

# ASHE

Association for the Study of Higher Education

## A newsletter of the Association of the Study of Higher Education

202 Hill Hall, University of Missouri  
Columbia, MO 65211, 573-882-9645

### President's Column: Examining the Field of Higher Education

John Braxton, Vanderbilt University

The Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) marks its 27th year. ASHE has had 26 Presidents and I serve as the 27th President.

ASHE and the study of higher education have changed over these 27 years. Our field now benefits from the existence of three core journals: *The Review of Higher Education*, *Research in Higher Education* and the *Journal of Higher Education*. All three of these refereed journals are indexed in the Social Science Citation Index. Our field has also seen the emergence of presses other than Jossey-Bass that publish higher education titles. Such presses include the SUNY Press, Johns Hopkins University Press, and Vanderbilt University Press. The membership of ASHE has grown to over 1,400 individuals, many of whom are graduate students. Our scope is also international as evidenced by the formation of the Council on International Higher Education, which holds its meetings prior to the start of the annual ASHE meeting.

The day-to-day operations of ASHE now necessitate a full-time Executive Director. As of January 1, 2004, Dr. Dennis Brown will serve as a full-time Executive Director and our headquarters will be located at Michigan State University.

Given these changes in ASHE and the field of higher education, reflections on the study of higher education and the scope and services of ASHE seems necessary at this point in time. Such reflections will be the theme of articles to appear in this and subsequent issues of the *ASHE Newsletter*. In this issue, my colleague in the Higher

[www.ashe.missouri.edu](http://www.ashe.missouri.edu)

Education Leadership and Policy program at Vanderbilt, Stephen P. Heyneman writes about the emergence of higher education administration programs in countries other than the United States. In another article, John C. Smart, University of Memphis and Editor of *Research in Higher Education* and the book series *Higher Education: A Handbook of Theory and Research*, discusses the characteristics of exemplary manuscripts in the study of higher education. My presidential talk at our 2003 Annual Meeting in Portland, Oregon will also focus on higher education as a field of study.

In this article, I will discuss some activities underway that reflect the growth and development of ASHE. Under the leadership and Presidency of Bill Tierney, immediate past president of ASHE, two important activities emerged. First, a book review section will be added to the *Review of Higher Education*. Elaine El-Khawas, professor of educational policy at the George Washington University will serve as the book review editor. The purpose of this book review section is to keep pace with the large number of new titles focused on higher education that are published each year. Second, the Lumina Foundation has awarded ASHE \$535,000 to fund doctoral dissertations on topics related to financial aid, access, and retention in higher education. This grant meets a long-expressed need for ASHE to support the dissertation research of doctoral students in higher education. Laura Rendon and Edward St. John co-chair the selection committee for these awards.

Another notable current activity of ASHE takes the form of a change in the format for the submission of proposals for presentations at the 2003 Annual Meeting of ASHE. Adrianna Kezar, the 2003 Program Chair, and Gary Rhoades, President-Elect, discuss this new format and its implications in articles in this issue of the *ASHE Newsletter*. The format for the submission of proposals will be organized around topical categories of inquiry rather than by type of presentation (e.g., research paper, symposium, focused dialogue). The seven categories of inquiry for 2003 include 1) students; 2) organization and administration; 3) teaching, learning and curriculum; 4) faculty; 5) contexts and foundations; 6) policy, finance and economics; and 7) methodology and assessment. Adrianna Kezar and I initiated this change because of the evolution of higher education from a field comprised of generalists to one comprised of experts in various specializations.

Occupational groups seeking status as a profession move through various stages of development. These stages include the creation of professional associations and journals. The study of higher education has attained both of these stages. The development of a code of conduct marks the last stage of professionalization (Wilensky, 1964). Because of the significant symbolic value attached

to the development of a code of conduct, an Ad Hoc Committee has been formed to consider the development of a code of conduct for ASHE. Melissa Anderson, University of Minnesota, chairs this committee.

The membership of ASHE has expressed a desire for professional development activities. Respondents to the recent web-based survey of the ASHE membership indicated an interest in professional development activities sponsored by ASHE. Accordingly, an ad hoc committee charged with identifying the professional development needs of ASHE members has been formed. J. Fredericks Volkwein, the Pennsylvania State University, chairs this ad hoc committee.

Further activities include the development of a program manual for the annual ASHE conference. Linda Hagedorn, University of Southern California, serves as chair of an ad hoc committee formed to develop this manual. The creation of such a manual reflects the continued growth and standardization of procedures used by our association.

A busy year is planned. In future issues of the *ASHE Newsletter* we will keep the membership of ASHE informed about these activities.

Reference: Wilensky, H.L. (1964) "The Professionalization of Everyone?" *American Journal of Sociology*, 70:137-58.

## Past President's Column: Homeland Security

*William G. Tierney, University of Southern California*

One of the first professional conferences I went to was ASHE. I feel that I have grown up in ASHE, and in many ways, it is my academic home. I have seen the various trials and tribulations we have encountered along the way, and I have watched friends and colleagues pass through the rituals of academic life—promotion, tenure, and the like. Many of my best friends are in ASHE. And some of my best critics—individuals who neither let me off with loose ideas or flabby texts—I meet every year at ASHE. With all of these encounters I feel lucky.

I also have been fortunate to have worked with many different people on multiple tasks over the years. Academic service, whether it is on my campus or with an association like ASHE, is not simply a duty or obligation; it's also fun. I encourage you to get involved.

I learn about my association, my discipline, the field of higher education, and myself when I work with others. And this past year I sure have worked with a remarkable array of individuals. Any credit for a successful conference lies in the hands of numerous individuals,

[www.ashe.missouri.edu](http://www.ashe.missouri.edu)

just as any steps forward we have taken this year is in large due to the contributions of many folks who gladly stepped up to the plate when I needed their help. I extend my thanks and best wishes for the New Year to all.

## Sacramento Revisited

In the past when I have asked participants for their thoughts about and impressions of the conference, attendees have graciously provided glowing remarks about great experiences. The tenor of this year's comments carries a decidedly different tone. Congratulatory comments share space with words of caution, concern, critique, and warning. Take a few moments to peruse these thoughtful remarks. Some hint at the opportunity for opening a dialogue among ASHE members around issues crucial to ASHE and to the field of higher education. I invite you comments for the next newsletter. *Mimi Wolverson, Editor*

## 'I Needed to Believe That Something Extraordinary was Possible'

*Len Foster, San Diego State University*

Most of you are familiar with the semi-fictional blockbuster movie "A Beautiful Mind (2001)" that chronicles the triumph of mathematician and Nobel prize-winner John Nash whose life accomplishments were seriously challenged by both his genius and his struggle with schizophrenia. At one point in the movie, Alicia, his long suffering wife, wearied by her support of him and the consequences of that support, remarks, "I need to believe that something extraordinary is possible." Alas, I must admit that in journeying to ASHE 2002-Sacramento, I too needed to have this belief confirmed.

I don't think that it's any new revelation to any of us that, amid looming large state budget deficits and mid-year cuts, that higher education is more vulnerable than it has ever been. Equally discouraging have been the mixed messages that have bombarded the best efforts and intentions in higher education. In *Beyond Dead Reckoning: Research Priorities for Redirecting American Higher Education* (2002), disseminated by the National Center for Postsecondary Improvement at Stanford University, we learn that while there is a broad base of support for higher education, the public, nonetheless, rates the products of higher education as only minimally good; that the business of higher education remains largely unchanged and unresponsive to the new national context of challenges and demands; and that the higher education enterprise has failed to be responsive to educating an engaged citizenry. These

themes have been particularly troubling to me because I know that large numbers of us are working through both our scholarship and personal engagement to address these very issues. Many of us have been working under formidable conditions that challenge our commitments to scholarship and to students on a daily basis. As I readied to journey to Sacramento, I needed to believe that something extraordinary was possible from the ASHE 2002 community of scholars.

As I had hopefully yearned, ASHE 2002-Sacramento left me rejuvenated and re-committed to the task of engagement through rigorous study and investigation. Claude Steele challenged the ASHE assembly to examine the underpinnings of “stereotype threat” that misrepresent student achievement and that threaten educational access. Mary Burgan and James Duderstadt shared with us competing conceptions of shared governance and the responsibilities and challenges awaiting our continued engagement at all levels of governance. ASHE president William Tierney provided us with a thoughtful and challenging (a recommitment) view of the future of the association and warned us of the kind of failure that was imminent if we did not remain true and steadfast to the guiding principles of inclusivity, engagement, and service that have bolstered our associational ranks and that have given purpose and meaning to our inquiry and scholarship.

The restructuring of conference presentation formats (i.e., Research/Scholarly papers) provided an ever-enriching venue for wide and diverse inquiry. Pre-conference and regular conference activities, receptions, and meetings fostered the work of the Association and supported bridges for new networks of collaboration and mentoring among both veteran and new members of ASHE.

As always, the personal interaction among the ASHE membership, particularly in the large number of faces in new faculty, international members, and graduate students, provided a concrete realization that our association is at the “heart” of the higher education enterprise. That enterprise is at the “heart” of our commitment to the improvement of higher education and to the benefits that can accrue to our local, state, regional, national, and global communities through our steadfast dedication as a scholarly association and community. As I needed to believe that something extraordinary was possible through our efforts as members of ASHE, I left ASHE 2002-Sacramento with the realization that “Perhaps it is good to have a beautiful mind, but an even greater gift is to discover a beautiful heart.”

