

ASHE

Association for the Study of Higher Education

A Newsletter of the Association for the
Study of Higher Education

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

President's Column

Pedagogical Content Knowledge and the Scholarship of Teaching

John M. Braxton, Vanderbilt University

IN THE PREVIOUS TWO EDITIONS OF THE ASHE Newsletter, I discussed the characteristics of higher education as a field of study. In the last issue, I discussed the implications of our low paradigmatic stature for graduate education. This article also focuses on our low paradigmatic nature. The late Thomas Kuhn used the term paradigmatic to describe the level of consensus that exists within an academic discipline on such matters as theories to explain phenomena of interest, the importance of problems, and research methodologies. Physics and chemistry represent high paradigmatic fields, whereas political science and sociology represent low paradigmatic fields.

An advantage of our low paradigmatic nature is the ability of higher education as a field of inquiry to quickly and easily embrace new research topics. In this article, I discuss the scholarship of teaching as an area worthy of our scholarly efforts. Other articles in this issue of the ASHE Newsletter discuss other possible areas of inquiry. Mimi Wolverton's piece discusses linkages between K-12 education and higher education. In his article, Timothy Caboni delineates research needed to guide the practice of institutional advancement.

Boyer (1990) outlines four domains of scholarship: application, discovery, integration, and teaching. My colleagues, William Luckey and Patricia Helland, and I assert that the development and improvement of pedagogical practice is the goal of the scholarship of

teaching. Classroom assessment and pedagogical content knowledge provide the base for such scholarship. Classroom research strives to understand the relationship between teaching and student learning (Cross, 1990). Although scholars interested in this relationship may engage in classroom research, such research is primarily conducted by college and university teachers interested in improving their own teaching practices. Lee Schulman expands on this notion. Schulman's important understanding of pedagogical content knowledge pertains to the knowledge of pedagogy specific to a particular academic discipline or field of study. Such pedagogical knowledge centers on how to help students understand subject matter.

I view research centered on pedagogical content knowledge as worthy of attention by higher education scholars. Some of us may focus on pedagogical content knowledge for various academic disciplines while others will center attention on teaching in higher education as a field of study. Regardless of the foci of such scholarship, I envision the construction of a knowledge base comprised of methods, approaches, and activities designed to help students learn the subject matter of a specific academic discipline or field of study. Keen interest centers on the delineation of difficult topics and ways to help students comprehend such topics. A daunting, but important task.

Specific courses in a given discipline or field of study provide a beginning point. In our field, organization and administration and the college student are typical courses taught. Each of these courses contains theories or concepts, which students may find difficult to comprehend. In organization and administration of higher education, the ideas of loosely-coupled systems and organized anarchy may pose problems of comprehension. For students taking a course on the college student, the concept of college environments may be difficult for students to understand. The idea here is for individuals engaged in the scholarship of teaching focused on higher education as a field of study to identify theories and concepts that instructors perceive to be difficult for students to understand. The cataloging of difficult concepts constitutes an important first step in the development of pedagogical content knowledge for our field and for others.

The identification of methods, approaches, activities, and devices faculty members use to help students understand difficult concepts for specific courses constitutes another important aspect of the construction of a knowledge base of pedagogical content knowledge. Classroom research and specifically designed studies offer empirically based approaches to the codification of pedagogical content knowledge.

Finding faculty engaged in classroom research striving to develop ways to make difficult course concepts understandable to students would be a critical task of scholars interested in constructing a base pedagogical content knowledge in different academic disciplines and fields of inquiry. Scholars of pedagogical content knowledge might also design and conduct their own studies to determine the efficacy of approaches to help student learn difficult course concepts. The literature on teaching and learning in higher education constitutes one source for the selection of approaches to teaching hard-to-learn material. Another source is faculty members who have developed their own approaches, but have not conducted classroom research to verify the effectiveness of their methods. Research designed to confirm the effectiveness of such untested approaches could be conducted.

The construction of a knowledge base of pedagogical content knowledge for our field, as well as others, constitutes an important stream of inquiry in the scholarship of teaching. Because of our low paradigmatic nature, the scholarship of teaching in general and the development of pedagogical content knowledge, in particular, are topics for research that higher education scholars can quickly embrace. To do so would greatly enhance the teaching and learning of both undergraduate and graduate students.

