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 Tennessee Table 1B. Input-Process-Output-Outcome Chart.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  **Inputs** | **Processes**  | **Outputs** | **Outcomes** |
| Ensure fair and equitable distribution of public funds to TN HEI consistent with goals of the Master Plan (3.4) | Develop statewide Master Plan for TN HEI (3.1) | Ensure increased degree production (3.1B) | Address states’ economic development and workforce needs (3.1A) |
| The policies and formulae or guidelines v provide for the consideration of the impact of tuition, maintenance fees and other charges assessed by each institution in determining the fair and equitable distribution of public funds as required by this subdivision. The commission shall therefore review tuition, maintenance fees and other charges assessed by each institution…(3.4B) | Ensure minimal redundancy in degree offerings (3.1C) | Ensuring competitive research (3.1C) | Foster economic growth (9.1) |
| x | Approve institutional mission statements for each HEI- degree offerings, type of students served (3.2) | Master Plan will provide Higher Education Opportunities to all TN citizens (3.3) | Accelerate the state’s economic and workforce development efforts in the field of energy sciences and engineering (9.2) |
| x | Nothing in policy can deter HEI from pursuing its mission (3.2) | Outcomes-, timely progress to degree, research and student success (3.4) | Support the development of clean energy technologies and jobs in Tennessee (9.3) |
| x | Master Plan promotes high degree of regional cooperation between K12, HEI’s, businesses, civic and community leaders (3.3) | Standardized and centralized community college system will aimed to produce more rapid and significantly higher rates of program completion through structured degree programs that incorporate fixed course offerings…on a pre-determined schedule. (8.c4) | Strengthen existing partnership between University of Tennessee and Oak Ridge National Laboratory (9.4) |
| x | Master Plan emphasizes outcomes across range of variables weighted to reinforce each HEI mission and provide incentives for productivity improvement consistent with the Master Plan (3.4) | Increasing number of STEM degrees to doctoral schools University of Tennessee and other institutions (to foster economic growth) (9.1) | Promote interdisciplinary program of energy science and engineering at the University of Tennessee , Knoxville that shall provide students anopportunity to undertake transformative research activities (9.6) |
| x | commission shall develop a university tract program within the University of Tennessee and Tennessee BoR of 60 hours for transfer and applied toward BA attainment at public institutions (4.e1) | Increase prestige of University of Tennessee as top tier institution (9.5) | Promote research in science, technology,engineering and mathematics that encourages entrepreneurialopportunities in Tennessee (9.8) |
| x | Community College students must be supplied with sufficient information about programs and courses so they know which courses will lead to degree and which ones will not (4.2ab) | Promote collaborative research anddevelopment by interdisciplinary teams of University of Tennessee,Knoxville, and other state university faculties and the Oak Ridge NationalLaboratory in energy-related fields (9.7, 9.9) | University of Tennessee is allowed to establish an academic unit at ORNL, with appointment and oversight of graduate students, the appointment of ORNL staff as faculty, and the development of interdisciplinary curricula between the two institutions (9.9ab) |
| x | Any person who satisfies the admission requirements for any two year school under jurisdiction of board of regents and any four year school under the board regents may be admitted to both (6g) | Ability to establish partnerships with private entities (11.a) | St. Jude’s Hospital, Tennessee Health Services and University of Tennessee now a Memphis Research Consortium (MRC). The MRC is a collaborative research venture with other leading business and research entities to promote economic development and job creation, promote opportunities for RD in public health, medical devices, medical and healthcare, bio-based products andchemical manufacturing, logistics and supply chain, computational andcomputer sciences, and learning technologies and related fields. (11.ab) |
| x | All 13 Tennessee Community Colleges, which operate independently, will now be unified under a standardized system, offering block scheduling (8.c1-6) |  | Promotion of participation by other institutions of higher education,hospitals and other health services providers, organizations engaged inthe promotion of public health, medical devices, medical and healthcare,bio-based products and chemical manufacturing, logistics and supplychain, computational and computer sciences, learning technologies,bioscience, and bioengineering and related business and research, aswell as industrial and commercial enterprises engaged in businessactivities related to these areas (11.ab) |
| x | An audit of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, theUniversity of Tennessee board of trustees and the board of regents may be conductedby the comptroller of the treasury (13) |  | x |
| x | The commission must submit higher education funding formula to the office of legislativebudget analysis and the comptroller no later than December 1 (3.4A) |  | x |
| x |  The office of legislative budget analysis andthe comptroller shall each provide comments on the higher education funding formula to the general assembly (3.4A) |  | X  |
|  | The commission, with commissioner of finance and comptroller, shall establish uniform standards of accounting, records and statistical reporting with which standards shall be adhered to by the various institutions in preparing for submission to the commission statistical data and requests for appropriations (3.4C) |  |  |
|  | The commission shall review tuition and maitence fees and other charges assessed by each institution and make recommendations to the respective governing boards (3.4B) |  |  |
|  | end of terms enrollments, student retention, transfers |  |  |
|  | Promotion of partnerships between community colleges and technology centers (8.c5) |  |  |
|  | Tennessee four year institutions may no longer offer remedial courses, but can plan with community college to offer remedial courses (7) |  |  |

Table 2B. Visual Representation of TN Input-Process-Output-Outcome.

