007, April 27). The rise of the essay coach. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(34), B11. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/The-Rise-of-the-Essay-Coach/21030>.
- Gumport, P. J. (2000). Academic restructuring: Organizational change and institutional imperatives. *Higher Education*, 39(1), 67-91.
- Hossler, D. (2006). Students and families as revenue: The impact on institutional behaviors. In D. M. Priest & E. P. St. John (Eds.), *Privatization and public universities* (pp. 109-128). Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Huber, S. (2000). Tough customers: Business' plan to corner the student market. In G. D. White & F. C. Hauck (Eds.), *Campus, inc.: Corporate power in the ivory tower* (pp. 106-118). Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Kimball, E. (2011). College admission in a contested marketplace: The 20th century and a new logic for access. *Journal of College Admission*, Winter(210), 20-30.

- King, S., & Slaughter, S. (2004). Sports 'r' us: Contracts, trademarks, and logos (Chapter 10). In S. Slaughter & G. Rhoades (Eds.), *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education* (pp. 256-278). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kniffin, K. (2000). The goods at their worst: Campus procurement in the global pillage. In G. D. White & F. C. Hauck (Eds.), *Campus, inc.: Corporate power in the ivory tower* (pp. 36-50). Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Levitan, T., & Osteen, J. M. (1992). College union activities and programs. In T. E. Milani & J. W. Johnston (Eds.), *The college union in the year 2000*. (pp. 11-26). New Directions for Student Services, 58. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Liu, A. (2009, November). *The marketiversity: Perceptions of campus commercialization*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Vancouver, BC.
- Liu, A. (2011). The admission industrial complex: Examining the entrepreneurial impact on college access. *Journal of College Admission, Winter*(210), 8-19.
- McDonough, P. M. (1994). Buying and selling higher education: The social construction of the college applicant. *Journal of Higher Education, 65*(4), 427-446.
- McDonough, P. M., Antonio, A. L., Walpole, M., & Pérez, L. X. (1998). College rankings: Democratized knowledge for whom? *Research in Higher Education, 39*(5), 513-537.
- McDonough, P. M., Korn, J. & Yamasaki, E. (1997). Access, equity, and the privatization of college counseling. *The Review of Higher Education, 20*(3), 297-317.
- Meredith, M. (2004). Why do universities compete in the ratings game? An empirical analysis of the effects of the *U.S. News and World Report* college rankings. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(5), 443-461.
- Mitten, M. J., Musselman, J. L., & Burton, B. W. (2009). Commercialized intercollegiate athletics: A Proposal for Targeted Reform Consistent with American cultural forces and marketplace realities. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport, 2009*(2), 202-232.
- Morrison, D. A. (2004). Why college marketing ("What's all the fuss?") (Chapter 2). In *Marketing to the campus crowd: Everything you need to know to capture the \$200 billion college market* (pp. 9-24). Chicago, IL: Dearborn Trade Publishing.
- Priest, D. M., Jacobs, B. A., & Boon, R. D. (2006). Privatization of business and auxiliary functions. In D. M. Priest & E. P. St. John (Eds.), *Privatization and public universities* (pp. 189-202). Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Ritzer, G. (1996). McUniversity in the postmodern consumer society. *Quality in Higher Education, 2*(3), 185-199.

- Ritzer, G. (2010). A tour of the new means of consumption (Chapter 1). In *Enchanting a disenchanted world: Continuity and change in the cathedrals of consumption* (3rd ed.) (pp. 1-22). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sperber, M. (2004). College sports, inc.: How big-time athletic departments run interference for college, inc. In D. G. Stein (Ed.), *Buying in or selling out?: The commercialization of the American research university* (pp. 17-31). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Tokuhamma, C. (2011). Consumption, a modern affliction: Branding culture, youth identity and college admission. *Journal of College Admission, Winter*(210), 32-38.
- Tyre, P. (2008, January 3). Getting in gets harder. *Newsweek*. Retrieved from <http://www.newsweek.com/id/83159>
- Usher, R. (2010). Consuming learning. In J. A. Sandlin & P. McLaren (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies of consumption: Living and learning in the shadow of the "shopocalypse"* (pp. 36-46). New York: Routledge.
- Walpole, M., McDonough, P. M., Bauer, C. J., Gibson, C., Kanyi, K., & Toliver, R. (2005). This test is unfair - Urban African American and Latino high school students' perceptions of standardized college admission tests. *Urban Education, 40*(3), 321-349.
- Wang, P. (2007, September 19). They want to sell your kid: ...to Harvard or Stanford or wherever you think he should go. And it will cost you only \$45,000. *Money Magazine*. Retrieved from http://money.cnn.com/2007/09/19/pf/college/wang_college_sept.moneymag/index.htm



