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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Landscape</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Institutions</td>
<td>Course Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Selective Private College or University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Selective Public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Private</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online/Hybrid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Associated with educational benefit of diversity**
- **Associated with educational benefit of diversity, but effects on private benefit/cost ratio may be mixed**
- **Benefit Likely to be Higher for Outsider than Insider**
Distribution of First Time, Full Time Undergraduates by Race, Ethnicity & Institutional Type

Black

- Highly Selective Private: 4%
- Highly Selective Public: 6%
- Other Private: 1%
- Other Public: 28%
- For Profit 1: 4%
- For Profit/Online: 1%

Hispanic

- Highly Selective Private: 2%
- Highly Selective Public: 1%
- Other Private: 10%
- Other Public: 55%
- For Profit 1: 2%
- For Profit/Online: 30%

Asian

- Highly Selective Private: 1%
- Highly Selective Public: 3%
- Other Private: 6%
- Other Public: 22%
- For Profit 1: 48%
- For Profit/Online: 20%

White

- Highly Selective Private: 1%
- Highly Selective Public: 1%
- Other Private: 15%
- Other Public: 51%
- For Profit 1: 1%
- For Profit/Online: 30%
1996 Analysis of California SP- 1

• Predicted a redistribution of black and Latino students from the highly selective UC campuses to the less selective UC campuses

• Suggested that the private benefit/cost ratio of a selective campus was slightly higher for black and Latino students than for white students.

• Described evidence on educational benefits of diversity as “limited”.

2013 Reassessment

- Redistribution of black and Latino students from the most highly selective UC campuses to less selective campuses & private colleges & universities. (UCOP and others)
- Need to re-evaluate the relative private benefit/cost ratio to account for reduction in number of in-person seats at public universities (Johnson, PPIC, 2012)
- Effects of college choice on major choice - mismatch v. climate (Arcidiacono, Aucejo & Hotz, 2013)
- Much larger evidence base for educational benefits of diversity in traditional university.
- Need to examine implications of changing landscape for higher education - Increased Hierarchy (Winston, 1999 & others), Growth in For-Profit; Access issues (Hoxby & Avery, 2012; Hoxby & Turner, 2012), Online learning.
Four Policy Implications

• Question the historical pattern of resource allocation among public institutions.
  – Is value-added greater at non-flagship campuses?
  – Mitigate disparities in reputation and social network

• Incentivize “rich” private institutions to adopt high value-added educational practices for diverse student bodies.

• Democratize access to high quality college counseling/information resources

• Build infrastructure so that online opportunities widen rather than narrow access.