References

- Boyer, E.L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.
- Braxton, J.M., Luckey, W. and Helland, P. (2002) *Institutionalizing a Broader View of Scholarship Through Boyer's Four Domains*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 29(2), San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cross, K. Patricia. "Classroom Research: Helping Professors Learn More About Teaching and Learning." In P.Seldin and Associates(eds.) *How Administrators Can Improve Teaching from Talk to Action in Higher Education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1990.
- Cross, K. P. "Classroom research: Implementing the scholarship of teaching." In T. Angelo (ed), *Classroom Assessment and Research: An Update on Uses, Approaches and Research Findings*, New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 75. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1998.
- Kuhn, T.S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962, 1970.
- Schulman, L.S. "Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching." *Educational Researcher*, 1986, 15, 4-14.
- Schulman, L. "Knowledge and teaching: Foundation of the new reform." *Harvard Educational Review*, 1987, 57 (1), 1-22.

Featured Column

Toward a Research Agenda for Institutional Advancement in Higher Education

Timothy C. Caboni, Vanderbilt University

IN THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2002, postsecondary education institutions received nearly \$24 billion in voluntary support from private sources. This accounts for over eight percent of that year's total higher education expenditures. Colleges and universities increasingly have turned to private fund raising in an attempt to offset state budget cuts and rising costs. Once the province of private higher education institutions and large, public, research universities, fund raising has been adopted by the nation's regional public institutions and community colleges. Many of these institutions had no formal institutional advancement (the moniker practitioners have given to fund raising, alumni relations, publications, and public relations functions) departments in place as recently as twenty years ago.

Compared to the central role institutional advancement plays in colleges and universities, the research literature is limited. Few studies in the fund raising literature concentrate on basic research or theory building. Additionally, institutional advancement receives scant attention from higher education researchers. For example, of the research papers accepted for presentation at the annual ASHE conference this November, only four address advancement issues.

The lack of attention to institutional advancement may be due to several factors. First, individuals pursuing doctorates who write dissertations focused on advancement frequently return to the world of practice, rather than pursuing career as faculty members. Practice as an area of inquiry is driven by professional interests, rather than by a program of research. As a result, the body of knowledge is fragmented, lacking many studies for the purpose of theory building.

Second, colleges and universities may be reluctant to share information with researchers for the fear of jeopardizing relationships with potential donors or alumni. As a result researchers may have difficulty gaining access to those populations necessary for understanding more fully the relationships that make fund raising possible within higher education.

Third, advancement practitioners themselves see limited utility for research in their jobs. Career fund raisers report that the knowledge they use in fulfilling their duties as development officers is primarily

general knowledge, which is best learned on the job rather than in formal educational settings. There is no theoretical knowledge base specific to fund raising or advancement in which practitioners are well versed.

Finally, higher education faculty who actively pursue research on advancement-related topics as a part of their programs of research are limited in number. Additionally, few programs include advancement courses as part of their higher education curriculum. Vanderbilt's four-course specialization in institutional advancement is unique among higher education programs; however, it is designed primarily for practitioners and senior administrators, not aspiring researchers.

With advancement playing an increasingly important role in higher education, a need exists for additional scholarly work that addresses issues of fund raising, external relations, and alumni relations. Basic research focused on building theory is the area most lacking in the study of advancement. While by no means exhaustive, the following areas may provide the beginnings of a framework for faculty and graduate students interested in the study of institutional advancement. Potential broad areas for inquiry might include: the history of institutional advancement, voluntary support of higher education, professionalism and advancement, and financial and management issues.

History - Understanding the roots of the advancement profession and its development over time could provide insight into its current functions. Additionally, as institutional advancement progresses on a continuum of professionalization, practitioners need to understand how the profession has grown into its present form. The profession needs an historical understanding of the role played by fund raising in the growth and development of higher education.

Voluntary Support - The question most frequently addressed by advancement research is "what are the characteristics of individuals who are likely to make a gift to University X?" Frequently, these single site studies seek to find the "magic button" that when pressed will cause individuals to contribute to the site-institution. With results which vary by institution, and little regard for previous studies in selection of variables, the study of donor motivations needs to shift toward developing or applying theories that help to explain the decision to participate in philanthropic giving to higher education.

Professionalism - As the number of institutional advancement staff members grows on college campuses, additional attention should be focused on the advancement profession itself. Potential topics

for study include: the evolution of advancement on college campuses; codes of conduct, ethical behavior and self-regulation within the profession; and the perception of campus fund raisers by potential donors, faculty, and other segments of campus populations.

Management and Finance - Finally, as pressure mounts on higher education institutions to increase efficiency, control costs, and justify tuition increases, voluntary support will play an increasingly important role in the fiscal stability of colleges and universities. Senior administrators will need new tools with which to manage their advancement organizations. Areas for exploration within this category include: how fund raising relates to overall resource issues in higher education, how fund raising effectiveness is measured beyond simple dollar totals, and how voluntary support influences academics on campuses.

