The Changing Enterprise
SECOND IN A SERIES

New Times, New Strategies: Curricular Joint Ventures

Peter Eckel, American Council on Education

Britany Affolter-Caine, University of Michigan

Madeleine Green, American Council on Education

American Council on Education
Center for Institutional and International Initiatives

American Council on Education

American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle NW
Washington, DC 20036

Additional copies of this publication are available by sending a check or money order for $15 per copy, plus $6.95 shipping and handling (for orders of more than one copy, call the number below), to the following address:

ACE Fulfillment Service
Department 191
Washington, DC 20055-0191
Phone: (301) 632-6757
Fax: (301) 843-0159

When ordering, please specify Item #309527.
A free electronic version of this report is available through www.acenet.edu/bookstore.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

This essay is the second in a series of *The Changing Enterprise* project, an effort that charts and analyzes the new directions that colleges and universities are pursuing in response to increased competition, globalization, new technologies, and changing fiscal realities. ACE is grateful to Accenture, The Goldman Sachs Foundation, and Peterson's, part of The Thomson Corporation, for their support of this project and the occasional paper series.

We also acknowledge the participants of two academic roundtables of leaders who work closely with the types of alliances discussed in this paper and higher education scholars knowledgeable about such issues: Michael Baer, ACE; Geoffrey Cox, Cardean University; Stephen Gabel, University of Chicago; Richard Katz, EDUCAUSE; Adrianna Kezar, University of Maryland; John Kimberly, University of Pennsylvania; Jaci King, ACE; Diana Kleiner, Yale University; Mark McNamee, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; Mark Milliron, The League for Innovation in the Community College; Barbara Mossberg, California State University–Monterey Bay; Eva Pell, The Pennsylvania State University; Clorissa Phillips, University of Virginia; Brian Pusser, University of Virginia; Frank Stork, the Global Film School; and Roger Whitaker, The George Washington University. We also thank those willing to discuss their ventures by phone and share materials: Dominique Abrioux, Athabasca University (Canada); Dawn Anderson, Kansas State University; Carole McCoy, Anne Arundel Community College; David Pilsbury, Worldwide Universities Network; David Ravenscraft, University of North Carolina; Mike Clay and Nora Candela, University of Michigan–Dearborn; and David Spencer and Debra White, The Michigan Virtual University.

We thank Lara Couturier, The Futures Project; Barbara Turlington, ACE; and Robin Middlehurst, University of Surrey—as well as some of those mentioned above for their helpful comments and suggestions on earlier drafts of this paper.

Foreword

While some conventional wisdom holds that American higher education has remained essentially unchanged since its creation more than 300 years ago, a great deal of evidence shows that it has continually adapted to an ever-changing external environment. The explosion of enrollments following World War II, the burgeoning research during the past quarter century, and the tremendous widening of access are but a few examples of major shifts in U.S. higher education in the last half of the 20th century. Other nations have followed their own paths of change, to different degrees and at different rates. Even the concept of teaching and learning–that bastion of academic tradition–has undergone profound change through the introduction of technology and the growing attention to pedagogy, learning outcomes, and assessment. Society's increasing demands on higher education to widen participation, serve as an engine of economic and cultural development, and be a full partner in the educational system have served as powerful forces for change at the system and institutional levels. At the same time, increasing competition for students and resources has spurred colleges and universities to explore new ways to maintain or expand their enrollments, create new revenue streams, and gain the visibility and prestige that can ensure their place in the higher education market.

Traditionally, institutions have responded to these challenges individually, charting their courses and navigating independently. The current environment of limited resources and growing demands makes it increasingly difficult for institutions or organizations to "go it alone," and technology has created new means to facilitate cooperation. Strategic alliances of all types offer increasingly attractive possibilities for institutions to combine their strengths and pool their resources.

This paper explores one type of strategic alliance, which we call the curricular joint venture (CJV). As the following pages elaborate, partnerships and strategic alliances are not a new concept to higher education, but CJVs represent a new form of a familiar strategy. They are collaborative efforts that tap the partners' curricular expertise to create new academic offerings, or, to use a more commercial term, "products."* CJVs are an entrepreneurial response to competition for students, prestige, and resources. They draw on an institution's intellectual capital, as represented by the curriculum and teaching capacities, and often are made possible because of advances in technology. These alliances enable institutions to partner with their peers or with dissimilar institutions and organizations to produce new academic offerings, pursue new directions, test new pedagogies and technologies, in some cases internationalize their

*Or "services," as they are referred to under the framework of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS).

programs, and sometimes generate revenue, thus maximizing the different capacities of partner institutions.

This essay maps the territory of CJVs and explores the issues they raise for leaders from a U.S. perspective, although we believe that this discussion offers value abroad as well. *New Times, New Strategies: Curricular Joint Ventures* is the second in the occasional paper series, *The Changing Enterprise*. This series explores the challenges created for higher education by the rise of technology, competition, and globalization, and charts and analyzes the new directions that colleges and universities are pursuing to meet these challenges. The first paper, *The Brave New (and Smaller) World: A Transatlantic View*, explores these challenges as they appear in North America and Europe and highlights institutional responses to them.

In developing this paper, ACE conducted a series of roundtables with experts who lead CJVs or are intimately familiar with partnerships in higher education. We also scanned web pages and related news articles, and we conducted a series of phone interviews to add depth to the information collected earlier.

Most CJVs have too short a history to draw any clear conclusions about their outcomes. But institutional leaders–seeking to innovate, optimize their institution's strengths, and ensure their ongoing adaptation to the challenges of the environment–do not have the luxury of waiting until the evidence is clear to decide on a course of action that is best for their institutions. Thus, charting this unknown territory, identifying the patterns and questions associated with this aspect of the changing enterprise, and raising potential implications for institutions and their leaders constitute an essential starting place for making informed decisions about such activities.

The Context: Innovation Through Collaboration

While higher education may not change fast enough or deeply enough for some of its stakeholders, it is far from static. Through an ongoing process of change–sometimes incremental, at other times sweeping–higher education institutions revise their curricula, add new programs, and accommodate new types of students. Their profiles, missions, and instructional programs are reshaped by the growth of technology; by students with different levels of academic preparation, learning styles, and interests; and by the needs of their surrounding communities. A variety of forces may drive such innovation, including improving quality, enhancing prestige, being more responsive to students, expanding access and service to society, advancing knowledge, and competing (or, possibly, surviving) in the higher education marketplace.