## **The Importance of the Congregation: Not preaching to the Choir**

*Adrienne Hyle, Oklahoma State University*

For years, ASHE has served as a haven for me. This once-a-year meeting has provided a place to visit with friends and colleagues from whom I get support for my research and career choices. We listen to each other’s sagas, talk about new adventures, present our latest research and even dance and have a few drinks together. Over the years, I’ve learned a lot about those who think like I do, engage in research I’m interested in as well, and work to develop supportive networks of the like-minded. I’m pleased to report, however, that this year’s ASHE reminded me of something I’d forgotten: the importance of discordant exchange or the importance of preaching to the congregation.

At the Ed.D./Ph.D. session, I heard perspectives that both supported and confronted my own. The session was packed and the presenters started with quick overviews of their web-posted papers. I heard the resounding gospel that differences were appropriate and needed to be recognized and capitalized upon. At the same time, the question was raised about what happens when differences are sought? Following the session, people continued discussion in groups, agreeing with the need to distinguish differences; few discussed what they assumed was moot. But it was through the examination of counter-points and the perspectives of those who did not agree with my views that I learned the most. I was able to crystallize and re-conceptualize my views and rationale. This was what helped me most and what I had been missing—discussions with the congregation, not the choir. I look forward to having more next year.

## **Deeper than a Glance**

*Nora Smith, University of Wisconsin-Madison*

Admittedly, the week in Sacramento in November constituted my first ASHE experience. As a neophyte, my impressions were also tempered by the graduate student policy seminar that precipitated the conference. That said, I savored the early morning walks across the city from our hotel (a few of the Madison contingency piled into cheaper lodgings by the interstate) to the Hyatt. Sacramento has saved its trees (palms among them), preserved some of its greenspace, and welcomed hundreds of blackbirds and starlings into urban environs. I noticed lots of ASHE attendees getting out for walks, runs, and jaunts at all times of the day.

I attended several interesting presentations, notably, the public policy forum that structured Wednesday evening’s fare, and I was gratified by the references to

de Tocqueville's philosophy (made by the Californian economist??!) of American higher education. I heard a few good papers each day of the conference. My notes taken during Alberto Cabrera's paper on his most recent retention studies are jumbled to the point of frenzy, which I interpret to be indicative of a sustained attentiveness that I don't always lend Professor C. closer to home.

I might have been more aggressive about getting a seat at Professor Pascarella's packed presentation with Patrick Terenzini, but I am happy that I did force my way into Friday afternoon's invited conversation about education for the public good, chaired by the renowned Astins of UCLA. I was too shy then to remind us that etymologically, "administration" merely means "service," but I will now argue that our dialogue about higher education, and our collective attempts to effect societal benefits, must begin with this reminder. Everything we do in our institutional contexts ought somehow reflect this rudimentary mission. Again, I left that session convinced that many of us would benefit from a closer reading (or re-reading) of *Democracy in America*. Much of what de Tocqueville noticed about our systemic inclinations then (he first published the text in the 1830's) remains entirely relevant now. Where, how, and when the educational system serves the poor and otherwise disenfranchised members of American society will always provide the most meaningful measures of the success of this particular experiment in democracy.

Professor Tierney's keynote address, I thought, was an ambitious speech. I liked the tension immediately introduced by the device of his structure, a projected tense, e.g. a retrospective dating from 2027 about the failures of the current system. I am too much of a Proust junkie, though, to forgive him the chasm between the promise of his title and his academic landscape projected into Colorado mountain peaks. As an artifact of the conference, his reflections certainly embodied a healthy pessimism, and even healthier concerns about extant institutional policies, but I still wonder if this is the most intellectually responsible stance to take in light of current and imminent crises in our disciplines and in our enrollments. The likely developments Tierney suggested for denizens of higher education point to very practical solutions we can look for and implement now, and I would have afforded him more mandates than he provided. Against the backdrop of the California budget crisis, a litany of declining resources and nuance in higher education might serve only to panic even our most stoic educational leaders.

I had not known, until the Sacramento meeting, that my old friend Bobby Wright lent his name to the Association's dissertation award. I had the good fortune to meet Bobby in Bozeman in the 1980's, playing basketball in the gyms of Montana State University, as he started his graduate career and as I finished my undergraduate degree. His dissertation remains one of the best essays of historical analysis I've encountered, and I have since longed for an opportunity to dialogue with him about the social justice issues under-girding his dissertating process (which now, admittedly, affect mine). He interjected ceaseless grace and good humor in the intellectual terrain of MSU, and he was never afraid to work tirelessly, as it were, alone. I will miss him a little less knowing his work has been so consistently honored and remembered. I will also remain grateful to the bevy of energetic ASHE conference coordinators and presenters for offering such worthwhile content, and I look forward to next year's meeting in Portland.

### **Impressions of ASHE 2002: The Return to Sacramento**

*Jim Fairweather, Michigan State University*

ASHE in 2002 was a "hotel conference" for me—I barely made it outside the Hyatt. The conference left two lasting impressions on me. The first and most sobering resulted from thinking about Bill Tierney's comments about our need to work with K-12. I have come to believe that the focus of our community on post-secondary financial aid alternatives, remedial programs, and even affirmative action miss the most basic of all points—the most at risk kids never make it through high school, which for them makes our post-secondary efforts rather moot. Kids who can't read by the sixth or seventh grade, as an example, are likely to have their fates cast long before post-secondary programs are relevant. On a different note, the second impression was my personal enjoyment in watching our MSU program rapidly increase in its visibility and status within the ASHE community. For the first time I could (I didn't say that I did!) fill my schedule simply attending the many presentations made by our students, recent graduates, and faculty. It's fun being part of and a contributor to a program that's growing, improving, and getting better all the time.

### **Words of Critique for Sacramento 2002**

*Roy Cox, Institute of Education, London University*

I thought in general the conference was well organized and although I don't usually like conferences I enjoyed parts of this one. I was stimulated to think especially by Claude Steele and William Tierney—although it was a

pity that some missed it for the sake of football. I shall now be much more conscious of the possible effects of stereotypes. I felt it gave me the opportunity to gain a very wide perspective on American higher education, which as a British academic was one of the main reasons for coming. The assessment session (C4) particularly impressed me with its methodological sophistication even if it did not seem to address sufficiently issues of control and independence in relation to students in the process of defining their own identity.

I realize that conferences are not particularly concerned with learning and most presenters probably don't think of themselves as teaching, but I should have liked to have more time for discussion. I often found that there was no opportunity to ask questions or comment the way I wanted to. This was partly due to the number of papers per session and speakers running over time, but more often it was the way the discussants took too long and sometimes dominated the conversation or prompted the speakers to reply to them rather than give time for the participants. I think it would be better to ask the discussants to only contribute after the participants had had time to feel they were not just an audience but genuine participants. In Britain now most conferences, especially those on education break up the information transmission with workshops where participants work through problems rather than just listen to how others have done it. Nevertheless, despite the rather passive experience it was well worth going making the trip to Sacramento.

### **Generation ASHE: Where is the Thrill?**

*Amaury Nora, University of Houston*

I know that what follows will sound like the ramblings of a senior professor as he recalls days gone by and memories of what once was and is no more. For that, I apologize in advance. My intent is not to compare, or criticize; rather, I put forth the following simply as an observation. When I was first asked to provide a brief overview of last year's ASHE Conference in Sacramento, I immediately accepted and thought nothing more of it until I was back in my office. I figured that I would identify three or four major aspects of the conference and summarize what I had seen. However, as I sat at my desk and tried to remember the most exciting things at the conference I came to realize that it was somewhat difficult. At the same time, I also came to realize that my reluctance, as opposed to, inability to identify a session, event, or occurrence was not due to a lack of quality but to what I have concluded was a lack of passion.

As I look back at the conference, I remember a session where, although the audience was engaged in discussion, enthusiasm/passion/fire was missing (even with Cliff Adelman on the panel!). It was the first time I saw Cliff merely say "Well, okay" even though he totally disagreed with the argument under consideration. I found myself sitting just outside the room where the ASHE Board was conducting its meeting. I had anticipated closed doors because rumor had it that a very sensitive issue would be raised. Such was not the case and no emotional pleas of any kind were to be heard. Finally, I recall the look on ASHE members' faces as I walked through the halls of the conference hotel. What I found missing most of all was a sense of high energy, an impassioned commitment to a perspective/belief/stance, and a sense that what we are doing is really important. Maybe it's the economy or world affairs, but perhaps, it says something about us as professionals, about higher education as a field of study.

### **The Fork in Our Field: Higher Education at a Crossroads**

*M. Christopher Brown II, Pennsylvania State University*

The 2002 ASHE Conference was bittersweet. It was a clear marker that both the field and I had changed. As a recently tenured faculty member, the transformation from junior to mid-career professor in both thought and responsibility became evident. Similarly, the metamorphosis occurring in our field into a pseudo-discipline was evinced in my analysis of sessions and posters.

I can now see areas of research in our field that suffer from imprecise language and assumptive reasoning. In fact, I am increasingly concerned about the use of secondary source citation in lieu of empirical evidence. How do we know what we say we know? Is it proven in our contemporary analysis of the data, or is it accepted via the citation of the discussion sections of other colleagues' scholarship? At the same time that this poses an overall concern, I am celebrating the increasing volume of research (especially on black colleges).