Table 3B.

Hegemony/Discourse chart (number in parentheses refers to location in policy, the following number is the frequency, and TC is total count)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Hegemonic/Neoliberal Term/Notion** | **Location/Frequency**  | **How the term shapes the public good** |
| References to the market/economic growth/ revenue and profit generation investment/ commercialization | (3.1A)1, (3.3)1, (9.1-8)3, (11b)4, TC: 9 | The promotion of economic development in TN is one of the main desired outcomes of TN PBF. In conjunction with other business related references in the policy, the public good is decidedly construed in market terms and financial capabilities. As has been mentioned before , the market cannot (and will not) readily produce non-rivalrous and non-excludable goods (Marginson, 2007). And the public good of any polity will be impoverished if there is a lack of public goods.  |
| References to efficiency, optimal use of resources  | (1C)2, (4.2)1, (8.3)4, (13) 4TC: 11 | There is a push by TN policymakers to ensure that TN institutions, especially community colleges, are not wasting resources and not duplicating programs. In addition, the TN legislature can audit all educational programs. Efficiency is a guiding principle of neoliberalism in general and the accountability movement in particular (Burke, 2005; Fowler, 2009). Efficiency is a valued foundational plank of the public good in TN higher education institutions one that is enforced with audit and government oversight. Efficiency and accountability have been a wider concern of higher education policy in the US and globally over the last forty years (Prokou, 2013). The TN policymakers have been inspired by this accountability focus. However, the focus on accountability has been pursued at the expense of social justice concerns (Mallott, Hill & Banefield, 2013; Prokou, 2013).  |
| References to vocational/workforce training and human capital/ job creation | (1.A)1, (9.2-3)2, (11b)1TC: 4 | There is only four references to job creation, but again, in conjunction with the other business terms, these four references help to further shape the public good in market terms.  |
| References to accountability and performance  | (1)1, (3.1)2, (3.1B)1, (3.4)7, (3.4C)1, (8.1-5)3, (9.1)1TC: 16 | Accountability and government oversight are the major planks of the TN PBF policy. There is a total of 35 references of accountability and government oversight. The entire TN community college system is overhauled and reorganized while the TN policymakers seek to hold four year HEI accountable to. There seems to be little trust between TN policymakers and TN HEI’s. Instead, the TN PBF is used to restructure higher education in TN. Of course the policymakers do call for the University of Tennessee Trustees to help inform PBF measures. Nonetheless, TN HEI’s become hierarchal entities, at the bottom of the chain. The vision of the public good can be constrained by lack of trust and hierarchy (Burke, 2005; Pusser, 2006; X, 2006). It should also be noted that this act makes it so the commission has NO authority for recommending individual technology centers operating budgets. The 27 TN technology centers are operated under the TN Board of Regents and specifically focus on workforce training. HEI are complex entities charged with fostering the public good (Ramaly, 2006). Their complexity defies the assumption of simple causation (X, 2006). TN policymakers assume that tighter government control will force HEI to conform to their (TN policymakers’) wishes. Policymakers cannot assume simple causality in complex organizations however, yet policymakers are paid to give simple answers to constituents (X, 2006). Yet, as Bohman and Deal (2008) argue, in complex organizations, turning on a lightswitch will not light the room, but make a toilet flush ten blocks away. HEI are very complex and simple casual assumptions can impede their functioning and the creation of the public good. The absence of trust and tighter bureaucratic control will most likely pressure the entire the system of HEI in unforeseen ways (as well as predictable ways) and pressure the entire system, limiting its ability to contribute to the public good and contribute to KM (Cooper, 2009).  |
| References to public-private partnerships and collaboration | (3.3)1, (8.4-5)2, (9.1-9ab)7, (11a-c)3TC: 13 | see STEM  |
| References to tuition un-affordability  | (3.4A)1, (3B)2TC: 3 | There is recognition of tuition increases, but there is no mention of the political motivations behind tuition increases, which have been largely due to the continual slashing of public funds at the hands of neoliberals over the last four decades (Newfield, 2008; Zumeta, 2011). Rather, tuition increases are treated as almost agentless actions which HEI must deal with effectively (Edmundson & D’Orso, 2007).  |
| References to competition | (3.1C)1, (4.1A)1TC: 2 | See prestige |
| References to knowledge based economy  | N/A | N/A |