As the community of scholars interested in advancement issues continues to grow, so do the outlets and opportunities for support and recognition. In addition to the higher education journals with which we are all familiar, the professional organization for advancement practitioners (CASE) created a journal four years ago specifically for research focused on educational advancement. The same organization also recognizes outstanding advancement research, with annual competitive awards in multiple categories for outstanding dissertations and published scholarship.

Invited Column

Scholarly Inquiry: A Question of Practice

Mimi Wolverson, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

WHEN JOHN ASKED ME TO CONTRIBUTE A PIECE ON the linkage between K-12 and higher education as a topic for scholarly inquiry, two responses came to mind. One: it shouldn't be too hard a task to do; after all, aren't higher education scholars engaged in exploring that linkage all the time? Every time we look for explanations for why students don't succeed in higher education settings, aren't we examining the K-12/higher education linkage for answers? In pursuit of knowledge and understanding, we investigate course-taking patterns, level of preparation, school involvement levels, the effectiveness of teachers in schools, and so forth.

This reasoning immediately raised a second, more cynical question: are we truly examining the linkage or simply looking for a place where we can assign blame for student failure in higher education settings? In truth, it seems that this latter question reflects, at

least in part, the true nature of a longstanding, adversarial relationship between the two education sectors.

From the higher education perspective, schools send under-prepared students into colleges and universities, where they must be remediated to bring them academically up to speed. K-12 institutions, in turn, assert that higher education institutions are so aloof and removed from the realities of educating today's youth that they fail to recognize the no-win situation in which schools find themselves. At the extreme, a highly frustrated, almost hostile, school sector rebuffs what it perceives as unwelcome intrusiveness by high-minded, know-it-all, higher education, do-gooders. And higher education retreats in the face of such rejection, unclear as to why schools don't welcome them with open arms. We hear occasional calls to arms, such as the one that Bill Tierney issued in his presidential address last year: higher education, get in there and help fix K-12. The unstated reality of such a call, as schools perceive it: schools lack the intellectual wherewithal to fix their own problems. To schools, such a directive smacks of elitism—a belief that 'our' sector of the system works and that 'yours' doesn't.

If we in higher education do take the call seriously, another question surfaces. Does the intersection of K-12 and higher education constitute a venue for scholarly inquiry? Results of work initiated by researchers in schools, if any, can take years to materialize. In a publish-or-perish world, scholars work under clear time constraints. The crusader may stick it out, but the pragmatist structures a research agenda that generates numerous publications in the short run.

If we frame the discussion, however, in terms of Boyer's understanding of scholarship and take his remonstrations to heart, the linkage between K-12 and higher education becomes a seedbed of reciprocal learning. Viewing scholarship as generating new knowledge, conveying knowledge through teaching others, and putting knowledge to use broadens the definition of inquiry. In essence, scholarly inquiry refers not only to data driven research but to experientially derived practice as well.

Perhaps, an example will illustrate what I mean. Rowley, Lujan, and Dolence took basic business planning concepts and applied them to the university setting. In *Strategic Change in Colleges and Universities*, they laid out a method of data-driven planning that requires universities to tie measurable performance indicators to goals and to evaluate the likelihood of realizing set goals based on analyses of the university and its external environment. The same

principles work in school district planning. Exposing local districts to Rowley et al's ideas represents scholarly inquiry in practice. Comparing the strengths and weaknesses of such an approach to planning in two distinct education sectors (K-12 and higher education) and delineating adaptations that work for both sectors represents scholarly inquiry as research. Exposing future university and school leaders to these research findings constitutes teaching as scholarly inquiry. Together, these three approaches to scholarly inquiry combine to influence policy, bringing scholarly inquiry full-circle to practice.

Service learning provides another flash point between schools and universities at which scholarly inquiry can take place. If we apply Boyer's triumvirate of scholarly inquiry, we clearly see the reciprocal nature of service learning. No one comes away from the service learning experience unchanged. School-age students learn from college students and visa versa. What they learn is the subject of research. How they learn the purview of teaching. And what they do with what they learn takes us into the realm of practice.

Can the linkage between K-12 and higher education serve as a viable arena for scholarly inquiry? Most certainly. Will it represent an avenue of mainline research? Probably not. As responsible members of the education system, is it our duty to engage in this line of scholarly inquiry? I'd say, yes.