Additionally, I applaud the adoption of multiple forms of research inquiry. The recognition of the value that data generated through different research questions and approaches suggests that the field is maturing yields. Although maturation is positive, we should be mindful of our youth. The field of higher education (in my opinion) is not old enough to jump headlong into heuristic and phenomenological forms of inquiry. In fact, I would argue that it was the premature proliferation of "reflective" scholarship that has stunted the development of curriculum theory (or theorizing).

Where are the t-tests, chi-squares, ANOVAs, path analyses, and more importantly hierarchical linear models? An enigmatic concern for a postsecondary governance and policy researcher who specializes in human science research methods, and recently completed a qualitative study of campus culture at a transdemographic black college.

In sum, the study of higher education has come a long way in a short time. My concern is that we do not grow too many branches before the roots are secured in the sediment of seminal studies, core values, research traditions, and professional practices. Robert Frost writes, "Two roads diverged in a wood, and I – I took the one less traveled by, and that has made all the difference." What will we do at the fork in our field?

### **Invited Column**

#### **Post-Graduate Degree Programs in the Management of Higher Education: International Demand**

*Stephen P. Heyneman, Professor, Vanderbilt University*

Postgraduate degree programs in higher education administration developed originally in the United States to meet the demands for a new profession. Today, 213 programs in higher education are listed on the ASHE website within the U.S. The rapid post secondary expansion in the post WW II era which drove this demand and the struggle for financial diversity, performance-based faculty salary structures, department-level management, and long-term strategic planning, now have parallels in many parts of the world. As a consequence of the common pressures on higher education, the demand for professional managers is rapidly increasing. And in response, post-graduate programs in higher education administration are expanding as well.

#### **Sources of Demand in Higher Education Administration**

*Changes in Political Demands.* Much has changed since the end of the Cold War. Trading blocks and new democracies in Western and Eastern Europe, Latin America, and Asia have strongly influenced the nature of economic competition and have raised the importance of education's influence on social cohesion.

Under autocratic governments, there was little need to explain higher education policy to the public. Policy consisted of edicts of intent and orders for administrative action. Mechanisms for public debate did not exist. The

*www.ashe.missouri.edu*

performance of educational institutions was not open to public scrutiny. Data on expenditures, faculty performance, and program effectiveness were unknown. The curriculum was imposed by ministerial mandate; goals in the teaching of history, humanities and the social sciences were decided unilaterally. If problems occurred, no official could be held accountable.

New democracies have emerged in South Africa, Europe and Central Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, and East Asia. With democracy, the exigencies of university management shift. The effectiveness of universities is increasingly open to public scrutiny, and higher education policy is the subject of heated public debate. In a democracy, policy requires public *ex ante* awareness and consensus over issues, such as criteria for admission, faculty conduct, tuition, and fee structures.

University systems in the new democracies are faced with problems even more serious than that of efficient management. In many countries private universities have opened their doors to the public yet have little experience in quality control. Corruption in admissions, grading, and graduation and of functions of accreditation and licensing is increasingly common (Heyneman, 2003).

*Changes in Labor Market Demands.* The growth of knowledge-based industries and the speed of economic change imply that employers will require increasing career flexibility. Few professions will remain unchanged, and this places pressure on higher education to innovate.

*Changes in Student Demand.* Higher education is no longer for the few. The typical country in Western Europe enrolled less than ten percent of the age cohort in the 1960s, and no less than 35% of the age cohort today. Industrialized nations, as a whole, enrolled 48% of the tertiary age cohort in 1990 and 61% in 1997. In Latin America, the enrollment rate climbed from 17% to 19%, in the Arab states, from 11% to 15%, and in East Asia from five to 10% (UNESCO, 2000. p.116). But no country is more illustrative of mass higher education than China in which the enrollment rate grew from 2% in 598 institutions in 1978 to 14% in 3,111 institutions today. Today, in terms of size, higher education in China is second only to the United States (Chen, 2002).

Public sources of financing may have been adequate when enrollment rates were less than the 10%, but few countries can avoid the necessity of diversifying higher education finance when higher education serves a large proportion of the population. Because private tuitions and fees are increasingly common, students behave like

'consumers'. Thus the supply-led approach that characterized higher education administration in the past is rapidly shifting to a demand-led approach in which courses begin to reflect student choice (Thompson, 1998).

#### *Changes in Knowledge and Technology Choices.*

Because the amount and variety of information has grown, higher education providers have to make careful choices about what they can provide in terms of both teaching and research. Because so much of higher quality education requires access to new technologies, how to plan for them and manage them now becomes a part of the skills of higher education administration. And because the nature of research has shifted from subjects to issues, higher education institutions must be more strategic about the issues in which they take an interest.

#### *Changes in Demand for Government Relations and University Self-Governance.*

Thompson (1998) pointed to three world-wide trends in the relations between higher education and government: a movement away from government control to supervision, changes in the way public funds are allocated to individual institutions (more on a competitive basis), and increased emphasis on accountability for those funds. None of these shifts can be effectively managed without changes in the manner by which higher education institutions govern themselves. Every institution needs a strategic direction associated with its budget and a process of self-government that can make its plans effective.

In spite of the proud and varying traditions of higher education, common managerial dilemmas force them all to find innovations in institutional efficiency. Each struggles with outsourcing traditional functions, department-based budgeting, marketing products, protecting copyrights, investing assets, forging relations with alumni, and developing donations and gifts. It is increasingly recognized that to perform these functions in a competitive environment requires specialized skills, and that these skills can be learned through training. It has not gone unnoticed that those institutions, which are led by professionals, have a considerable advantage in this new competitive environment.

### **Post Graduate Training in Higher Education Administration**

Short-term programs for university administrators have been available in the former Soviet Union and in many countries in Asia. What appears to be new, however, is the appearance of self-standing degree granting programs. The CHEMS Survey of University Management Programs for Commonwealth Universities

[www.ashemissouri.edu](http://www.ashemissouri.edu)

lists 24 degree-granting programs outside the U. S., including programs at Leeds, Lincolnshire and Humber, Manchester, Massey Nova Southeastern, Salford, and Bristol (Center for Higher Education Management Website [www.acu.ac.uk](http://www.acu.ac.uk)). Perhaps because of the traditional weaknesses in schools of education, some higher education administration programs are situated in schools of business administration. The program at Anglia is a case in point. New universities, former polytechnics for example, seem to be more quickly establishing programs than the older more traditional research institutions.

Many graduate programs in the U.S. (e.g., University of Minnesota, Boston College, the University of Southern California, SUNY – Buffalo, Michigan State and the University of Pittsburgh) have broadened their teaching and research to systematically include higher education issues internationally and graduate students from many other countries who wish to study higher education management and administration.

The Vanderbilt graduate program in higher education has been rapidly expanding in anticipation of the demand from universities to open their own degree-granting programs. Vanderbilt currently has projects with East Kazakhstan State, Kainar and Kazakhstan National Technical Universities. These universities send their senior scholars and administrators to Vanderbilt for short term managerial training; and Vanderbilt scholars make presentations to local faculty and graduate students, interview administrators, and help to assess local university policies and strategic plans. A similar project was initiated last year for universities managers in South Africa. Future projects are planned for Uganda, Georgia, Ukraine, and Mexico. Graduate students specializing in higher education management at Vanderbilt now come from a dozen countries, with the highest representation from the former Soviet Union.

#### **Summary**

It is never simple to predict the future, but it is obvious that the pressures on higher education will continue to be similar around the world and that the demand for professional administrators will increase. While in many ways the U.S. has had an advantage in the provision of higher education training programs, that advantage may be challenged as new post-graduate programs open and innovate in non-traditional ways.

#### **Sources**

Chen, David (2002) "On the Policy for China's Massifying China's Higher Education," *Journal of Educational Development* (Shanghai).

Heyneman, Stephen P. (2003) "Education and Misconduct," *Encyclopedia of Education* James Guthrie (editor). New York: Macmillan Publishers.

Thompson, Quentin (November, 1998) *Trends in Governance and management of Higher Education* Washington D.C.: The World Bank, Department of Human Development, Latin America and the Caribbean Region.

UNESCO (2000) *World Education Report*. Paris: United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

## 2002 Forum on Public Policy in Higher Education

*Ami Zusman, 2002 Forum Program Chair  
University of California*

How have state and federal budget deficits affected funding for higher education, and what can we expect in the near future? How do government programs designed to award financial aid and improve academic preparation actually impact student access and persistence? How do public policy decisions influence the performance of higher education systems? These are just a few of the issues discussed at the ASHE Forum on Public Policy in Higher Education in Sacramento on November 20-21, preceding the ASHE general conference. Over 90 people registered for the Forum this year—a record number.

November's Public Policy Forum marked the third year that scholars, policy makers, and policy analysts came together for a daylong program to discuss research on critical public policy issues facing higher education, hear a variety of perspectives on these issues, and build networks for future research collaborations. A theme that ran through several sessions explored the impact of public policies on access to and persistence in higher education. There were sessions as well on the role of statewide governance systems, legislative interest in time-to-degree, statewide articulation policy, and a transatlantic comparison of decision-making loci for accountability. To increase networking among different groups, the Public Policy Forum also sponsored a joint reception with the Graduate Student Seminar and the International Forum. The Forum's highlight was an invited plenary session, held jointly with the Graduate Student Policy Seminar, about "Financing Higher Education: Old Problems, New Alternatives." The session brought together a panel of researchers and policy makers from institutional, coordinating agency, legislative, and federal perspectives to discuss the challenges facing the financing of higher education today.