| References to Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics  | (9.1-9ab)9, (10)1, TC: 10 | There is a special relationship between STEM, technology and a private partnership with Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL). ORNL is a laboratory run by the US Department of Energy. Yet, the mission and purpose of ORNL is to promote the commercialization of goods in the private sector. Thus, as Marginson (2007) notes, the dichotomy between public and private is blurry. Further, Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) argue that neoliberalism conflates the boundaries between the public and private spheres. This conflation of public and private purpose is illustrated by TN policymakers. Promotion of STEM disciplines and collaboration with ORNL, a public laboratory, is meant to spurn private sector growth. The public good, in line with business purposes of TN policymakers and outcomes of TN PBF is, at least partially, to promote private interests. The policy allows for ORNL employees oversight of graduate students. As Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) and Washburn (2005) note, this could lead to a conflict of interest especially if ORNAL is pursuing for-profit ventures which collide with UT’s public mission. Again, this is a further example of the conflation of public and private interests.  |
| References to online instruction  | N/A | N/A |
| Elevation of status/prestige  | (9.5)1TC:1 | While there is only one reference to prestige, and only two to competition, these references are important because another plank of neoliberalism is that universities be competitive and compete for students and resources (Marginson, 2007; Rhoads & Torres, 2006; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). This competition is sustained and enhanced by the various college ranking systems (Marginson, 2007). The desire for the University of TN to be a top tier university is indicative of this competitive strand of neoliberalism. Competition and rankings structure the public good as a market, where competition (never on equal terms) determines status and position.  |
| References to Government Oversight  | (3)2, (3.2)1, (3.4C-D)2, (4)1, (4Ai-ii)3, (4.2)3, (4.3)1, (4.3f)1, (5)1, (6)1, (7)1 (8.c1-5)6, (11c)1, (12)1, (13)1TC:25 | See accountability  |

Table 4B. Visual Representation of Hegemony in TN Policy.

Table 5B. Private and non market externality chart

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Private Non-market benefits and externalities** | **Frequency Count/Location**  | **How the public good is shaped by the term(s)** |
| References to health/life expectancy  | (11a-c)8TC: 8 | TN policymakers have dedicated an entire section to promoting health concerns. In section 11, the policymakers urge for public health research as well as create a research consortium with St. Jude’s Children Hospital. As discussed earlier, there is a conflation of public and private entities, but there is some recognition (two references) of purely public health concerns. Public health and well being are integral parts to any notion of public good (Kaul, Inge & Grunberg, 1999; Zacher, 1999). The furtherance of public health is a precursor to general well being (McMahon, 2009). However, the policymakers mention public health in conjunction with private partnerships, including businesses; so again, the public good may not be framed in purely public terms.  |
| References to poverty reduction/assistance/financial stability | N/A | N/A |
| References to general happiness | N/A | N/A |
| References to non-market knowledge and research | N/A | N/A |
| References to art, literature, theater | N/A | N/A |
| References to cultural diversity  | N/A | N/A |
| References to pedagogy  | N/A | N/A |
| References to college mission  | (13)1, (3.1)1, (3.1C)1, (3.2)3, (3.4)1TC: 7 | There is an emphasis on individual college missions, even a safeguard to protect unique college missions (although what constitutes a unique mission is left undefined). Unique missions promote the public good in a variety of ways, through research, service, teaching and other ways (Pusser, 2006; X, 2006). Despite the safeguards, each institution is situated in the hierarchy, at the bottom. How an institution can exercise its mission within a hierarchy remains to be seen. |
| References to enhancing citizenship/public service | (3.2)1, (3.3)1TC: 2 | There were two direct references to public service and one reference to civic leaders. TN policymakers do recognize public service as part of the public good.  |
| References to liberal arts | N/A | N/A |
| References to externalities/social benefits | N/A | N/A |
| References to social transformation/social criticism  | N/A | N/A |
| References to reduced Crime Rate | N/A | N/A |
| References to glo-na-cal/horizontal linkages  | (11.a-b)2TC: 2 | See health and public service |
| References to social contract/state support/resident enrollment | (3.1)1, (3.2)1, (3.3)1, (8.1)1TC: 4 | There were four references to ensuring that Tennessee citizens are served. This speaks to the social contract between the state and HEI (Lewis & Hearn, 2003). Of course, the main outcome of the policy is to promote economic and market efficiency for Tennessee and its citizens. So service to citizens in framed in market terms.  |