2003 Public Policy Forum

Exploring the Issues and Decisions Affecting Higher Education

*Ami Zusman, 2003 Forum Program Chair,
University of California*

ACCESS. ACCOUNTABILITY. ECONOMIC DRIVERS OF public policy. Legislative and public attitudes toward higher education. These are the main themes of the fourth annual **ASHE Forum on Public Policy in Higher Education**, which convenes Wednesday, November 12 at 10 a.m. in Portland and ends Thursday, November 13 at noon, shortly before the ASHE General Conference starts. The Forum is organized by the Council on Public Policy in Higher Education, a standing committee of ASHE that is open to all ASHE members.

The Public Policy Forum provides a unique opportunity to spend a full day hearing from and talking with other colleagues engaged in analysis of the critical state and federal public policy issues facing colleges and universities today. It also brings together ASHE scholars, policy analysts, public

representatives, and institutional decision makers, to gain a better understanding of different perspectives on public policy matters. Forum sessions are structured to promote interaction among all participants, with at least one-third of the time in each session set aside for open discussion. Because everyone meets together for all the sessions, the Forum creates an intimate and cohesive environment that stimulates networking and informal discussions between and after sessions.

A highlight of this year's Forum will be the invited plenary session, *Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act: The Three A's – Access, Accountability, and Affordability*. This session, which will be held jointly with the Graduate Student Policy Seminar, will bring together institutional, association, accreditation, and federal perspectives on the wide-ranging and sometimes deeply divisive issues now being debated in Congress regarding federal programs and regulations that have shaped, or have the potential to shape, the landscape of higher education.

Other sessions include the following:

- *Public Policy to Increase Access to Postsecondary Education*. Recognizing that inadequate student preparation is a barrier to college access, this symposium will discuss research on major federal academic early intervention programs geared especially to students of color and low-income students.
- *Expanding Access to Higher Education: The Impact of State Finance Strategies*. Complementing the first session, this symposium will address another aspect of access – the impacts of differing state finance and financial aid policies on college access and enrollment.
- *Brain Draws and Brain Drains: Financial Aid, Admissions Policies, and Race*. Using varied approaches, these research/scholarly papers will examine the impacts of state and federal policies dealing with merit-based scholarships, admission standards, and the G.I. Bill.
- *External Pressures on Higher Education*. State-level accountability efforts, state regulatory structures, and the “commodification” of science will be the focus of these research/scholarly papers.
- *Public Attitudes Toward Higher Education: How Can Research Contribute to Mutual Understanding, Support and Public Policy?* Setting the stage for the future, a diverse group of panelists will lead a discussion of public

attitudes and the need to conduct policy research on higher education.

The Forum will also co-sponsor a Wednesday evening reception with the other pre-conference programs (the Graduate Student Policy Seminar and the International Forum). New officers and executive committee members of the newly established Council on Public Policy in Higher Education will be named during the brief Thursday morning business meeting, which will also provide time for program evaluation and discussion of other Council issues.

The full program schedule for the Forum on Public Policy in Higher Education can be found at: http://www.ashe.missouri.edu/conf_program_2003_publicpolicy.htm. More information about the sessions will be disseminated through the Council's listserv. To sign up for this listserv, contact Scott Thomas (slthomas@arches.uga.edu). Registration forms for the Forum and the ASHE General Conference are on the ASHE website.

The 2003 Public Policy Forum promises to offer lively discussions that we hope will stimulate new research ideas, networking opportunities, and important dialog on public policy developments. Join us!

Thinking Globally

What Price International Comparisons in a Global World?

Simon Marginson, International Program Chair, Monash University, Australia

IN AN INCISIVE ARTICLE IN *HIGHER EDUCATION* IN 1996, the German scholar Ulrich Teichler remarked, “How useful it is to study higher education on the basis of cross-national comparisons. Such perspectives “are indispensable for understanding a reality shaped by common international trends, reforms based on comparative observation, growing trans-national activities and partial supra-national integration in higher education.” At the same time, he added, making comparisons between higher education in different countries has become an increasingly tricky business, in a world that is becoming more and more inter-dependent and mutually affected, whether by technological, economic, social, cultural, political or (to our cost) by military means.

The act of comparison involves freeze-framing two different contexts that are in constant change. That in and of itself has always carried problems, dangers and limitations; but now a more fundamental

difficulty is at work undermining the restrictive nature of tried and tested methods. The traditional approach to comparative education assumes that we can analyze and compare national systems that are defined as relatively closed. That assumption is being broken down by the world-wide flows of students and faculty between countries, the trade in education services, the increasingly common pattern of cross-national collaboration in research teams, the global (world-wide) character of academic disciplines, and the most striking change, the instant transmission of data and ideas in real time.