I want to recognize in particular the Lumina Foundation, which provided funding for some of the Forum's activities, and to thank especially Lumina's Jerry Davis and Derek Price for marshalling this support. I also want to thank the many other people who made the third annual Public Policy Forum a success and who helped

create a permanent Council: Pat Terenzini (chair of the Public Policy Forum planning group), Carol Everly Floyd (Council bylaws), Toni Larson (invited plenary session), Scott Thomas (external funding), and all the presenters and proposal reviewers. Thanks also to Bill Tierney, Barbara Townsend and Laarni Goma, for their consistent support in facilitating the Forum's activities, and to Jim Antony, 2002 ASHE general conference program chair, for smooth coordination between the conference and the Forum.

The Forum marked a milestone this year: Thanks to approval by the ASHE board last summer, the Forum is now a new standing ASHE committee, the Council on Public Policy in Higher Education. The Council's establishment reflected the board's recognition that research, analysis, and networking on public policy issues in U.S. higher education is a significant and ongoing area of concern to ASHE members. A Nominating and Election Committee is being formed to nominate future Council officers.

If you've not participated before, I invite you join with us, in developing an even stronger and more varied focus on public policy issues affecting higher education. To get involved, contact Scott Thomas ([slthomas@uga.edu](mailto:slthomas@uga.edu)), who is establishing a listserv for those interested in continuing discussion and networking on public policy issues within ASHE. And to help plan or participate in next year's program and proposal review, contact me (I will continue as program chair for 2003) ([ami.zusman@ucop.edu](mailto:ami.zusman@ucop.edu)), Toni Larson, invited session coordinator ([toni.larson@mindspring.com](mailto:toni.larson@mindspring.com)), or others on the interim steering committee: Pat Terenzini ([terenzini@psu.edu](mailto:terenzini@psu.edu)), Carol Everly Floyd ([CEFL88@famvid.com](mailto:CEFL88@famvid.com)), or Scott Thomas.

## ASHE Council on International Higher Education: An Update

*Judith Glazer-Raymo, Long Island University*

The one-and-one-half day international forum held on November 20 and 21 in Sacramento once again exceeded the expectations of program planners. Widespread interest in comparative and international higher education was evident in the high attendance (81 pre-registered; more than 100 in attendance). Ably chaired by Professor Jussi Välimaa (University of Jyväskylä, Finland), presenters came from five continents: Africa, Asia, Australia, Europe, North America, and from 15 different countries. A total of 66 participants

presented 27 scholarly papers, 5 symposia, 3 focused dialogues, and 2 roundtables. Topics under discussion included comparative and case studies of higher education in European, African, Asian, Middle Eastern, Australian, and Latin American nations, and thematic research on such issues as the global context of economic and social policy, faculty governance, institutional restructuring and reform, and student assessment. A joint reception with the public policy forum attendees proved one of the many highlights of the annual meeting.

The International Council is now an ASHE standing committee, assuring its continued support and growth within the larger organization. Jussi Valimaa has been elected Vice-Chair and Simon Marginson, University of Monash, Melbourne, Australia, was appointed Program Chair for the 2003 meeting. Jean Morton Elia, Executive Director of the Frank Kenan Institute at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, is our new Secretary and Ed Morgan, doctoral student at the University of Arizona, will maintain the international listserv as Communications Director. ASHE members doing research on international and comparative topics are encouraged to submit proposals for the 2003 meeting in Portland, and to also make use of the online discussion list as a means of extending the dialogue on international topics of mutual interest.

### **The 2002 ASHE Conference**

*Jim Soto Antony, University of Washington*

On behalf of the entire 2002 Conference Program Committee, I would like to thank you for helping make the annual meeting such a big success. By all measures, the 2002 Conference broke new ground. We had a record number of individuals register for the annual meeting. Additionally, the sessions were very well attended.

I would like to also mention that graduate students, who continue to play such an important role in ASHE, registered for the conference in record numbers this year. Graduate student involvement in ASHE is an important indicator of the organization's vitality. I am hopeful that our graduate students' levels of interest in the organization will ensure that our research agendas, and organizational priorities, remain current and provocative.

A special word of thanks goes to Benjamin Baez and Philo Hutcheson who did a stellar job of organizing the review and selection process of hundreds of research and scholarly paper proposals. A thankless job under the best conditions, these two colleagues stayed calm, cool, and collected throughout.

Our annual meeting is typically a source of rejuvenation for those of us who attend, but also an important barometer of emerging issues in higher education for those outside of our organization. I eagerly anticipate the ways in which we, together, will continue to develop our conference so that it always meets these needs.

### **Examining the New Process for Submission of 2003 General Conference Proposals**

*Adrianna Kezar, University of Maryland*

The ASHE 2003 Program Committee, of which I am the program chair, will use a new proposal submission format based around divisions of inquiry rather than types of formats. In the past, presenters submitted their proposals to session chairs based on whether they were research papers, symposia, roundtables, focused dialogue, or poster sessions. The ASHE conference will maintain many of these session formats, but is changing the organizing principle for the actual submission of proposals. This year, ASHE will move to the following seven divisions: 1) Students; 2) Organization and Administration; 3) Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum; 4) Faculty; 5) Contexts and Foundations; 6) Policy, Finance, and Economics; and, 7) Methodology and Assessment. International issues and multicultural or diversity issues should be seen as integrated across all the divisions. In addition, we will continue separate submission procedures for the pre-conference International and Public Policy Forums.

Why change the submission process? There are several reasons. First, ASHE receives a disproportionate number of research proposals, making the work of the chair or even co-chairs extremely difficult. Second, within any given presentation format, the division chairs often did not have the content expertise to evaluate all the feedback submitted by reviewers. If there was a discrepancy in reviews, the division chair was challenged to make informed decisions about that disparate feedback. Third, chairs were less intellectually engaged with the materials for their particular track, and there was no intellectual core to align with. These three concerns led ASHE leaders to discuss ways to reorganize the submission process so that it capitalized on ASHE members' expertise, spread out the work of

the review process, and made the task more intellectually engaging for those involved. The result was the suggestion to organize around intellectual domains. The development of the seven divisions, listed above, reflect the major areas of inquiry at ASHE over the past decade.

Some divisions, Context and Foundations for instance, focus more on a theoretical perspective while others, such as Students, are interdisciplinary in nature. Because the field of higher education is organized in multiple ways, the divisions vary to encompass different ways the field is conceptualized. Many of the divisions are relatively self-explanatory, for example, Students and Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum. Others may be more difficult to clearly define – what exactly are Contexts and Foundations? Is this a catchall division for all those that do not fit in one of the other more clearly defined divisions? What if I am studying a new methodology for researching students? Is that a paper for the division of students or methodology? You will need to evaluate whether you feel your paper is more about students or methodology. What about studies that can fit across divisions, such as multiculturalism, international issues, or technology? Where do I submit my proposal? These are the tough questions that we will have to work out together as a community. If the planning committee disagrees with your assessment, we might move your proposal to another division chair. The planning committee will do its best to find the most appropriate fit, but there may be times that a paper seems to fall outside of these “given” divisions.

One advantage our planning team had was the experience of AERA, which uses this form for proposal submissions. Four members of the 2003 planning committee have worked with the AERA conference planning process and have already spent time negotiating and thinking through proposal submission within this format. There are many other professional associations that use this approach and I believe that it can also be successful for ASHE. The 2003 Planning Committee will meet in person in June to review all the proposals together, no one person is responsible. The committee will undertake a thorough and thoughtful process. However, there are some concerns that I would like to raise and to ask you to help us think through as a community. Gary Rhoades has offered to articulate some of these concerns and questions in the article found later in the newsletter. Gary is President Elect of ASHE and Ben Baez, a member of the 2003 Program Committee, is the 2004 Program Chair. They will evaluate the results of this year’s experiment.

## 2003 Program Committee General Conference

### Students (two chairs)

Proposals for this division focus on research on students participating in or preparing for post-secondary education. It includes student development, student retention and attrition, student outcomes, student activism, and student government among a host of other topics.

Anna Ortiz - [ortizam@msu.edu](mailto:ortizam@msu.edu)  
Scott Thomas – [slthomas@arches.uga.edu](mailto:slthomas@arches.uga.edu)

### Organization and Administration (two chairs)

Proposals for this division should deal with issues related to governance, leadership, strategy, change and innovation, organizational culture, and planning. Research on deans, department chairs, president, and vice president as well as other administrators would be part of this division. Other appropriate proposals might include research that applies organizational theory to the study of higher education institutions.

Christopher Morpew – [morpew@ukans.edu](mailto:morpew@ukans.edu)  
Mimi Wolverton – [mimi.wolverton@cc.mail.nevada.edu](mailto:mimi.wolverton@cc.mail.nevada.edu)

### Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum

Proposals for this division examine instruction, including pedagogical approaches and assessment; learning theory; student learning; curriculum development, change, and reform; faculty attitudes or behaviors related to teaching, learning and curricula; and the influence of institutional disciplinary, or other contexts on curricula, teaching and learning.