| References to institutional autonomy | N/A | N/A |
| References to pollution reduction/clean air | (9.3)1TC: 1 | There is one reference to pollution reduction. The TN policymakers want to promote the creation of clean energy products. Clean air and pollution reduction are integral to any vision of the public good and are public goods in themselves (Kaul, Inge, Grunberg, 1999). However, the promotion of clean energy is framed within public/private partnership, specifically with ORNL.  |
| References to global citizenship, global public goods/national/regional local goods or publics | N/A | N/A |
| References to deliberate inter-generational concerns | N/A | N/A |
| References to just use of STEM | (9.3)1TC: 1 | See pollution/clean air |

Table 6B. Visual Representation of TN Non-hegemonic categories.

Table 8B. Social Actors Chart.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Social Actor(s)**  | **Positioning**  | **Location** | **How actor(s) frames public good**  |
| Tennessee Higher Education Commission  | “The commission shall construct a statewide master plan…” | First mention: (3.1)26 total mentions | THEC is the coordinating agency for the state of Tennessee, with members appointed by the governor. In 2001, Zumeta (2001) argued that coordinating boards across the nation have been advocating performance based funding policies for over two decades because they have been increasingly staffed with corporate allies. This trend seems only to have intensified. The commission is charged by the legislature with developing a statewide master plan for all public universities. The purpose of the plan is to make Tennessee Higher Education accountable and to allow TN HEI’s to address the state’s economic and workforce needs.  |
| University of Tennessee Board of Trustees/ Board of Regents | “…with input from the board of regents and the University of Tennessee board of Trustees… | First mention: (3.1)9 trustee15 Regents | The BOT is the governing body of UT and its members are appointed by the governor. The BOR The BOT and BOR are invited to aid the THEC in crafting the master plan. These entities have more of an advising role in the creation of the master plan. With these three agencies underneath the legislature, there is a clear hierarchy of power in Educational policy making in TN. At one point, boards were supposed to insulate faculty from the political fallout of operating in republic (Zumeta, 2001 ). Now however, these boards have are increasingly staffed by corporate allies sympathetic to business needs (Zumeta, 2001). This massive centralization of power may be an inhibitor of certain voices contributing to the public good, it may also stymie the creation of bridging structures (Calhoun, 1998) |
| Four Year Public Institutions  | “The commission shall engage public universities, community colleges, and technology centers for input during the creation of the master plan.” | First mention: (3.1)15 | Four year public institutions are largely viewed as passive actors by TN policymakers. The THEC is supposed to solicit input of public HEI’s, but this input is supposed to come subsequent to the input of BOR and BOT. Further, the four year HEI’s are not supposed to contribute input to the question of accountability. The method of accountability has already been decided: outcome based performance. The four year institutions are supposed to work within the confines of performance and outcomes funding and not offer alternative models of accountability. Yet, as Zumeta (2011) argues, HEI’s have to tell policymakers and the general public what they *should* desire for accountability purposes.However, there is one clause which does give a degree of power or at least latitude to all HEI to carry out their missions. Section 3.3 reads that nothing in the act can prohibit any institution from pursing its mission. However, what if an institutional mission comes into conflict with PBF, such as a liberal arts based mission? Thus this power dynamic is ambiguous. In addition, this clause may also empower TN HEI’s to pursue KM and other public service goals (Cooper, 2009).  |
| Community Colleges | “The commission shall engage public universities, community colleges, and technology centers for input during the creation of the master plan.” | First mention: (3.1)19 | Community Colleges perhaps are the most restricted entities in the state of TN under this policy. The TN PBF policy creates a brand new framework to unify, centralize and streamline community college operations and offerings. Community Colleges are integral to the public good because they can give educational opportunities for transfer and vocational training for many who may not have the chance (Brint & Karabel, 1989). Thus it is imperative that centralization does not restrict their ability to provide this.  |