The past decade has been characterized by heightened competition, not only among U.S. institutions but also between domestic and foreign providers. Colleges and universities compete for the most talented faculty and for the best students. Some institutions struggle to maintain their enrollments, using sophisticated marketing techniques and financial aid to attract and retain students. They compete for government and foundation funding, and for the prestige that national rankings and large research grants bestow. And today, in the face of declining state budgets and a weakening economy, the shrinking resource pool likely will intensify competitive behaviors and promote a survival-of-the-fittest mentality.

Competition, coupled with new opportunities created by emerging technologies, has spurred higher education institutions to become increasingly entrepreneurial and seek new ways to become more agile, offer new programs, and enhance their standing. In the United States, entrepreneurial and competitive behavior in higher education is no longer viewed as an unmitigated evil, a betrayal of academic values. Rather, today's debate turns on the definition of acceptable boundaries. For example, it is accepted that colleges and universities enter into arrangements with corporations to sponsor research and to supply goods and services on campus in exchange for corporate advertising.

Colleges and universities create and deliver customized, onsite courses to employees of an organization, develop continuing education and executive MBA programs that are institutional profit centers, and pursue research agendas shaped increasingly by available funding. The ambiguity–which gives rise to the

Competition, coupled with new opportunities created by emerging technologies, has spurred higher education institutions to become increasingly entrepreneurial and seek new ways to become more agile, offer new programs, and enhance their standing.

controversy–arises when such arrangements distract institutions from their core missions, infringe on institutional and academic integrity, or interfere with academic freedom.

Colleges and universities frequently turn to strategies such as partnerships and collaborations, sometimes using them as vehicles for competitive activity, at other times using them for purposes of sharing and cooperation. A wide range of partnerships and collaborations exist, often described in varying terms. Consortia–a familiar form of interinstitutional cooperation–are the most well-known examples. The Association for Consortium Leadership lists more than 60 member consortia. Specific examples of well-established consortia include the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), founded in 1958, which is composed of the 11 research universities of the Big Ten and the University of Chicago. Another example is the Associated Colleges of the South, a group of 16 liberal arts colleges in 12 states. Other smaller consortia exist, such as the Associated Colleges of Central Kansas, serving six church-related liberal arts colleges within a 40-mile radius. Finally, new virtual consortia are also appearing, such as Colorado Community Colleges Online, which links 16 community colleges, mostly in Colorado. While consortia possess similar characteristics–numerous members, a coordinating staff, and multiple functions[1]–a common goal is to create efficiencies, such as through shared resources or expanded purchasing power. For example, consortia may provide access to each partner's academic resources by facilitating cross-enrollments in courses, study-abroad programs, and graduate education. They can facilitate library cooperation, offer joint professional development programs, provide group purchasing, and address common challenges such as computer security and software licensing. Some consortia focus exclusively on academic issues; others address administrative or business issues; still others collaborate on a variety of issues.

Athletic conferences represent yet another common example of interinstitutional alliances, helping colleges and universities work together to coordinate interinstitutional competition, heighten members' visibility, and generate revenue.

Research partnerships constitute a third example of collaboration. These partnerships occur at many levels–between institutions and corporations, and among research institutes or individual scholars, frequently with corporate or government financing. A well-developed body of literature addresses research collaboration, and the first paper of this *Changing Enterprise* series–*The Brave New (and Smaller) World of Higher Education*[2]–touches upon examples of these partnerships in Europe and North America.

A fourth example of collaborative ventures can be seen in the emerging partnerships around technology and distributed education. A separate ACE publication–*Partnerships in Distributed Education*[3]–describes different types of alliances in that arena.

The challenges of the current climate provide powerful motivation for institutions to build upon and expand their alliances and collaborations, working with others–rather than competing against them–to accomplish institutional goals. Higher education, like many business and nonprofit organizations, has turned to strategic alliances to enhance effectiveness and, in some cases, to increase competitiveness. Partnering can expand capacity and can provide institutions with access to new markets, new resources, and levels of expertise that would be unavailable to them on their own. Alliances link the complementary strengths of partners and permit joint investing in technology or activities that would be otherwise unaffordable. They also may save money by avoiding certain investments or may generate revenue by functioning in an entrepreneurial (and, in some cases, commercial) manner. Partnerships also may facilitate organizational learning as institutions with one set of capacities provide others with new ideas or ways of working. A joint venture even may increase the legitimacy and reputation of the partners, who benefit from the prestige of others in the alliance or from the recognition of their innovation and pioneering efforts. Prestige brings new opportunities and beneficial associations that normally would be unavailable to lower status institutions. Finally, alliances may provide students and faculty at the partner institutions with new opportunities, such as faculty and student exchange, dual enrollments, and joint research projects. The commercial and educational/scholarly benefits of alliances are not mutually exclusive.

The challenges of the current climate provide powerful motivation for institutions to build upon and expand their alliances and collaborations, working with others—rather than competing against them—to accomplish institutional goals.

Defining Curricular Joint Ventures

While partnerships and strategic alliances are familiar sights on the higher education landscape, today they are taking on new, more varied, and more unconventional forms. The idea of strategic alliances has become fashionable. The term describes many collaborative projects, agreements, or relationships covering many different kinds of arrangements, from the provision of contract services to tight partnerships, and includes activities such as consortia, interinstitutional partnerships around research or teaching, dual degree programs, and exchange agreements, to name a few. Although CJVs share some common traits with these other types of strategic alliances, they demonstrate the following four distinguishing features:

1. Focus.

CJVs focus on the curriculum and on teaching and learning activities as their primary activity. This focus distinguishes them from other strategic alliances that center more around research, library exchange, purchasing cooperatives, or study-abroad collaborations.

2. Instructional Offerings.

CJVs create new institutional offerings, or new packages of institutional offerings–that is, courses, programs, certificates, or degrees that go beyond or differ from the partners' current array of offerings. The new programs' building blocks may originate from the partner institutions' existing courses, or the partners may work together to create new courses or programs. Alternatively, the offerings may also represent some combination of the two approaches.

3. Goals.

An important (but not sole) goal of CJVs is securing new revenues and/or expanding into new markets, either by offering students new courses and programs or by reaching new students. CJVs position the partners in the marketplace of academic offerings. Sometimes the markets are international; at other times they are local or regional. Institutions rarely make these goals explicit, and we must infer them from the nature of the program. But it is not accidental that CJVs took off in the late 1990s, when the e-learning boom was in full swing. Another major goal of forming a CJV is the opportunity to experiment, especially in the emerging and untested e-learning market. For many, the opportunity to enter this market through partnerships promised to lessen that risk.