Lisa R. Lattuca – [lattuca@psu.edu](mailto:lattuca@psu.edu)

### Faculty

Proposals for this division may address a wide range of issues such as faculty motivation, work roles, tenure, promotion, preparing future faculty, productivity, evaluation, growth and development and disciplinary and professional cultures.

Roger Baldwin – [rbaldwin@msu.edu](mailto:rbaldwin@msu.edu)

### Contexts and Foundations

Proposals for this division should involve sociological, philosophical, historical, or interpretive analyses of higher education. Unlike the others section (e.g., faculty or students), this area is not limited to proposals about particular aspects or groups in higher education, but this

section encourages theoretical perspectives on those aspects and groups.

Ben Baez – [bbaez@gsu.edu](mailto:bbaez@gsu.edu)

#### Policy, Finance, and Economics

Proposals for this division are related to federal and state public policy, higher education finance, and the economics of higher education. Topics include access, student financial aid, affordability, performance, state governance restructuring, and collaboration among sectors. Policy analysis or economic theory that is utilized to study any topic area should be submitted to this division, e.g., economic analysis of faculty salaries.

Laura Perna – [lperna@wam.umd.edu](mailto:lperna@wam.umd.edu)

#### Methodology and Assessment

Proposals for this division focus on how we know what we know about higher education. The focus can be applied (how to conduct assessment and research) or theoretical (how to conceptualize studies of higher education including qualitative, quantitative and other methods.)

Patrick Dilley – [pdilley@siu.edu](mailto:pdilley@siu.edu)

#### **International Forum**

The purpose of the meeting is to advance knowledge about and the practice of comparative research on higher education systems across nations and over time.

Simon Marginson –  
[Simon.Marginson@education.monash.edu.au](mailto:Simon.Marginson@education.monash.edu.au)

#### **Public Policy Forum**

This forum provides ASHE conference participants the opportunity to explore the processes and impacts of significant public policy issues affecting higher education in the U.S. at federal, state or local levels.

Ami Zusman – [ami.zusman@ucop.edu](mailto:ami.zusman@ucop.edu)

#### **Evaluating the 2003 Conference**

*Barbara J. Johnson and Marietta Del Favero*

In conjunction with the changes to the 2003 conference format and proposal submission process, changes will also be implemented relative to the evaluation process. One of the proposed changes in the evaluation process is to institute an on-line evaluation form to supplement the paper and pencil input received at the conference. Our objective is to increase participant avenues for providing feedback on the new format and proposal submission process as ASHE strives to be responsive to member

needs. We welcome the advice anyone may have on improving the evaluation process. Your feedback will be vital to the continued success of the conference as we work together to move ASHE forward.

#### **Contact Information:**

Barbara J. Johnson - 504-280-6448 - [bjjohnso@uno.edu](mailto:bjjohnso@uno.edu)  
Marietta Del Favero - 225-578-2156 - [delfavm@lsu.edu](mailto:delfavm@lsu.edu)

#### **Call for reviewers, chairs, discussants, and facilitators**

We need your help! We want to be as inclusive as possible in our planning for the 2003 conference. One of the major responsibilities for the conference is the review of proposals. This year should be particularly exciting, as you will receive proposals by area of expertise (listed elsewhere in this newsletter).

A second way that you can become involved in the conference is by chairing or serving as a discussant for a research/scholarly paper session. Chairs facilitate the session by introducing speakers, keeping time, and organizing questions. Discussants read the papers, in advance, provide written feedback to authors, and compose 10 minutes of comments about how papers are related, insights across papers, and strengths and weaknesses. A new role that we are introducing this year is the facilitator. The facilitator combines the role of chair and discussant. We are asking a few people to volunteer for this new role to see how it works. The experiment with the facilitator role is a response to evaluations from previous ASHE conferences.

Please contact the General Conference chair(s) for the division(s) in which you have expertise to volunteer to review proposals or to serve as a discussant, chair, or facilitator. For the Pre-conference Forums, please contact the individuals listed below and let them know if you want to be a proposal reviewer or chair for a session, and let them know your area(s) of expertise.

The seven divisions for proposal submissions for the General Conference are: Students; Organization and Administration; Teaching, Learning and Curriculum; Faculty; Contexts and Foundations; Policy, Finance, and Economics; and Methodology and Assessment. To understand more about these divisions, please read the article about the new review process. Thank you for your interest!

## Featured Column

### An Exemplary Manuscript is Grounded Thoroughly in the Appropriate Research Literature

John C. Smart, Professor of Educational Research and Higher Education, University of Memphis

Perhaps the central feature that differentiates exemplary from ordinary research manuscripts using quantitative analyses is that the former are thoroughly grounded in the appropriate research literature. The first thing I look at when I receive a manuscript for publication consideration is the reference list. *The importance of this grounding in the extant literature is due simply to the fact that the cited literature represents the intellectual heritage or foundation of the current study.* The importance of the cited literature is at least twofold in that it informs the present study in terms of both substance and methodology (Light, Singer, & Willett, 1990). The substance includes commonly used theoretical frameworks, the constructs included in them, and the accumulated knowledge that has been acquired from previous studies. Methodological guidance is provided in terms of the measurement of constructs included in the study and the analytical procedures most commonly used in previous studies. Studies that are not fully grounded in the appropriate research literature lack this substantive and methodological guidance, and are much less likely to be of high quality. In the current vernacular, “You can’t make a silk purse out of a sow’s ear.”

The central importance of full grounding in the appropriate research literature is also predicated on one’s philosophy about how systematic, accumulative knowledge is acquired. Systematic, accumulative knowledge emerges over time based on the collective evidence provided by literally hundreds of studies. In fact, *the purpose of undertaking research is fundamentally to contribute to the accumulation of systematic knowledge of a topic, that indeed, no single study proves anything. Given this perspective, it is absolutely essential that a study be grounded in and contributes to the best examples of previous research on the topic.*

The central importance of grounding a study in the best examples of previous research on the topic requires comprehensive and thorough knowledge of that literature. This is not especially difficult in the higher education research literature given the relatively small size of higher education as a field of scholarly inquiry. *What I find to be particularly attractive in a manuscript are references to germane studies in other academic*

*disciplines.* Scholars from other disciplines created the field of higher education, and our literature was initially comprised predominantly of contributions that attempted to inform discussions of perplexing problems facing the academic community based on the theoretical and methodological paradigms of other disciplines. Even today, there is a strong recognition of the advantages of interdisciplinary teaching and scholarship. Furthermore, higher education *per se* has few if any inherent theories or conceptual frameworks. All this leads to my enthusiasm about manuscripts that seek to bring the best examples of theoretical and methodological paradigms of other disciplines to important topics on the higher education research agenda.

#### Two Cautions

*Substantive Caution.* While I find the use of theories and conceptual frameworks from other disciplines to be an attractive feature of manuscripts, there are numerous instances in which authors seem to use them in inappropriate or incomplete ways. This is often evident in what I characterize as the superficial application of those theories and conceptual frameworks. It sometimes appears that authors are trying to “dress up,” justify, or rationalize the legitimacy of common constructs in the conventional higher education literature by equating them with “more lofty” constructs in theories from other academic disciplines. For example, several authors have attempted to use Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of social and cultural reproduction (see Bieber, 1999 for a full discussion of the theory) to examine the extent to which colleges and universities contribute to the social mobility and learning of students. His theory postulates that education serves as a mechanism to perpetuate existing social class distinctions and the inequitable distribution of economic, cultural, and symbolic capital existing in a society. This seems to be an exciting possibility on the surface, given the stature of his theory and its conceptual appropriateness in addressing the complex issue of whether colleges and universities contribute to the social mobility and learning of students. Yet, all too often his theory is used to justify the inclusion of customary components of socioeconomic status (e.g., family income, parental educational levels, etc.) in studies. Surely, Bourdieu’s theory is more intellectually rich in terms of the depth of meaning of economic, cultural, and symbolic capital, the interrelationships among these components of his theory, and their individual and collective influences on students’ social mobility. Authors who use theories from other academic disciplines in such a trite and superficial manner damage their credibility with knowledgeable readers.

*Methodological Caution.* The principal theme here is that use of the most recent and sophisticated analytical

procedures is not necessarily the best approach. Oftentimes I think manuscripts are too heavily into methodology and too weakly into substance. The method must be appropriate for the question(s) of the study and the author(s) must have full and complete knowledge of the assumptions and complexity of the analytical procedures used. The rush to use the most recent analytical procedure is often premature in that the author does not have full command of the fundamental nature and assumptions of the procedure. This again will diminish the credibility of the author.

The rush to use the most recent analytical innovation seems predicated on the assumption that such procedures might well yield substantively different findings from the consensus in the extant research literature. With the possible exception of the growing use of path analysis or causal modeling procedures to explore the indirect and total effects of variables, I am not aware of where the use of new analytical procedures has resulted in substantially different results over the past three decades. The advent of LISREL (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1984), for example, was embraced by many scholars and the literature soon became replete with the application of LISREL to issues before the academic community. The consequences are at least twofold. First, there are numerous instances in the literature where these procedures have been misused. The rush to use LISREL preceded authors' full and complete knowledge of the complexity and assumptions that underlie the use of these procedures. Second, the collective findings from such studies have certainly not reshaped the previous findings using more conventional analytical procedures. Now the rush is to use hierarchical linear modeling procedures (HLM) (Ethington, 1997). Again, we find many examples of the misuse of HLM, and, though it is much too early to reach anything approaching a definitive conclusion, the results obtained thus far from the use of HLM have not suggested any dramatically different conclusions from those based on the use of more conventional analytical procedures.