| Technology Centers | “The commission shall engage public universities, community colleges, and technology centers for input during the creation of the master plan.” | First mention: (3.1)6 | Technology centers are given more autonomy than any other institution in the policy, because the THEC does not control their budgets or funding. Again, this speaks to the fact that technology, STEM and workforce training are prized facets of the public good and policymakers promote these facets, usually at the expense of the humanities (Calhoun, 1998; Mallot, Hill & Banefield, 2013; Vestrich, 2008; Wolfe, 1998).  |
| Tennessee Citizens | “The commission shall construct a statewide master plan that directs higher education to be accountable for increasing the educational attainment levels of Tennesseans.” | First mention: (3.1)2 | One of the major purposes of the policy is to hold TN HEI’s accountable for increasing the level of educational attainment of Tennessee citizens. It is assumed that increasing the number of degrees is the surest way to educate the citizens and increase the public good. As McMahon (2009) has shown however, a myopic focus on quantifiable outcomes can and usually does blind policymakers and citizens to the larger social benefits of higher education. While the policymakers do recognize some social benefits of higher education, the thrust of the policy is financial betterment. So the real voice and power of TN citizens as promoted by the policy is somewhat questionable because their welfare is couched mainly in quantifiable outcomes which are really simplistic assumptions; i.e. the assumption that simple outcomes can promote the public good (McMahon, 2009; Ramaly, 2006).  |
| Governing Boards of Individual Institutions | “In consultation with the respective governing boards, approve institutional mission statements concurrent with the adoption of each revised statewide master plan” | First mention (3.2)3 | In the TN PBF specifically, governing boards of individual institutions are given some power to help craft the master plan, but this power is only given after the debate about whether having a master plan based on quantifiable outcomes is over. Formerly, boards were supposed to insulate faculty, but now, as Zumeta (2001) has noted however, much like coordinating boards, individual governing boards have been instrumental in promoting a neoliberal agenda because the boards have been increasingly staffed with corporate allies. So it is likely that many members on these individual boards are in agreement with the notion of performance based funding. Thus, the voices advocating an alternative vision of the public good may not be heard, especially if those voices are not in a position of authority.  |
| Governor of Tennessee  |  | (3.3) and (5).2 | The governor signed the bill into law in 2010. The governor is a powerful, but removed player. The education committee in the house and senate must prepare an annual report for the governor regarding the progress of institutions and the PBF policy. Thus, the governor can presumably make recommendations for policymakers to follow and ultimately for HEI’s to abide by if these recommendations are put into future policy revisions. It should also be remembered that the NGA was responsible for pushing PBF policies.  |
| Office of Legislative budget analysis/ Commissioner of Finance | “The office of legislative budget analysis and the comptroller of the treasury, shall provide comments on the higher education funding formula to the chairs of the education and finance, ways and means committees of both houses of the general assembly.” | (3.4A) first mention 3 | The THEC must submit the higher education funding formula to OLBA and to the comptroller of the treasury annually. (The THEC must also work to establish uniform plans of statistical analysis and accounting).The OLBA and comptroller than give comments on the budget to the house and senate education committees. The OLBA and comptroller are the “middle men” between the THEC and the legislature. This helps cement a hierarchy which places HEI’s toward the bottom of the decision making ladder. This is not uncommon, as Alexander (2000) has noted, many policymakers feel that education is too important in regards to the economy to be left to educationalists, so the power must be taken out of their hands. This speaks to the lack of trust (Burke, 2005) and the subsequent effect on the public good, as well as the simple assumption that higher education is simple organization. |
| Comptroller of the Treasury  | “The office of legislative budget analysis and the comptroller of the treasury, shall provide comments on the higher education funding formula to the chairs of the education and finance, ways and means committees of both houses of the general assembly.” | (3.4A) first mention 5 | The comptroller also has the power to audit the THEC, the BOR and BOT in regards to their accountability efforts to provide high enough levels of educational attainment. This gives the comptroller a tremendous amount of power to influence how HEI are held accountable and how HEI respond to accountability measures. This further adds to the power that that the executive branch has and the less power that HEI’s have in the hierarchy. The hierarchy looks something like this in TN, from bottom to top: HEI’s (CC,4Y)-BOR BOT, THEC-OLBA, comptroller-house and senate committees, governor. Technology centers are under the legislature but over the THEC and ORNL is not subject to the legislature but can impact HEI. A vertical hierarchy can stymie the power and influence of an institution (Marginson, Pters…2010) and thus it is essential that HEI begin to look horizontally as well. |