The idea of strategic alliances has become fashionable. The term describes many collaborative projects, agreements, or relationships covering many different kinds of arrangements, from the provision of contract services to tight partnerships, and includes activities such as consortia, interinstitutional partnerships around research or teaching, dual degree programs, and exchange agreements, to name a few.

4. Technology Intensive.

CJVs frequently draw upon technology that facilitates curriculum delivery or, at a minimum, enables communication among dispersed partners–some of whom are located around the globe. Technology helps CJVs transcend the geographic boundaries and time and space limitations that in the past have often defined traditional consortia.

By our definition, many institutional strategic alliances or partnerships–terms often overused and loosely defined–are not CJVs, and instead encompass a range of interorganizational relationships. For instance, the agreements between institutions to facilitate student or faculty exchange are not CJVs, since they focus on improving existing programs for current students–nor are agreements that place students in internships or facilitate their enrollment in partner institutions. Other partnerships more closely resemble purchasing relationships, such as instances in which institutions deliver courses on the employer's work site on a contractual basis, or philanthropic activities, such as when the partners make financial contributions to an institution.[4]

Mapping the Landscape

Although CJVs share some key characteristics, they show tremendous variety, as the following descriptions reveal. This paper describes the terrain of the CJVs, examining their structure, the implications of this activity for academic management and governance, and the potential benefits and costs of undertaking such strategies.

Meant to be representative rather than exhaustive, the following profiles demonstrate the diversity of alliances. Some alliances have multiple partners; others are dyads. Some offer a wide range of programs, while others operate with a narrow focus. In some, leveraging the curricular offerings to generate revenue is one of many goals, while in others it is the sole focus of the venture.

AllLearn

A partnership between two universities in the United States and one in the United Kingdom offering online continuing education courses. (http://www.alllearn.org/)

The University of Oxford, Stanford University, and Yale University developed a nonprofit venture, AllLearn, to offer continuing education programs online. The effort originally targeted only graduates of the three partner institutions and sought to build upon and extend the enrichment activities currently offered to alumni. AllLearn has since opened its offerings to anyone seeking continuing education. It offers courses in American studies, archeology, art history, classics, current events, economics, history, humanities, literature, music, philosophy, politics, psychology, and women's studies. Depending on the course, AllLearn uses a combination of web-based activities, CD-ROMs, books, and audio and video lectures (mostly streamed over the Internet). AllLearn identifies potential topics and contacts faculty from the three institutions to develop the courses; some programs have faculty authors from all three institutions. AllLearn offers three types of courses–forums (two to five days), short courses (four to six weeks), and more traditional courses (eight to ten weeks). None of the courses is credit bearing; however, AllLearn will provide a letter stating that participants have completed the courses. Courses are taught by moderators, who are usually graduate students at the member schools or faculty elsewhere. Moderators receive training from AllLearn to prepare them for this role. Each partner institution has a team responsible for its institution's involvement in AllLearn–this team includes an academic administrator who acts as the primary liaison between the project team and representatives from the alumni office, the office of information technology, and the institution's media or instructional design office.

[T]he following profiles demonstrate the diversity of alliances. Some alliances have multiple partners; others are dyads. Some offer a wide range of programs, while others operate with a narrow focus.

Cardean University

A for-profit organization that offers online learning. (http://www.cardean.edu/cgibin/cardean1/view/public_home.jsp)

Cardean University, a subsidiary of UNext, is a for-profit university working in concert with five institutions–Columbia Business School, Stanford University, The University of Chicago Graduate School of Business, Carnegie Mellon University, and the London School of Economics and Political Science–to deliver online courses and an MBA. The Illinois Board of Higher Education granted Cardean the authority to award the MBA degree, and Cardean is accredited by the Distance Education and Training Council (DETC). Its five partner institutions are shareholders in the company, along with other investors. Cardean offers exclusively business courses, but it plans to expand into additional disciplines and degree levels. The offerings consist of a combination of short noncredit and longer credit-bearing courses. Faculty from the five partner institutions develop new courses in conjunction with Cardean instructional designers and technology experts. Cardean faculty teach the courses, not the faculty from partner institutions who developed the content. Cardean has an internal quality control process, but partner faculty who provide content for the courses have sign-off authority on the final product. The students are a mix of individuals seeking online education and employees of corporations that have established contracts with Cardean, such as General Motors, Thomson, and Barclays' Bank. Most students to date have come from corporate clients, although Cardean is now also actively recruiting individuals as well as corporate employees.

eArmyU

A virtual consortium of institutions to serve the educational demands of army personnel. (http://www.earmyu.com/)

IBM Business Consulting Services (originally, PricewaterhouseCoopers) coordinates and serves as the government contractor for the following partner colleges and universities to provide online post-secondary education to U.S. military personnel: Anne Arundel Community College (MD); Atlantic Cape Community College (NJ); Baker College (MI); Central Texas College; Coastline Community College (CA); Cochise College (AZ); Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University (FL, AZ); Excelsior College (NY); Fayetteville Technical Community College (NC); Franklin University (OH); Grambling State University (LA); Hampton University (VA); Indiana University; Jefferson Community College (NY); Kansas State University; Lansing Community College (MI); North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University; Northwest Missouri State University; Nova Southeastern University (FL); Pennsylvania State University World Campus; Pierce College (WA); Rio Salado Community College (AZ); Saint Joseph's College of Maine; Saint Leo University (FL); Southern Christian University (AL); Southwestern College (KS); State University of New York Empire State College; Thomas Edison State College (NJ); Troy State University (AL); University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; University of California, Los Angeles Extension; University of the Incarnate Word (TX); and University of Maryland University College. Students enroll in one of the participating institutions' online degree programs (associate, bachelor's, or graduate degrees) or certificate programs. Each participating institution is responsible for recruiting and admitting prospective students. Once admitted to a program, students can take courses toward their degree or certificate at other participating institutions, as credit transfer is facilitated by agreements within eArmyU. The academic programs open to eArmyU students are usually available to other students enrolled at the member institution. Through its infrastructure, eArmyU provides IT support, counseling, and other delivery services. Participating institutions provide instruction, placement testing, and course advising, and award the degrees and certificates. Because each institution is responsible for the academic programs it offers, its policies regarding quality assurance, faculty workload, and curriculum approval apply.