My concern is not with the appropriateness of new methodological advances such as LISREL or HLM, for when applied appropriately they have much potential to strengthen our knowledge base. They need not produce radically different findings. Our knowledge base is strengthened if the proper application of such procedures simply confirms existing findings. My concern is with the "user friendliness" of many of the computer programs for these new innovations that enable under-prepared users to employ them. Very substantial mathematical and statistical training is essential in order to properly use the newer genre of methodological advances, and I fear that our rush to be current precedes

our training and preparation. Unless fully prepared, authors would be best advised to use traditional analytical procedures.

#### Reference List

Bieber, J. P. (1999). Cultural capital as an interpretive framework for faculty life. In J. C. Smart (ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 14, pp. 367-397). New York: Agathon Press.

Ethington, C. A. (1997). A hierarchical linear modeling approach to studying college effects. In J. C. Smart (ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 12, pp. 165-194). New York: Agathon Press.

Joreskog, K. & Sorbom, D. (1984). *LISREL VI: Analysis of linear structural relationships by maximum likelihood, instrumental variables, and least squares methods*. Mooresville, IN: Scientific Software, Inc.

Light, R. J., Singer, J. D., & Willett, J. B. (1990). *By design: Planning research on higher education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

*Note.* This paper is a slightly revised version of one section of an invited paper, "Attributes of Exemplary Research Manuscripts Employing Quantitative Analyses," presented in the session entitled "Verifying Data" at the 2002 ASHE meeting in Sacramento. Seven attributes are presented in the complete paper, which is available from the author via email requests (jsmart@memphis.edu).

## ASHE Committee Chair Appointments

The ASHE Board of Directors announces the appointment of chairpersons for several important committees. These appointments are Carolyn Thompson, Chair of the Awards Committee; Stephen DesJardins, Chair of the Budget Committee; Sylvia Hurtado, Chair of the Bobbie Wright Dissertation of the Year Award Committee; and Judith Glazer-Raymo, Chair of the Publications Committee. Each of these chairpersons serves a three-year term.

The ASHE Board of Directors expresses gratitude to the following individuals who completed their service to ASHE as committee chairpersons: Janet Lawrence, Awards Committee; Michael Paulsen, Budget Committee; Roger Baldwin, Bobbie Wright Dissertation of the Year Award Committee; and Mildred Garcia, Publications Committee.

The service of Mimi Wolverton to ASHE as Editor the Association's Newsletter also merits recognition. The ASHE Board is pleased that Mimi has agreed to continue to serve as Editor of the ASHE Newsletter.

## Ways to Think About the New Submission Process

*Gary Rhoades, University of Arizona*

With Adrianna's kind invitation, I have the opportunity to express a few thoughts about the change in the

proposal submission process. My first thought has to do with conceptions of expertise. One of the motivating reasons for reorganizing the submission and review process is to enable a more effective application of expertise. But what is the basis of our expertise? The seven divisions for this year are topical areas. Are topics how we think of our expertise? I am trying to imagine someone saying, "I do students." What about them? Student persistence. Student development. Student activism. Student sub-culture. Multiculturalism and racism among. And so on. Without debating the particular topical areas, some might suggest that our expertise is grounded more in disciplines and conceptual frameworks, and in methods of data gathering and analysis than in general topical areas. That would lead to quite different divisions.

But what if we framed our expertise in more interdisciplinary, problem-focused ways? I can almost hear George Keller counseling and chiding us (and rightfully so, in my view) to study "big questions" that go beyond delimited topics, disciplines, and data gathering techniques. What would the divisions of submission and review be if we did that? State and institutional budgeting processes and effects on diversity, pursuing global markets and impacts on local access and communities, faculty and non-faculty professionals' relations and organizational productivity, academic science policy and faculty/student relations, commercial curricular products and educational processes, and Higher Education program curricula as a mechanism for facilitating school/university partnerships for enhanced matriculation. These are but a few examples, which I offer because they cut across various committees and councils, such as the Committee on Ethnic Participation, the Council for the Advancement of Higher Education Programs, the Council on International Higher Education, and the Council on Public Policy in Higher Education, which have emerged in ASHE, that represent members' interests. I could see these and other big issue topics as being the divisions for proposal submission/review.

A second thought about the divisions relates to my last point. It should be easy to see how divisions can be signs, symbolizing what sorts of knowledge gets featured and what sorts get overlooked or downplayed. The Program Committee will work hard to make sure that all proposals are accommodated and appropriately placed. However, the game is to "fit." If we want to push beyond the current boundaries of knowledge, we need to encourage, reward, and feature work that does NOT fit in established divisions. Perhaps we should create an interstitial, wildcard division of "Beyond the Divisions."

A final thought about the new format has to do with audience. Much of the work embedded in and featured by the seven divisions can be traced to the history of our field as one of providing advice to institutional managers. In the division of students, for example, a lot of work done on persistence is on how to keep students in a particular institution to increase its efficiency/graduation rate. But what if we took our charge to be to speak to students in order to facilitate their best choice of institutions and the optimal transfer among institutions? In other words, what if we saw part of our function as advising not those at the top of organizations and policy-making bodies, but those in the middle and at the bottom? What if we saw part of our role as speaking to the interests and needs of these constituencies? What divisions would we come up with then?

Of course, any format for proposal submission and review has potential drawbacks and benefits. The new format being introduced this year focuses attention on the substance of the proposals and the program more than on the format. In our view, that is all to the good. It also encourages the Program Chair to more explicitly address and represent a broad diversity of scholarly interest on the Program Committee, by appointing people focused on a wide range of topics in higher education scholarship. I hope that such a spirit of engaged conversation about the substance of our work proves to be the defining feature of the new proposal and submission process. Adrianna and I invite your comment. Please forward comments to: kezar@wam.umd.edu.

## Higher Education Programs

The Council for The Advancement of Higher Education Programs (CAHEP) is a standing committee of ASHE. The purpose of the Council is to enrich the teaching and learning experiences of students and faculty in the Association's constituent Higher Education programs. Any ASHE member that is interested in the advancement of Higher Education programs is welcome to become an active participant in the Council. CAHEP sponsors a pre-conference program each year before the annual ASHE Conference beginning on Wednesday evening with dinner followed by focus dialogues on program issues Wednesday night and Thursday morning. The Council is also in the process of developing a website for members to dialogue about program issues between conferences that will be linked to the ASHE Website. If you would like more information about CAHEP programs and activities, please contact one of the CAHEP Officers.

### CAHEP Officers

Karen Card, Chair  
University of South Dakota  
[kcard@usd.edu](mailto:kcard@usd.edu)

Al Smith, Vice Chair  
Baylor University  
[Al\\_Smith@baylor.edu](mailto:Al_Smith@baylor.edu)

Michael Miller, Program Chair  
San Jose State University  
[mmiller5@email.sjsu.edu](mailto:mmiller5@email.sjsu.edu)

Linda Serra Hagedorn, Secretary  
University of Southern California  
[lsh@usc.edu](mailto:lsh@usc.edu)

Tim Letzring, Treasurer  
University of Mississippi  
[tdl@olemiss.edu](mailto:tdl@olemiss.edu)

### ASHE Reader Series: Call for Proposals

ASHE members are invited to submit a proposal to develop a new edition to the ASHE Reader Series. Complete proposals should be received by **April 4, 2003**. Proposals for new Reader titles should describe:

1. The proposed purpose and content of the Reader;
2. Who are the intended audiences for the Reader and how the needs/ interests of those audiences influence the purpose and organization of the Reader;
3. How the proposed Reader is similar to and/or different from other Readers in the series and other potentially-competing books;
4. A preliminary list of chapter/section titles and the basis upon which they will be sequenced;
5. The method by which key readings will be selected for each chapter/section;
6. The advisory board, section editors, or other key personnel, including on what basis they were or will be chosen and what they will contribute;
7. Short biographical statement(s) for each editor(s); and
8. A timetable for completion of the Reader, pending approval of the proposal by the ASHE Reader Series Board and concluding with the submission of all materials in final copy to the publisher.

Proposals are to be confined to 15 pages of single-spaced text and should be submitted in electronic **and** paper forms. Proposals should conform in style to the APA 5<sup>th</sup> edition manual. The preferred word processor is Microsoft Word (.doc) for electronic submissions. Faxed proposals will not be considered. No proposals for this call will be considered after the **April 4, 2003** deadline.

### Submit all proposals to:

Dr. Len Foster, ASHE Reader Series Editor  
San Diego State University  
College of Education  
Educational Leadership Department  
5500 Campanile Drive  
San Diego, CA 92182-1190  
E-mail: [lfoster@mail.sdsu.edu](mailto:lfoster@mail.sdsu.edu)  
Telephone: (619) 594-7185

### Soft Money

*Raphael Guillory, Eastern Washington University*

Soft Money provides current information on websites, grants, fellowships, and scholarships in higher education as well as helpful tips that can give you a competitive edge when searching and applying for support from funding sources. If you have any questions or would like additional information regarding funding sources, contact Soft Money columnist, Dr. Raphael Guillory, at (509) 359-2274 or [rguillory@mail.ewu.edu](mailto:rguillory@mail.ewu.edu).