| Education and Finance/Ways and Means committees  | “The office of legislative budget analysis and the comptroller of the treasury, shall provide comments on the higher education funding formula to the chairs of the education and finance, ways and means committees of both houses of the general assembly.” | (3.4A) first mention 5 | The finance and ways and means committees in the house and senate are the controllers of the purse string which makes them arguably the most powerful actors in the policy. The power of the purse usually allows those actors the ability to shape the public good in their image yet these views may not be equitable or inclusive (Calhoun, 1998; Mansbridge, 1998). In a wider sense, a budget is not just a list of expenditures, but a reflection of a polities priorities (Fowler, 2009).  |
| Oak Ridge National Laboratory  | “The provisions of this agreement shall address matters including, but not limited to, the appointment and oversight of graduate students, the appointment and oversight of graduate students, the appointment of ORNL staff as faculty, and the development of interdisciplinary curricula between the two institutions.” | (9.1-9.1-b). 7 | It is understood that the policies of ORNL and the federal DOE are in no way impinged upon by the TN PBF policy, yet graduate students of UT HEI’s can be placed under the supervision of ORNL staff and ORNL staff can be made professors. Thus, ORNL is perhaps the most powerful player in the policy, perhaps even more powerful than the TN legislature. While ORNL is a public entity, their mission is to advance private sector interests. As Slaughter and Rhoades (2004), Marginson (2007) as well as Washburn (2005) note, this may be a blurring of the public and private spheres. So the power of ORNL over the TN executive and legislature could lead to conflicts of interests between the public mission of UT and private sector endeavors by the federal government. The goals of ORNL are to promote private sector innovation, yet as Stiglitz (1999) agues patents and commercial knowledge may be more effective as public goods, because the market is not the most effective allocator of information (Sy, 1999). |
| Doctoral Students at UT | “…that shall provide students an opportunity to undertake transformative research activities.” | (9.6)1 | Doctoral students at UT are given the opportunity to perform transformative research in the fields of energy research and engineering. But this only affects doctoral students in energy and engineering fields and neglects doctoral students a variety of other disciplines. So only a small portion of students; STEM doctoral students, are empowered by the policy. This neglect of other disciplines, such as the humanities and social sciences is characteristic of many PBF policies (Zumeta, 2011). This neglect also limits the actors which can participate in the ongoing creation and sustainment of the public good (Calhoun, 1998). There is also an artificial divide between STEM and the humanities, whereas STEm can be humanized and made just (Hall, 2008; Suronta & Vaden, 2007). |
| University of Memphis/University of Tennessee Center for the Health Sciences/St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital | “…it is hereby declared that the University of orators in the Memphis, the University of Tennessee Center for Health Sciences and St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital are lead collaborators in the Memphis Research Consortium.”“…the promotion of public health, medical devices, medical and healthcare, bio-based products and chemical manufacturing, logistics and supply chain, computational and computer sciences, learning technologies, bioscience, and bioengineering and related business and research, as well as industrial and commercial enterprises engaged in business activities related to these areas.”  | (11.a-b)1 | The Memphis Research Consortium (MRC) is empowered by the TN policymakers in a variety of ways. The MRC is encouraged by TN policymakers to develop strategies and plans for establishing and enhancing opportunities for research and development in private industries as well as public health services. While there is a public component, the MRC is largely encouraged to engage in industrial and commercial ventures. Partnering with the private sphere can blur the public mission of the public university (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Washburn, 2005). While there is a public health component, the MRC is a largely encouraged to undertake private sector initiatives, which could lead to the blurring of the public and private spheres, and the privileging of the private sector over the public good.  |