Global Film School

A for-profit initiative by three film schools in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia. (http://www.globalfilmschool.com/index.asp)

The Global Film School (GFS) is a for-profit venture of the School of Theater, Film, and Television at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), the Australian Film, Television and Radio School, and the National Film Television School in the United Kingdom. GFS was formally launched in May 2001 to make filmmaking courses available to a wide and geographically dispersed group of students and to generate supplemental revenue for the partners' traditional programs. It also serves as an important testing ground for the introduction of new technologies into film education. Partner schools provided in-kind and limited financial support to launch the effort. GFS offers online professional and university-level courses and seminars. It caps enrollments at 200 students in its instructor-led courses; the shorter, self-paced seminars have larger enrollments. GFS recruits faculty predominantly from partner schools to develop its courses and seminars. However, it is open to working with nonpartner faculty and leaders from the film industry to augment the curriculum. GFS bears the production costs and shares revenue among the partners and subject-matter experts. A curriculum committee–consisting of the dean and one faculty member per partner institution–reviews all GFS offerings. GFS does not offer degrees but does grant certificates of completion. GFS administrators are developing certificate tracks in various subdisciplines of film education (screenwriting, directing, cinematography, and so forth). Each track will reflect completion of a group of integrated courses.

Great Plains Interactive Distance Education Alliance

A network of Midwestern research universities offering online graduate degrees. (http://www.gpidea.org/)

The Great Plains Interactive Distance Education Alliance (Great Plains IDEA) was established in the late 1990s with the aim of offering distance education graduate programs. Great Plains IDEA stemmed from the work of faculty and staff at the Colleges of Human Sciences (sometimes called Human Ecology) at the following universities: Colorado State University, Iowa State University, Kansas State University, Michigan State University, Montana State University, University of Nebraska, North Dakota State University, Oklahoma State University, South Dakota State University, and Texas Tech University. In 2001, a subset of Great Plains IDEA institutions–Kansas State University, Montana State University, Iowa State University, South Dakota State University, North Dakota State University, Oklahoma State University, Iowa State University, and the University of

Nebraska–began offering an online master's degree in Family Financial Planning (42 credit hours). The alliance is currently developing additional degree programs (Gerontology and Youth Development). Students enroll in the program through one of the partner institutions. All students, regardless of home institution, pay a common tuition. The partners have created a tuition-sharing formula that distributes tuition to programs teaching specific courses and to home institutions and departments for program oversight and student services. For most institutions, Great Plains IDEA tuition is higher than graduate in-state tuition, but less than out-of-state rates. The master's degree in Family Financial Planning was designed by faculty from partner institutions. Most courses are taught by a faculty member from one of the partner institutions; however, some courses are team-taught across partner institutions, and other courses rotate among institutions. All courses, regardless of the institution actually offering the course, appear in other participating institutions' catalogs, eliminating the need for transfer agreements. Students graduate with a degree from their home institution. The alliance has a board of directors–which consists of administrators from each partner institution–that provides oversight and sets policy for the alliance.

Michigan Virtual University

A collaboration among two- and four-year institutions, government agencies, and corporate partners in Michigan. (http://www.mivu.org/)

The Michigan Virtual University (MVU) is a not-for-profit organization that brings together partners from government, higher education, and the business community. The purpose of MVU is to provide educational opportunities to Michigan residents as part of an effort to stimulate workforce development in the state. MVU receives operating funds from the state and the Michigan Economic Development Corporation, and scholarships and grant money from other organizations. As part of its various programs, MVU operates the state-appropriated Michigan Virtual High School, which enables high school students to take classes online in the event of scheduling conflicts or limited resources at their schools. Another MVU initiative is the grant-supported Virtual Learning Collaborative, which brings together the state's 28 community colleges to provide online courses that supplement programs offered at each institution. MVU also offers contractual continuing education to corporations and organizations throughout the state. Faculty who participate in MVU are enlisted and compensated by their own institutions. In some instances, faculty are paid an overload; at other times, they receive release time. Students do not earn degrees through MVU, but rather supplement their current degree programs or participate in nondegree continuing education programs. MVU acts as a vehicle for member institutions to reach new students. Each institution or organization is responsible for the course content and quality. An exception occurs when MVU develops, or adapts for the web, courses from partner institutions for contract education; in such cases, MVU internally reviews the content according to its guidelines for web-based instruction.

OneMBA

An effort by five business schools in several countries to create and offer a unified MBA relevant to the Americas, Europe, and Asia. (http://www.onemba.org/)

OneMBA is an integrated 21-month executive MBA program. Partners include the following institutions: The Kenan-Flagler Business School of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; The Rotterdam School of Management (RSM) of Erasmus University Rotterdam; The Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK); The Monterrey Tech Graduate School of Business Administration and Leadership (EGADE-ITESM) in Mexico; and Brazil's Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo (EAESP)–the largest of the schools that make up the Fundação Getulio Vargas (FGV). Students enroll at one of the partner institutions and pay that institution's tuition and fees. Faculty and administrators from the five institutions jointly constructed a curriculum with three types of activities aimed at preparing globally competent executives. The first part of the program consists of coursework at the home institution that covers topics of local relevance as well as topics that program faculty believe do not require a global dimension, such as accounting and statistics. A second component, called global residency, is a series of week-long visits to each of the five institutions for short programs. Each residency focuses on issues of importance to the region being visited. For example, students study logistics and sustainability in Europe, spending time in Rotterdam and in Dubrovnik to understand these issues in developed and developing contexts. The third component is a set of globally coordinated courses. These courses are jointly designed by faculty from the partner institutions and are taught concurrently using parallel syllabi and common case studies. The globally coordinated courses include virtual global project teams drawing students from each of the five participating institutions. Upon completing their coursework, students receive an MBA degree from their home institution. They also receive a OneMBA diploma issued jointly by the five participating institutions.