This issue of Soft Money focuses on what it takes to write successful grant proposal for a private foundation. To this end, a representative from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation was interviewed about what constitutes a successfully funded grant proposal. Needless to say, the information from this interview does not guarantee your proposal will be funded. It simply offers helpful tips and strategies when writing and submitting a proposal to a private foundation. The following interview was conducted with Mike VanBuren, Communications Manager, W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

**Q: Soft Money** – “Can you offer our readers any helpful tips and strategies when writing and submitting and grant proposal?”

**A: Mr. Van Buren** – “We like to see proposals that offer creative ideas that align with the foundation specific goals. It is particularly important to use language that reflects the guiding principles, ideas, and the funding priorities of the foundation. I believe other private foundations, similar to the Kellogg foundation, would offer the same advice.”

**Q: Soft Money** – “What other advice do you think would be helpful?”

**A: Mr. Van Buren** – “Well, the Kellogg Foundation has a two-stage process when reviewing grant proposals since we get so many each year. First, is the pre-proposal stage, where a one to two page proposal is submitted that

basically summarizes your idea. At this stage, pre-proposals have a better chance of getting past the first stage if they are detailed but concise. The briefer the better! Also, be sure to provide accurate contact information, and the full name of your organization. No acronyms! Then, if we like the idea, we then contact the proposal writer and ask them to submit a full proposal detailing the specific of your project, which is stage two.

**Q: Soft Money** – “Any last comments?”

**A: Mr. Van Buren** – “[When submitting the full proposal] be sure to review the foundation guidelines, which can be found on foundation websites. At this stage, we want to see what you intend to do with project, with an emphasis on how your project will make an impact on real people!”

More information on the W.K. Kellogg foundation can be found at <http://www.wkkf.org/>

## **Survival in the Academy: Transitioning From Administrator to Faculty Member**

*Marietta Del Favero, Louisiana State University*

The trend toward increasing professionalization of administrative work in higher education has been accompanied by the growing appeal of programs for advanced study in higher education leadership. The majority of graduates from these programs use their doctoral degrees to enhance their academic credentials and advance in the administrative ranks. Many others however, doctorate in hand, opt to enter the ranks of faculty in higher education leadership or similar programs and continue the scholarly work begun in their doctoral training. For these individuals, particularly if they enjoyed a fairly lengthy tenure as an administrator, the transition from administrator to faculty member can be an arduous, and sometimes frustrating one. This is due largely to the fact that administrative work values and orientations are well engrained, and many of these values mediate against success as a faculty member. Now in my second year as a tenure track faculty member, after a 17-year administrative career, I hope that the perspectives I offer in managing this transition will help those now coping with its frustrations or others contemplating a similar transition.

### **Conflicting Work Values**

Administrative work life is dominated by institutional interests. Individual action is constrained by hierarchical and procedural structures that guide decision-making and maintain an overall balance in organizational systems (Birnbaum, 1988). While creativity is important,

one's work is nonetheless bounded by that which is prescribed by function and work role. Key skills for successful administrators are problem-solving, efficiency, relationship-building, and persuasion. Problem-solving and efficiency enable one to navigate bureaucratic work prescriptions and hurdles in ways that facilitate action, while relationship building and persuasion foster consensus building and advancement of agendas designed to further organizational goals. One's success is defined primarily by effectiveness of contributions to organizational goals and evaluated by superiors within a hierarchy.

In contrast, faculty work focuses on one's individual scholarly interests. Research agendas and pedagogy are determined by the interests, inclinations, and judgment of the individual scholar. An individual's work toward these goals is left to his/her sole discretion. The autonomy stemming from the priority of individual interests means that faculty work can proceed with little regard for organizational concerns (e.g., the day-to-day conduct of departmental or institutional business). Institutional loyalty takes a back seat to disciplinary loyalty, particularly at research institutions. As such, good scholarly work is not dependent on much of the organizational activity that occurs in relatively close proximity to the scholar's work context. Foremost amongst the skills required of good scholars are creativity, self-direction, and analysis. The social skills so necessary to administrative work are less critical in the production of good scholarship, particularly for junior faculty striving to establish a research agenda and get published. Success is measured by scholarly output and evaluated by colleagues. Involvement in organizational matters plays far less into the success equation, particularly at research-focused institutions.

### **The Value of Administrative Experience**

These differences in values and approaches to work are critical in explaining the transitional context faced by the administrator-turned-scholar. Yet another important element complicating the transition is the importance of both skill sets. One's scholarship, particularly in the teaching realm where many of the students are practitioners, is tremendously enhanced when a faculty member's practitioner side can be integrated into the teaching-learning environment. Students become the ultimate beneficiaries in the classroom. And in one's research, experience as a practitioner enhances the ability to make all-important links between theory and practice. So while the work values may differ and create a source of conflict and frustration for faculty, the answer lies in managing how one applies the two sets of values, not in complete abdication of administrative values. The solitary nature of faculty work then is both a

blessing and a curse. On the one hand it affords distance from the old ways of looking at the world. The distance serves to minimize frustrations around “how things are done around here” and the tendency to want to “fix” or “improve” the systems we believe can potentially aid us in being more productive scholars. Alternatively, it is a curse in that we are unused to working in isolation or shutting ourselves off from organizational concerns. The social nature of administrative work, which has previously defined our approach to professional life, becomes less a requirement, and in extreme cases, can even be a detriment to our success. The solitary nature of the academic life, especially for the junior faculty member where retreat into one’s teaching and research is critical to meet the scholarship requirements of tenure, therefore stands in stark opposition to what we know.

### **Transition Pointers**

Individual approaches to coping with this transition in work contexts and values are many. I offer my own to stimulate others’ reflections on their own best approaches.

**Focus on your scholarship.** As a junior faculty member I hear resoundingly, and often, of the importance of focusing on one’s scholarship. This rule has become the overarching tenet for a comprehensive approach to my work. Adopting a rational, logical perspective, well honed in my experience as an administrator, I often have to remind myself that I am a scholar and my work has moved beyond concerns of organizational effectiveness. And, because I love what I do (not unlike most scholars), and my departmental colleagues respect and support my need to be so focused, this is not difficult. But being aware that a tension between one’s administrative and scholarly personas is likely to exist for a while is the first step. The Focus on Your Scholarship rule serves as a reminder to me of my most vital professional purpose. How I execute this tenet is reflected in the following more specific self-directives.

**Resist the strong temptation to evaluate and improve the organization.** You may have good ideas for improving organizational systems that may over the long run enhance your ability to be productive as a scholar. But as administrators we know that such system improvements can require investments in time that go well beyond what is initially thought. In the zero sum game of production, such time commitments ultimately reduce the time you have to devote to your scholarship. Certainly there is a fine line between being a good departmental citizen and using one’s time most constructively toward the production of quality scholarship. Remember though that using your expertise and experience to contribute on occasion to

organizational problem solving looks very different than the kind of initiative and collaboration often required to improve organizational operations from conceptualization of the problem through execution. It is important to recognize and avoid the latter.

**Collegiality has limits in a practical sense.** Collegiality is indeed important, but takes a back seat to publications and teaching in evaluation for tenure, particularly in research- focused institutions. Consider your participation in relationship-building activities accordingly. For example, relationship building is important in demonstrating to your colleagues that you are a serious scholar, but such activity for purposes of program improvement, student recruitment, and marketing should, in general, be left to administrators or to your senior faculty colleagues.

**Vita-building should determine effort.** With some constraints posed by the nature of the employment contract, faculty have complete autonomy in the structuring of their work effort. The workday of administrators is more structured as a rule by virtue of collaborative activities, which require integration with others’ work schedules, and work timelines imposed by bureaucratic systems. In transitioning from a more to a less structured work environment, it is important to be aware of this difference and devise an approach for structuring your work that meets your particular scholarly objectives. My own rule is simply: How the amount of effort expended on an activity depends on how that activity will count toward tenure. Activities that count little should not command as much time and effort as those that result in a publication in a top-tier journal. When it comes to effort expended on organizational matters, with the exception of requisite service activities, I avoid (admittedly, not infrequently with some pain) large commitments of time and effort. As an alternative to avoiding such involvements you might also consider how engaging in departmental or institutional projects might be incorporated into your scholarship, thereby serving a dual purpose.

**Be true to yourself.** Above all, remember that we came to this profession by virtue of our desire to make a contribution to the study of higher education and further its understanding in society. Only we are in a position to judge how we can put our talents to use in becoming the best scholars we can be. It is incumbent on each of us to reflect on our best approach to achieving this goal while at the same time remembering that part of being a good scholar is modeling for others, particularly our students, that investing in our institutions is important and worthy of our time and energy.

My research suggests that the transition from faculty member to administrator (e.g., to department chair or dean) may be similarly difficult. In these individuals one not only has to confront a new set of work values but also the additional stigma of being viewed by colleagues as “traitors” who have abdicated to the “other side.” Whatever the direction of the transition however, understanding and navigating the cultural differences are important to excelling, if not surviving, in the academy.

References

Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

**News from the ASHE Publications Committee**

*Judith Glazer-Raymo, Long Island University*

New appointments to the ASHE Publications Committee include the following: Judy Glazer-Raymo, the committee chair will be joined by Ana Martinez Alemann, Joann Cooper, James Earl Davis, and Bill Tierney, serving in his capacity as past president. In other news, Len Foster will succeed Jim Ratcliff for a five-year term as Editor of the ASHE Reader Series. Adriana Kezar will continue as editor of the ASHE-ERIC Reports. The Publications Committee welcomes your suggestions and comments and asks that you forward them to Judy Glazer-Raymo at raymo@liu.edu.