New Course Proposal

Education 98T Consumerism and Commercialization in Higher Education

<u>Course Number</u>	Education 98T
<u>Title</u>	Consumerism and Commercialization in Higher Education
<u>Short Title</u>	CMMRCLZTN-HIGHER ED
<u>Units</u>	Fixed: 5
<u>Grading Basis</u>	Letter grade only
<u>Instructional Format</u>	Seminar - 3 hours per week
<u>TIE Code</u>	SEMT - Seminar (Topical) [T]
<u>GE Requirement</u>	Yes
<u>Major or Minor Requirement</u>	No
<u>Requisites</u>	Satisfaction of entry-level Writing requirement. Freshmen and sophomores preferred.
<u>Course Description</u>	Seminar, three hours. Enforced requisite: satisfaction of Entry-Level Writing requirement. Freshmen/sophomores preferred. Exploration of consumer dynamics and opportunities students encounter as they move through college pipeline. From admissions and beyond, critical examination of what it means to buy and sell your way through higher education. Letter grading.
<u>Justification</u>	Part of the series of seminars offered through the Collegium of University Teaching Fellows.
<u>Syllabus</u>	File Education 98T syllabus.doc was previously uploaded. You may view the file by clicking on the file name.
<u>Supplemental Information</u>	Professor Robert Rhoads is the faculty mentor for this seminar.
<u>Grading Structure</u>	Active Participation 10% (10 points) Pedagogical Discussion 15% (15 points) Thought Papers 10% (10 points) Final Paper Proposal 10% (10 points) Annotated Bibliography 10% (10 points) Final Paper Draft 10% (10 points) Final Paper Presentation 5% (5 points) Final Paper 30% (30 points)
<u>Effective Date</u>	Winter 2012
<u>Discontinue Date</u>	Summer 1 2012
<u>Instructor</u>	Name Amy Liu Title Teaching Fellow
<u>Quarters Taught</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Fall <input type="checkbox"/> Winter <input type="checkbox"/> Spring <input type="checkbox"/> Summer
<u>Department</u>	Education
<u>Contact</u>	Name CATHERINE GENTILE E-mail cgentile@oid.ucla.edu
<u>Routing Help</u>	

ROUTING STATUS

Role: Registrar's Office

Status: Processing Completed

Role: Registrar's Publications Office - Hennig, Leann Jean (lhennig@registrar.ucla.edu) - 56704

Status: Added to SRS on 6/20/2011 10:06:57 AM

Changes: Description

Comments: Edited course description into official version.

Role: Registrar's Scheduling Office - Thomson, Douglas N (dthomson@registrar.ucla.edu) - 51441

Status: Added to SRS on 6/10/2011 9:45:00 AM

Changes: Short Title, Units

Comments: No Comments

Role: FEC School Coordinator - Soh, Michael Young (msoh@college.ucla.edu) - 65282

Status: Returned for Additional Info on 6/7/2011 11:37:18 AM

Changes: No Changes Made

Comments: Routing to Registrar's Office

Role: FEC Chair or Designee - McClendon, Muriel C (mcclendo@history.ucla.edu) - 53918

Status: Approved on 6/7/2011 8:20:38 AM

Changes: No Changes Made

Comments: No Comments

Role: L&S FEC Coordinator - Soh, Michael Young (msoh@college.ucla.edu) - 65282

Status: Returned for Additional Info on 6/6/2011 5:35:51 PM

Changes: No Changes Made

Comments: Routing to Vice Chair Muriel McClendon for FEC approval

Role: CUTF Coordinator - Gentile, Catherine (cgentile@oid.ucla.edu) - 68998

Status: Approved on 6/3/2011 2:38:23 PM

Changes: No Changes Made

Comments: on behalf of Professor Kathleen Komar, chair, Collegium of University Teaching Fellows.

Role: Initiator/Submitter - Gentile, Catherine (cgentile@oid.ucla.edu) - 68998

Status: Submitted on 6/3/2011 2:37:31 PM

Comments: Initiated a New Course Proposal

[Back to Course List](#)

[Main Menu](#) [Inventory](#) [Reports](#) [Help](#) [Exit](#)
[Registrar's Office](#) [MyUCLA](#) [SRWeb](#)

Comments or questions? Contact the Registrar's Office at
cims@registrar.ucla.edu or (310) 206-7045