Universitas 21 Global

An online for-profit university that is an activity of Universitas 21, a consortium of 17 research universities from 10 countries and a corporate partner. (http://www.universitasglobal.com/)

Universitas 21 (U21) is an international network of 17 research universities spanning North America, Europe, Asia, and Australia and New Zealand. A subset of U21 members, in partnership with Thomson Learning, has developed an initiative called Universitas 21 Global (U21 Global), a for-profit corporation offering online professional and graduate courses, as well as MBA and MIS degrees. The European partners include The Albert-Ludwig University of Frieburg, University of Birmingham, University of Edinburgh, University of Glasgow, University of Nottingham, and Lund University. The Asian partners include Fudan University, University of Hong Kong, National University of Singapore, and University of Peking. The Australian and New Zealand partners include University of Melbourne, University of New South Wales, University of Queensland, and University of Auckland. The North American partners include McGill University, University of British Columbia, University of Virginia, and the corporate partner, Thomson Learning. U21 Global will award its own degrees, which will bear the emblems of partner institutions, and will market its courses and degrees to individuals throughout Asia. It contracts individually with faculty around the world to provide course content and hires separate instructors (other than those providing course content) to deliver the courses. The parent organization, Universitas 21, developed another body responsible for quality control, Universitas 21 Pedagogica, whose board consists of presidents of partner institutions. Administrators and faculty from partner institutions, under the coordination of the Academic Standards Council, review and approve U21 Global degrees and courses.

University of Michigan–Dearborn and Erudite Corporation

A partnership between a university and a corporation to deliver courses in health care.
The Center for Emerging Business Issues (CEBI) at the University of Michigan–Dearborn's School of Management (UM-D) formed a partnership with Erudite, an e-learning and knowledge management company already offering training programs in health care, to create a 10-course management development program for health care professionals. CEBI had previously developed these courses on a contract basis for a local hospital system, and the school's management faculty delivered them in a classroom environment. Recognizing the potential appeal of web-based courses to busy health care professionals, CEBI approached Erudite to partner in developing and marketing online versions of the courses. Erudite saw this opportunity as a complement to its existing health care continuing management education programs. Erudite is responsible for supporting the instructional technology, marketing the courses, and collecting tuition. CEBI faculty develop and teach the courses. They receive a stipend for developing each course and then are compensated for teaching it, commensurate with the number of students participating in the course at any one time. Erudite and CEBI share the remaining tuition revenue based on a cost-sharing formula. The university views this program not only as a way to offer continuing education courses, but also as an important recruitment tool for its web-based MBA program. Students, if admitted to the program, can apply some of the Erudite/UM-D courses toward their degrees.

Virginia Tech–Wake Forest University School of Biomedical Engineering and Sciences

A new school developed jointly by a public university and a private university, located in two different states.
These two universities–one public and one private, and located in different states–collaborated to create a new academic unit, the School of Biomedical Engineering and Sciences. Initiated by the faculty from the partner institutions, this school will offer joint MS and PhD degrees in biomedical engineering, and an MD/PhD. Through this new unit, the collaborating institutions aim to be competitive in recruiting new graduate students and applying for external research funding in a growing discipline. Wake Forest does not have an engineering school, and Virginia Tech does not have a medical school. Through this program, students enroll and reside on one of the two campuses and take courses delivered either in person or via distance learning technologies from faculty at both institutions. They pay the local university's tuition; however, most students are supported by grants or graduate research positions. Each course, regardless of where it is taught, is cross-listed in the catalogs of both universities. Four newly created core courses are supplemented with a set of electives offered by one of the partner institutions. Faculty will

deliver core courses using distributed education technology, and the electives will be taught through a combination of technology and face-to-face courses. Participating faculty hold appointments in traditional departments at their respective institutions. Leadership for this particular CJV is provided on a rotating basis by the engineering, medical, and graduate deans at the two partner institutions. The school's governance committee includes three faculty from each institution, and the deans are *ex officio* members. This committee sets policy for the school; however, both institutions' formal curriculum committees must approve all offerings and degrees.

The Wharton–INSEAD Alliance

A multifaceted partnership between a U.S. and a Eur-Asian business school. (http://www.wharton.upenn.edu/alliance/index.html)

The University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School, with campuses in Philadelphia and San Francisco, and INSEAD, a private, free-standing business school with campuses in Fontainebleau, France and in Singapore, have created an alliance to extend their reach in the emerging global business research and education marketplace. Based on the notion that the alliance should permit the two schools to do together what neither could do alone, the broad-based initiative includes exchanges of faculty and both MBA and doctoral students, joint faculty research and publication, joint alumni programs, a variety of joint communications and public relations activities, and both custom and open-enrollment executive education programs. Students in the degree programs enroll at one of the two schools, but may, within limits, take courses at any of the four campuses. Executive education courses are offered at any combination of the campuses and involve faculty from both schools. An Executive Committee–which consists of the deans of the two schools, an executive director from one school, and a research director from the other–oversees the governance of the partnership.

Worldwide Universities Network

An alliance of research universities from three continents beginning to offer collaborative graduate programs online. (http://www.wun.ac.uk)

The Worldwide Universities Network (WUN) is an alliance of research universities from North America, Europe, and Asia that engages in research collaboration and student and faculty exchange. WUN partners include, from the United Kingdom, the universities of Bristol, Leeds, Manchester, Sheffield, Southampton, and York; from China, the universities of Nanjing and Zhejiang; and from the United States, the universities of California, San Diego; Illinois; Washington; and Wisconsin, Madison; as well as Pennsylvania State University. WUN encourages the formation of common interest groups among partner institutions, provides an infrastructure, and seeks support to facilitate research collaboration among the faculty at its member institutions in 10 areas–biomedical informatics, advanced materials and nanotechnology, green chemistry, wireless communications, nursing, Geographical Information Systems (GIS), globalization and the geography of the new economy, earth systems, public policy and management, and Medieval studies. The alliance also supports work in online English language teaching and educational technology research that will facilitate its efforts. Its work centers on three types of collaborations: research, graduate student and faculty exchange, and online distributed learning. University leaders in the United Kingdom and the United States originally developed WUN; later, the founders invited Chinese institutions to participate, and the organization is expanding to continental Europe. Members of WUN are beginning to collaborate in online graduate programs. Its first degree program is a master's degree in public policy and management, taught in English. The degree is awarded by the University of York in the United Kingdom, which acts as the lead institution in the collaborative effort. Students enroll through the University of York and pay that institution's tuition and fees. These fees are then distributed to partner institutions according to a cost-sharing formula. However, the course draws upon faculty expertise across partner institutions, with nine institutions authoring material. Faculty pairs from one U.S. and one U.K. university jointly created the content for each program course to ensure that the ideas, pedagogies, and approaches from both countries shape the course. The BBC also participates as a partner in this program by allowing students and faculty access to its archive of key public policy issues and events, creating a rich multimedia resource. WUN is exploring offering additional joint graduate programs with multiple partner institutions awarding the degrees. This will be the model for the alliance's new master's degrees in bioinformatics and in GIS, both of which have recently been funded. For some partners, WUN provides an additional outlet to distribute web-based courses already in their catalog and encourages the development of other courses that can be used in WUN. For example, Penn State plans to tap some of its courses currently offered through its online World Campus for WUN.