**ANNOUNCING A NEW SERIES FROM  
*Stylus Publishing*  
INVITATION TO AUTHORS**

***Key Issues in Higher Education Series***  
Editor: Donald E. Heller

The reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965 by Congress in 2003 will bring to the fore the issues of college costs, funding and access; heighten public debate about the role of higher education in society; and focus the spotlight more sharply on administrators and faculty in higher education.

The *Key Issues in Higher Education* series will bring together some of the nation’s most respected researchers, scholars, and policy analysts to inform the debate on these issues, and help shape future policy. The series will be targeted at policymakers, higher education leaders, researchers and scholars interested in the intersection between post-secondary education and society.

**SUBMISSIONS:** The Editor and Publisher welcome proposals for volumes in the series. Please contact Donald E. Heller at Pennsylvania State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education, 400 Rackley Building, University Park, PA 16802. Tel.: 814-865-9756 / dheller@psu.edu

**GRAD ALERT**

Katherine Garlough, University of Oklahoma  
Amy Metcalfe, University of Arizona

Welcome and congratulations to Amy Metcalf, my new colleague elected to the ASHE board of directors as a graduate student representative from the University of Arizona. Shederick McClendon is the retiring graduate student representative and I want to thank him for his tireless service and efforts in programming for the last two years. In addition, to a great extent our accomplishments are due to the efforts of past-presidents Ann Austin and Bill Tierney. They have been amazing in their support of graduate students and on behalf of the graduate students of ASHE, thank you.

The ASHE 2002 Annual Conference in Sacramento was very successful for graduate students. Over 280 graduate students attended the conference and our two sessions at conference, *ASHE from ABC to Ph.D.* and *The View from the Professional Side*, were standing room only. At the board of directors meeting, the ASHE Graduate Student Scholarship proposal was passed unanimously. The scholarship will assist graduate students that have been selected to present at the ASHE conference with monies for travel and lodging. The scholarship is dependent on the generosity of ASHE members and we hope to see donations indicated on registration forms in the future. I want to take this opportunity on behalf of the graduate students of ASHE to express our gratitude to the College of Education at the University of Oklahoma for sponsoring the Graduate Student Luncheon attended by over 60 students, many attending the ASHE conference for the first time.

Here are the things we want to accomplish this year:

Democratization This is making the process of selecting and appointing other graduate students to committees and other posts, as directed by the board, more democratic. Despite our best efforts, we're still selecting student reps for other committees more from who we know than from a broader representative group of ASHE grad student members. To this end, we will establish guidelines for selecting reps.

Shared Opportunities Somehow the opportunities to participate must be expanded within the ASHE grad student network. Part of this is communication and part

is organizational. To accomplish this we intend to form committees that work together via email.

**Ex-Officio** This committee of the ex-graduate student representatives continues to contribute to ASHE as an advisory board to the grad student representatives as they work on long-term projects, such as developing procedures and guidelines.

**Gratitude and Service** This is what we would be doing if we had our act together. Paying it forward for the valuable opportunities that ASHE provides for us.

**Appreciation** This is not the same gratitude, but the graduate student body response to specific acts that have improved our situation within ASHE. One of our first tasks is to respond to the Lumina Foundation for the graduate student fellowship.

If students are interested in participating specifically in any of the above activities or are interested in working with other graduate students or faculty, generally on ASHE projects, let us know via email. Amy Metcalfe can be reached at [amysm@email.arizona.edu](mailto:amysm@email.arizona.edu) and Katherine Garlough at [garlo@ou.edu](mailto:garlo@ou.edu). And, join the graduate student listserv at <http://lists.ou.edu/archives/ashegrads-l.html>. Finally, we encourage students to participate in ASHE in the annual conference, and beyond, in the community of scholars.

## Notables

*Joni Montez, Washington State University*

This is ASHE's posting place for news about people, places, publications, and other items of interest in higher education. We invite all members to send us your current news, whereabouts, recommendations, kudos (yours, others), new book titles, announcements, awards, and website information to keep others up to date. Send your articles or snippets to Joni Montez, email address:

[jonim@wsu.edu](mailto:jonim@wsu.edu)

## Book Review

Keeton, M.T., Sheckley, B.G., Griggs, J.K. (2002). *Effectiveness and Efficiency in Higher Education for Adults: A Guide to Fostering Learning*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co. ISBN 0-7872-9254-0

In this timely adult education practitioners' handbook (sponsored by the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL), Joan Griggs joins Morris Keeton and Barry Sheckly in updating the two authors' (Sheckly and Keeton) earlier work on adult education arenas of practice (*Efficiency in Adult Higher Education: A*

[www.ashe.missouri.edu](http://www.ashe.missouri.edu)

*Practitioner's Handbook* (1995). Unlike its predecessor, however, *Effectiveness and Efficiency in Higher Education for Adults* describes best practices in terms of a set of eight key principles. These principles focus on clarifying goals, practice, balancing expectations with supports, experience, reflection, focusing on problems in inquiry, developing effectiveness, and creating a culture of learning. Drawn from research in cognitive psychology, neurophysiology, anthropology, and teacher education, these principles have application to learners at work, in college, in distance education, through community activities, and in self-directed activities. Each chapter highlights one principle through research and anecdotal narrative, followed by strategies for application. The authors make a convincing case for an overall strategy that comports with the institution's primary educational mission and offer their thoughts about, and tactics with which to implement, an alternative *Framework* that supports *Effectiveness and Efficiency* (FEE). Finally, they suggest various management practice strategies to improve the institution's administrative efficiency.

## Distinctly Notable

In this and subsequent issues, the Newsletter will feature winners of ASHE's awards, given at its conference in Sacramento, California, in November 2002. This month, we highlight Marvin W. Peterson, winner of the Howard Bowen Distinguished Career Award.

## MARVIN W. PETERSON

### Howard Bowen Distinguished Career Award Winner

Dr. Marvin W. Peterson, professor of higher education and Program Director of the National Center for Postsecondary Improvement at University of Michigan, received the Howard Bowen Distinguished Career Award at ASHE's conference in Sacramento, California, in November 2002. This award is given to an individual whose professional life has been devoted in substantial part to the study of higher education and whose career has significantly advanced the field through extraordinary scholarship, leadership, and service.

Dr. Peterson's accomplishments in higher education are numerous; his professional career has included faculty, administrative, and research positions at the Harvard Graduate School of Business and at the University of Michigan. In addition to this faculty work, he has served as a visiting scholar at NCHEMS and at several universities in the U.S. He also served as visiting faculty or consultant to foreign governments in Austria, Brazil, Hungary, Germany, Kyrgyzstan, the Netherlands, the People's Republic of China, Russia, and Uruguay.

Dr. Peterson is a past president of ASHE, the Association for Institutional Research (AIR) and the Society of College and University Planning (SCUP). He is also active in the Higher Education Colloquium, the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), the American Education Research Association (AERA), the European Association for Institutional Research, and the Council for Advancement and Support of Education. Dr. Peterson's primary research interest is in organizational and administrative behavior and institutional research and planning in higher education. Notable among his publications are the *ASHE Reader on Planning and Institutional Research* (1999), *Planning and Management for a Changing Environment* (1997), *Assessing the Organizational and Administrative Context for Teaching and Learning* (1991), *ASHE Reader on Organization and Governance in Higher Education* (Third Edition, 1986 and Fourth Edition, 1991), *Governance, Management and Leadership* (1987), *The Organizational Context for Teaching and Learning* (1986), *Institutional Research in Transition* (1985), *Improving Academic Management: Handbook for Planning and Institutional Research* (1980), *Black Students on White Campuses: The Impact of Increased Black Enrollment* (1978), and *Benefiting from Interinstitutional Research* (1979). Dr. Peterson has served on editorial boards or as consulting editor for scholarly journals including the *Journal of Higher Education*, *American Education Research Journal*, *Research in Higher Education*, *Review of Higher Education*, *Planning for Higher Education*, *ASHE-ERIC Research Report Series*, *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, and *Change* magazine. He was also editor of the Jossey-Bass monograph series, *New Directions in Institutional Research*.

This prestigious award holds special meaning for Dr. Peterson; he knew Howard Bowen and had great respect for him. In the mid-1970s, Dr. Peterson had the opportunity to interview Dr. Bowen, who then served as president of University of Iowa, for a study of institutional responses to increasing African American enrollments. Peterson observed, "I was impressed by his personal warmth and openness as a human being and with his grasp of, and commitment to, this important issue as an institutional leader. Later when he served as a faculty member at Claremont, I marveled at his influential scholarship and at his leadership in ASHE and in the field of higher education more broadly. So this recognition is personally meaningful."

The Bowen award is usually presented at, or near, the time of the individual's retirement. Dr. Peterson notes

that receipt of the award usually implies "It's time to start over or it's all over!" Though he says he will definitely retire, he states that he finds it difficult to contemplate things, such as retirement, because he enjoys what he is doing. He notes, "I have always viewed myself in my scholarly life, which has focused on organizational behavior in higher education as trying to balance my interests and involvements in the academic, analytic, and applied worlds of higher education. ASHE, AIR and SCUP provided a professional arena in which to constantly engage that interface. Having served in leadership positions and been recognized by all three is a source of pride."