home. Private and public universities also are examined, and the latter show lower rates of internal efficiency.

The basic theme and policy conclusions throughout the book are refreshing for their simplicity and profound implications. The rates of return to private as well as public investment in Brazil are constrained by low productivity of the labor force, largely the consequence of an educational system which is anemic, inefficient, and inequitable. Simultaneous stimuli in the supply of, and demand for, more and higher-quality schooling are needed to increase workers’ skills and ensure the sustainability of Brazil’s socioeconomic development. While obviously more resources would help, the key element of the book lies in its appeal for major reform consistent with a more rational allocation of existing resources.

Manuel J. Carvajal
Florida International University,
Miami, FL, USA
E-mail address: carvajal@fiu.edu
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Enrollment Management for the 21st Century: Institutional Goals, Accountability, and Fiscal Responsibility

As ambiguous as any administrative concept in higher education, enrollment management has been discussed and practiced (more often in the breach than the observance) for almost thirty years. In one of those circular definitions for which educational theorists are famous and which drive logicians and the more practical minded screaming into the night, Penn quotes Hossler’s standard definition: “Enrollment management is an organizational concept and systematic set of activities whose purpose is to exert influence over student enrollments” (Hossler, Bean and Associates, 1990, p. 5). As Hossler’s definition only partially clears the semantic fog surrounding the idea of enrollment management, so Penn’s disjointed and superficial survey of the field only partially clarifies current enrollment management practice.

Penn begins with a review of the current macro-economic and public policy world within which higher education and enrollment management exists. She proceeds to a discussion of the various theories of enrollment management, its most common operating models, twelve mini-mini-case studies of how enrollment management is practiced at a cross-section of public universities and arrives at a series of marginally useful and overly general set of concluding observations. In mimicking the inchoate field of enrollment management, Penn’s work is neither valuable as theory nor as practical advice. As theory, it does not advance the profession. Penn’s contribution is scarcely more than a summary of the findings of a survey of how nascent notions about managing enrollments have been implemented. Regarding implementation, Penn offers scant practical advice and too few nuggets of insight. Such insight as she does provide ranges from the discovery of the obvious – Presidential involvement, faculty and senior administrative commitment are crucial to successful enrollment management – to the teasingly interesting – the University of Memphis’s creation of a 35 person, campus-wide enrollment management council.

There are, these misgivings aside, several things one can learn from Penn’s somewhat slapdash survey of the enrollment management field. First, enrollment management as it is actually practiced generally has some combination or all of four goals: a) “to define the institution’s nature and characteristics, and to market the institution appropriately;” b) “to incorporate all relevant campus constituencies into marketing plans and activities;” c) “to make strategic decisions about the role and amount of financial aid for students and the institution;” and d) “to make appropriate commitments of human, fiscal, and technical resources to enrollment management” (p. iii, citing Dixon, 1995, p.7). Secondly, enrollment management practice includes four administrative models: a) enrollment management committee, b) enrollment management coordinator, c) enrollment management matrix, and d) enrollment management division. The first is the most informal, the latter the most formal. All are driven by the relative degree of institutional commitment and the chief enrollment manager’s personal charisma. Lastly, enrollment management’s greatest value is as a centralizing focus for a student-centered institution and as the campus-wide engine driving continuous quality improvement and outcomes assessment.

Other than a good bibliography for the beginning student of enrollment management, the chief value of Penn’s work is the latter observation. Enrollment management is a new paradigm in higher education governance. It is a construct that unites all of an institution’s various independent facets. It combines academics with student services, both of these with intercollegiate athletics and all of the above with the institution’s purely operational components – bursar, maintenance, buildings and grounds, etc. – into a unified service organization attempting to meet the needs of students. Because it is such a radical departure from previous organizational models, its adoption has been sporadic, piecemeal and
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Penn’s work, like so many recent writings about
enrollment management, admissions, financial aid, reten-
tion, student-centeredness, etc., ironically supports the
notion that higher education is undergoing a managerial
revolution. It is a revolution driven by the need for insti-
tutions to be more consumer oriented. This orientation,
with its inherent values conflict for a faculty-centered
institution, is not unlike the revolution in health care and
his physician-centered world. No one has yet written the
theoretical description/analysis of how enrollment man-
agement is the key to harnessing that revolution’s energy
in a way that meets the needs of both higher education’s
most precious assets (its faculty) and the society which
it serves (students, employers, research consumers and
others). The answer lies not in a review of public institu-
tional practices (where Penn searched in vain), but in
private institutions, where, as Penn notes, the most
aggressive adoption of enrollment management and out-
comes assessment practices and measures have been
adopted. That Penn had nothing to say about enrollment
management in private institutions only underscores her
work’s marginal usefulness.
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Holding Schools Accountable: Performance-based
Reform in Education
Helen F. Ladd (Ed.); The Brookings Institution, Wash-
ington, D.C., 1996, pp. vii+382, Price: $42.95 (cloth)

This book contains 9 papers presented at an April
1995 Brookings Institution conference organized by
Helen F. Ladd of Duke University and includes an exten-
sive introductory chapter written by her. The conference
participants come from the fields of Economics, Political
Science and Educational Policy. The point in common
to all the papers is the quest for a more effective use of
available educational resources at the high school level
and below. The papers provide empirical evidence
addressing two main approaches to accountability: (1)
holding individual schools and teachers directly respon-
sible through effective measurement and managerial
incentives and (2) allowing parents more freedom to
choose the schools for their children. Three of the papers
report the results of empirical analyses of performance-
based incentive programs in South Carolina, Texas, Ken-
tucky, Mississippi, Michigan, and California. Two papers
look at the then limited evidence concerning the
effects of voucher programs, while the remaining four
papers are concerned with the measurement of costs and
the way funds are actually allocated across school dis-
tricts.

Charles Clotfelder and Helen Ladd address the practi-
cal problems involved in assessing performance and how
the South Carolina and Dallas public school systems
have handled them. In particular, they focus on the diffi-
culties of accounting for differences in socioeconomic
background of students in a way that makes the distinc-
tion identifiable and justifiable to parents and staff when
assessing the performance of individual schools. A
second issue concerns the incentives given teachers to
teach narrowly in order to maximize their students’ per-
formance on the tests used to evaluate the teacher’s con-
tribution to achievement.

Richard Elmore, Charles Abelmann, and Susan Fuhr-
man consider a similar set of issues in Kentucky and
Mississippi, while also emphasizing the differences
between relative and absolute measures of achievement
and the political difficulties inherent to resolving these
philosophical differences involved in the allocation of
educational resources.

David Cohen looks at the difficulties of reform from
within the educational system and suggests that the more
likely outcome given the current political environment is
an eventual abandonment of reform from within the pub-
lic school system to one driven by parental choice and
local control.

The next two papers turn to school choice as an alter-
native to the micro-managing of schools by educational
administrators. John Witte provides a summary of the
results known at the time of the conference suggesting
that Catholic schools produce relatively higher gradu-
ation rates and greater enrollment rates in college for
their students, especially for students at the lower end of
achievement ladder, despite a lack of evidence that tests
scores are any higher for Catholic school students once
one controls for other factors.

Caroline Minter Hoxby attempts to address the lack
of experimental data on voucher programs by simulating
the effects of a more extensive voucher program by
drawing on data on differences across schools due to the