Additional Approaches

The CJVs highlighted in this paper serve as examples of innovative alliances. Others exist as well, some of which have been widely publicized, such as Fathom (a well-known CJV that has closed). Others are less well-known, such as the Global University Alliance (http://www.gua.com), a partnership among universities from North America, Europe, Australia, and New Zealand that offers courses and degrees to students in Asia; EMBA Global (http://www.london.edu/emba-global/index.html), an alliance between the Columbia Business School and the London School of Economics; and Øresund University (http://www.uni.oresund.org/), a consortium of 12 Danish and Swedish universities.

Variety Among Approaches

As these brief descriptions illustrate, CJVs cover a range of initiatives—and despite certain core similarities, they vary in form. Key differences exist in the number and types of partners, partner relationships and contributions, alliance structure and oversight, issuance of credentials, and content and delivery mode. Such variety suggests that no single model has emerged, as institutions are experimenting with a variety of structures, partners, relationships, and business models.

Number and types of partners. The composition of CJVs range from a dyad to a network. The partners may represent similar types of institutions, such as other traditional colleges or universities, or dissimilar organizations such as corporations or for-profit institutions. Partners may also include foreign universities, government agencies, or nonprofit organizations. For example, a dyad might include two traditional U.S. universities (for example, Wake Forest and Virginia Tech), a U.S. and foreign peer institution (for example, Wharton and INSEAD), or a traditional university and a corporation (such as the University of Michigan-Dearborn and Erudite Corporation). Triads and networks also vary. AllLearn's partners include Oxford, Stanford, and Yale. The Michigan Virtual University includes two- and four-year institutions, state agencies, corporations, and technology providers. Some networks are international in scope, such as Universitas 21 Global and Worldwide Universities Network. Others are domestic, such as the Great Plains Interactive Distance Education Alliance and the Michigan Virtual University.

Partner relationships and contributions. The relationships among partners also reflect different ways in which to operate—for example, the type and level of contributions that CJV partners make vary. In some instances, such as the Global Film School, the three partners—all higher education institutions—share in course provision, oversight through a deans' council, quality assurance through a faculty-administrator-led curriculum committee, and capital, both financial and physical (for example, office space, hardware, and software). In OneMBA and the Wharton-INSEAD alliance, faculty and school administrators share management and coordination responsibilities, and contribute equally to alliance activities and products. Partners in other alliances have different relationships. Some partners provide content only, or they provide content and instruction to a lead agent that directs the venture. Examples include Cardean—which partners with Columbia Business School, Stanford University, The University of Chicago Graduate School of Business, Carnegie Mellon University, and the London School of Economics and Political Science—and AllLearn, which partners with Oxford, Yale, and Stanford. In these situations, one partner enters into formal agreements with

Such variety suggests that no single model has emerged, as institutions are experimenting with a variety of structures, partners, relationships, and business models.

others that provide specific types of materials, and the alliance delivers the material. In the case of eArmyU and Michigan Virtual University, each partner institution provides degrees and certificates. Ownership of the CJV also varies when the CJV is a separate entity. For example, in the case of AllLearn, the partner institutions are the sole owners of the venture. In the case of Cardean and Universitas 21 Global, outside shareholders and institutional partners are involved.

Alliance structure and oversight. Some CJVs have a separate administrative structure located outside the parent institutions. For example, the Global Film School has a separate headquarters and staff directing the venture, as do the Worldwide Universities Network, AllLearn, and the Michigan Virtual University. The consulting arm of IBM Business Consulting Services is the Army contractor that directs eArmyU (formerly directed by Pricewaterhouse-Coopers), and Thomson Learning provides contracted administrative services for Universitas 21 Global. In contrast, other CJVs, particularly smaller ones, do not have a separate entity that manages operations, as is the case with many of the business school alliances and Wake Forest's and Virginia Tech's Biomedical Engineering School. However, even when CJVs have external structures, often those individuals responsible for collaboration and CJV initiatives are faculty and administrators from partner organizations. For example, although WUN has a small central staff, according to its CEO, campus partners conduct a clear majority of its work. The CJV staff is responsible for coordinating, brokering, and supporting collaboration.

Another structural distinction is the type or level of units that interact. In some instances, the locus of the CJV is a specific academic department or college within the institution, such as OneMBA, Great Plains IDEA, and the Global Film School. In other situations, the CJV is an institutional commitment, such as eArmyU, the Worldwide Universities Network, Universitas 21 Global, and AllLearn. Even when institutions, rather than departments, are the signatory partners, alliance activity might be limited to a few departments or programs. Rarely does the whole institution participate.

A final structural element relates to resources. There are several ways in which CJVs receive resources and funding. Some CJVs are initiated through financial or in-kind investments by its partners–for example, the for-profit Global Film School and the nonprofit Great Plains IDEA. Other CJVs rely on a primary investor (or investors), with other partners making smaller investments. For example, Universitas 21 Global secured Thomson Learning as a financial partner in addition to being supported by founding institutional partners. Other CJVs receive resources that are raised primarily outside the partnership, such as through venture capital or philanthropic gifts, with individual partners making little to no cash investment in the alliance. For example, Cardean University sought partners who could provide course content (such as the University of Chicago, Stanford University, Columbia University, the London School of Economics, and Carnegie Mellon University) as well as investors to support the effort. A final approach is a combination of the various funding strategies.

Issuance of credentials. Some CJVs offer degrees, such as Cardean University and Universitas 21 Global; others offer certificates, such as the Global Film School. Others offer individual courses, such as AllLearn; and still others offer a mixture of individual courses, certificates, and degrees. In some CJVs, one of the individual partners awards the credentials, as is the case with eArmyU, Great Plains IDEA, and OneMBA. In other CJVs, both partners jointly issue the degrees, such as Wake Forest's and Virginia Tech's School of Biomedical Engineering. In still other instances, the new entity awards the credential independent of its parent or partner institutions–such as Universitas 21 Global, which awards the credential itself but includes the crests of participating institutions on all of its diplomas. Cardean also awards its own degrees. OneMBA offers a joint diploma acknowledging all partner institutions, in addition to the recognized degree awarded to graduates from one of the institutions (see Table 1).

Content and delivery mode. The final distinction involves the curriculum offered and its mode of delivery. In some instances, partners create offerings in which the content largely replicates, modifies, or repackages existing courses–for example, eArmyU and Great Plains IDEA. In other cases, partners create new courses or significantly modify existing ones. OneMBA, the Global Film School, and AllLearn are examples. CJVs may vary in their breadth of disciplinary or programmatic focus (see Table 2). Some CJVs offer courses in a limited area, such as in a single discipline, as is the case with the Global Film School and the School of Biomedical Engineering, or in a small number of areas, such as Universitas 21 Global and Cardean University, offering programs in business management and information

Table 1. Credentials Issued

Nondegree certificates/ courses	Degree offered by any single partner institution	Degree offered jointly by partner institutions	Degree offered by the CJV
AllLearn	eArmyU	Worldwide Universities Network**	Cardean
Global Film School	Great Plains IDEA	Virginia Tech–Wake Forest School of Biomedical Engineering	U21 Global
	OneMBA*		
	University of Michigan–Dearborn and Erudite Corporation		

*In addition to the recognized degree awarded by one partner institution, students also receive a joint diploma presented by all of the partner institutions.

**Future plans include joint degrees.

Table 2. Range of Disciplines/Fields Offered

Single Discipline	Narrow Range of Fields	Broad Range of Fields
Global Film School	Cardean University	AllLearn
OneMBA	Great Plains IDEA	eArmyU
Virginia Tech–Wake Forest School of Biomedical Engineering	Worldwide Universities Network	Michigan Virtual University

systems. However, other CJVs, such as eArmyU, the Michigan Virtual University, and AllLearn, offer programs and courses in a broad range of fields.

In terms of delivery, many CJVs rely predominantly on distance education technologies–for example, the Global Film School, AllLearn, and eArmyU. Others, including many of the business school alliances, use more traditional classroom instructional modes. A third group uses a combination of distance education and traditional face-to-face instruction.

Emerging Models

Within this diversity of CJVs, three models are beginning to emerge based on their structure and goals (see Table 3). One version is the stand-alone for-profit organization. Such CJVs–including Cardean University, and the Global Film School–distinguish themselves from their parent or partner institutions by offering courses and programs that tap expanding markets. A second approach, similar to the stand-alone model, also represents an independent structure but operates as a not-for-profit entity. AllLearn and the Michigan Virtual University are examples of this approach. The objectives shaping this approach tend to be more experimental and/or service-oriented than revenue-oriented. The third model also operates as a not-for-profit entity (although one person responsible for this type of CJV referred to it as "not-for-loss") and is embedded in the parent organizations. Examples include the Biomedical Engineering School created jointly by Wake Forest and Virginia Tech, Great Plains IDEA, the Wharton-INSEAD alliance, and OneMBA. This third approach tends to have multiple objectives, such as joint research or exchange opportunities for current and future students, experimentation in the e-learning marketplace, and the expansion of academic offerings. The revenue generated tends not to be the driving force behind the efforts, instead representing only one of many motivations.

Within these approaches, each CJV charts its own business model and work plan. Some engage multiple partners, others enlist only a single collaborator. Some participants offer courses or programs in multiple fields, while others identify a narrow market niche. Some develop courses specifically for the alliance; others draw upon their current curriculum and simply offer it unchanged or in new formats and via different technologies. Some offer degrees or credit-bearing courses that are transferable; others focus solely on continuing education.

Table 3. Emerging Models of CJVs

For-Profit CJVs	Nonprofit CJVs—Separate Entity	Nonprofit CJVs—Embedded Entity
Cardean	AllLearn	Wharton-INSEAD
Global Film School	eArmyU	Great Plains IDEA
Fathom (now closed)	Michigan Virtual University	OneMBA
Universitas 21 Global	Worldwide Universities Network	University of Michigan–Dearborn and Erudite Corporation
		Virginia Tech–Wake Forest School of Biomedical Engineering

An Adaptive Strategy for a Changing Future

CJVs present both advantages and risks. Among the benefits noted earlier are expanding capacity; creating new offerings that partners cannot deliver on their own; providing institutions with the confidence, tools, and expertise to explore new markets or new fields; and, sometimes, generating revenue. Other benefits are less tangible but nonetheless important. CJVs may facilitate organizational learning and provide students and faculty at the participating institutions with new opportunities.

However, CJVs also present risks, as the closure of some fledgling initiatives indicates. Some high-profile efforts seeking to tap the e-market have folded (such as Fathom, which closed after a multimillion-dollar investment, and the online, for-profit efforts by New York University and the University of Maryland University College) or have restructured after realizing that profits are less forthcoming than first thought. Others, even those designed as nonprofits, are altering their expectations, seeking to serve as test beds of innovation rather than to provide monetary returns on investments.

Many external factors will determine the ultimate success of CJVs, not the least of which are a rocky economy and the dot-com bust. Additionally, the demand for the courses and programs offered by CJVs may turn out to be less robust than anticipated. Competition from other providers–for-profit institutions, foreign institutions, and other CJVs–may be greater than predicted. In the case of transnational CJVs, the impact of the ongoing General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) negotiations also remains uncertain. Will GATS significantly lower the trade barriers that exist, thus providing a more favorable climate for CJVs? Will there be enough exceptions or refusals to make commitments by various governments in the trade negotiation process to negate GATS's impact? We will know some answers to these questions in 2005, when the current round of negotiations concludes. Nevertheless, trade negotiations will be an ongoing process that may have a considerable effect on CJVs.

Strategic alliances of all kinds bring with them a set of internal challenges that differ from the usual finance, governance, and management issues that institutions face. Estimates from the business sector suggest that as many as two of every three joint ventures do not succeed.[5] The strategic alliance literature offers many reasons for failure: Many difficulties arise because participants do not select potential partners wisely, identifying partners with incompatible (or dissimilar) goals or who are unwilling or unable to commit the needed resources and make necessary investments. Once partners are paired, they must reconcile their dissimilar purposes into a common alliance objective. Partners often have different goals not only for themselves, but also for the alliance. Alliances may struggle because partners do

Strategic alliances of all kinds bring with them a set of internal challenges that differ from the usual finance, governance, and management issues that institutions face.

not share a common understanding of the environment, or, in the case of transnational alliances, do not even operate in the same environment. Additionally, alliances must negotiate the different cultures of partner organizations and learn how to work across multiple decision-making structures. Partners often fail to understand the other's operations, norms, and preferences. Overcoming the difficulties of launching and managing CJVs can be more acute when the partners are more dissimilar than similar, as might be the case with alliances between business and higher education or among universities from countries with very different higher education systems and cultural norms.

While colleges and universities may have some experience with partnerships and strategic alliances, CJVs push institutions into even newer territory. Some CJVs may cause those traditionally involved in curricular and campus governance decisions to feel a need for stronger involvement, thus complicating what may already be a delicate balance. Each party may want a greater say: faculty because of the curricular foundation of the efforts; administrators because of their managerial responsibilities in negotiating, implementing, and monitoring new institutional agreements; and trustees because of their fiduciary responsibility. CJVs may raise questions about the extent to which partners may influence each other's decision-making process. Where do the interests of the alliance end and the prerogatives of the individual institutions begin? By deciding to participate in CJVs, institutions make intentional choices to open some aspects of their operations to outsider influence–choices that some argue might erode institutional authority. The entrepreneurial nature of many CJVs may create a distraction from core purposes. Institutions spending time, energy, and money on one set of activities cannot exert the same effort or apply those same resources elsewhere. CJVs might further erode public confidence in the university as a social institution, as such strategies may appear to be simply new ways to fill institutional coffers. CJVs have the potential to raise questions about accreditation, quality assurance, and credit recognition, depending on their form and offerings. Delivering courses transnationally, having degrees offered by newly created CJVs recognized, and ensuring that students are able to transfer courses may be difficult to achieve. Finally, finding partners with complementary strengths may not serve as a ready remedy for institutional weakness. Instead, such collaborations may only exaggerate weaknesses across partners, thus leading to a whole that is weaker than the sum of its parts.

Regardless of these challenges and difficulties, the continued appearance of new CJVs and the enthusiasm of their champions suggest that optimism reigns. Undoubtedly, some CJVs will prove successful and will provide workable models for others. A new and little-tested strategy, CJVs will continue to evolve, shaped by lessons of experience and a changing environment.

Conclusion: Right Time? Right Strategy?

This report began with the assertion that collaboration represents an important way for institutions to maximize their physical, financial, and intellectual resources and to avoid needless, expensive duplication and competition. But such ventures come with their share of risks and dangers as well, including succumbing to the pressure to jump on the bandwagon of innovation led by high-profile institutions. Today's hot new strategy may turn out to be another failed experiment, difficult to undertake, and costly. Higher education is not immune to fads.[6] Many institutions that succumbed to the call of the technology sirens regarding distance education found that it was far more complex and expensive than anticipated and its impact was difficult to assess. That said, the need to be perceived as innovative is strong, and many board members and policy makers expect their institutions to be front-runners in all ways. Innovation also is a badge of leadership, and few institutions want to be perceived as sitting still.

CJVs, in their multiple formats, hold promise, but they may not be right for every institution. Some institutions will be able to tap a readily available and capable technology infrastructure, while others may have to build one from scratch or enhance one that is woefully insufficient. CJVs may require significant investment–both short- and long-term. Sometimes the returns on investment will be uncomfortably delayed. Assessing success may be complicated, combining fiscal, reputational, and intangible results. Only the strongest, most flexible, and most dedicated partners may be able to stay in the game long enough to see the fruits of their labors. To date, it seems that the richer, larger (and often more prestigious) institutions are the ones engaged in CJVs, as they have the resources to invest and the prestige that bodes well for success in the marketplace. However, other types of institutions may find suitable strategies for themselves as well. For example, many small colleges have strong histories of other types of collaboration, and emerging technologies may allow them to work together in new and different ways.

The appearance of CJVs on the higher education landscape raises important questions that should be carefully considered by administrators, boards, and faculty as they venture into this new territory. We leave the reader with a set of questions to consider:

- What purposes and motivations might a CJV serve? (For example, commercializing strengths, positioning within emerging markets, internationalizing offerings, experimenting with new pedagogies, and so forth.)
- Is this institution well-positioned and well-suited to initiate or join a CJV? Why?

- What does this institution stand to gain? To lose?
- What effects might the CJV have on existing policies, practices, and programs? How might governance or quality assurance be affected? In what ways might it impact other, similar campus efforts (such as e-learning and distributed education, serving different student markets, or the introduction of new pedagogies)?
- What impact might such an effort have on the core of the institution, vis-à-vis the faculty? To what extent might the academic culture impede or facilitate faculty participation and invention? How might institutional partners make such an effort appealing and interesting, and compatible with academic culture?
- What internal changes might the institution need to make? What changes are feasible and desirable?
- What structure might work best to meet the institution's objectives? What types of partners should it seek? How many? For what contributions?
- What financial investment will be required? What is the anticipated return on that investment, and over what period of time?
- What decision-making or oversight structure will the CJV adopt? What will be its relationship to the parent organizations and how will the partners interact?
- How will partners define and measure the success of the CJV?

Endnotes

1. Baus, F., & Ramsbottom, C. A. (1999). Starting and sustaining a consortium. In L. G. Dotolo & J. T. Strandness (Eds.), Best practices in higher education consortia: How institutions can work together. *New Directions for Higher Education* (106), 3–18. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

2. Green, M., Eckel, P., & Barblan, A. (2002). *The Brave New (and Smaller) World of Higher Education: A Transatlantic View.* Washington DC: American Council on Education. http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/2002_brave-new-world.pdf

3. Katz, R. N., Ferrara, E. M., & Napier, I. S. (2002). *Partnerships in Distributed Education.* Washington DC: American Council on Education. http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/index.cfm?pubID=279

4. Waddock, S. (1988, Summer). Building successful social partnerships. *Sloan Management Review*, 17-23.

5. See for example: Barringer, B. R., & Harrison, J. S. (2000). Walking a tightrope: Creating value through interorganizational relationships. *Journal of Management,* 26 (3), 367–403. Peng, M. W., & Shenkar, O. (2002). Joint venture dissolution as corporate divorce. *Academy of Management Executive,* 16 (2), 92-105.

6. Birnbaum, R. (2000). *Management fads in higher education: Where they come from, what they do, why they fail.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

American Council on Education
Center for Institutional and International Initiatives

ACE is grateful to Accenture, The Goldman Sachs Foundation, and Peterson's, part of The Thomson Corporation, for their generous support of the American Council on Education's Changing Enterprise Project and this occasional paper series.