It must be said that the effect of these cross-border flows in higher education is uneven. Globalization is not a single unifying pattern. Some national systems are more open and more affected by international phenomena than are others. Some aspects of higher education are more internationalized than others: for example first degrees are mostly developed and taught according to national traditions, whereas knowledge in the sciences, and increasingly knowledge in the social sciences, has become highly globalized. In one sense, American higher education is less globalized than higher education in most other countries. The international student presence is growing but remains only just over 4 percent of the enrollment, and the movement of American students out of the country for part of their studies lags behind the movement of foreign students into America. In the USA, the 'internationalization of the curriculum' more often means studies that help American students to understand other cultures, not more fundamental changes in what is learned.

In universities in some parts of the United States – unlike universities in every other country in the world – it is even possible to pretend that the global dimension is marginal or irrelevant, that international education is a quaint hobby on the borders of the main game in higher education. This is because of the culturally specific character of global flows. The growing internationalization of knowledge, and growth of educational trade, presents less of a challenge to American universities given that much of the money is American, much of the knowledge is American, and nearly all of the international teaching and research is conducted in English (though this may not remain the case). So far, unlike their counterparts in most other nations, American faculty and students have not been required to transform their degree structures, curriculum, scholarship, or even their educational values under the weight of foreign influences. From this perspective, the globalization of higher education is something that American universities do to the rest of the world, not what universities in the rest of the world do to the United States.

Still, in a world in constant communication, even domestic American higher education – protected as it is by its own material wealth and by global technological, academic, and cultural power – is no longer isolatable from international influences. One suspects that in the longer term the flow of global effects will be increasingly reciprocal.

However, the point is that cross-national comparisons in the field of higher education studies must deal with three new realities. First, 'the global' has become a significant unit of analysis, alongside 'the nation'. Second, the national system characteristics inherited from the past are sometimes (but not always) overshadowed by global flows and effects. Third, now that individual universities are able to deal directly with each other across national borders, 'local-to-global' relationships have become very important. Institutions have long related to the rest of the world through the framework of cross-national relationships via government to government dealings; but increasingly now they relate to each other and to each other's faculty and students directly in their own right. And the identities of individual faculty, of all of us, are shaped not only by our local biographies, grounded as they are in place and nation, but by professional associations and personal friendships that span international borders. We live in a world of plural affiliations.

This does not mean that universities have escaped the policy and regulatory influence of national or provincial/state governments. Territorial authority still matters in higher education, and governments remain powerful through their command of finance (public sources continue to fund 30-90% of higher education costs throughout the world) and through routine processes of accountability and evaluation. Rather, it means that in examining higher education on a comparative basis we need to take into account three dimensions operating simultaneously – the global, the national, and the local. In an article published in *Higher Education* last year, Gary Rhoades and I proposed a *glonacal* agency framework for studying higher education. The term 'glonacal' is derived from these three essential building blocks of an analysis in three dimensions: *global*, *national* and *local*.

All three of these dimensions have implications for the identity and mission of institutions of higher education; for the various developmental strategies (whether original or imitative or some combination of the two) that are pursued by academic and institutional leaders; for the research, scholarship, teaching, and service activities of faculty; and for the longer-term capacity and potential of individual institutions and of whole country systems of higher education. The role and impact of these three factors,

the global, national, and local, varies according to time and place. For example when comparing different national systems, there may be much variation between them in the degree and type of international influences that are operating; in the direct policy role of national government and, perhaps, in the level of funding provided by state or provincial administrations; and in the local autonomy and strategy of institutions. Within one national system, some of its institutions will be more internationalized than others.

On one hand, this suggests that the future of comparative international studies in higher education lies in researching the global level itself (e.g., the role of global agencies and multilateral organizations such as the World Bank and UNESCO). On the other, locating national and local phenomena within the full constellation of local, national, and global effects. In comparative work, it is no longer possible to consider the national and/or local dimensions in isolation without closing off from view powerful salient parts of the reality of higher education. The national dimension remains important and nation-to-nation comparisons are still useful; but they should be located in a larger analytical framework, recognizing trends of convergence and other global effects and noting also that global effects are contested and uneven and vary across nations, regions, and institutions.

At the same time, it is equally vital that the global dimension (like the national and local dimensions) is understood as *culturally specific*. It is unstable and can be transformed over time. Fortunately, for many universities, students, and scholars around the world, international benchmarks and 'world's best practice' are not fixed but can be changed.

Update on 2003 General Conference Planning

Adrianna Kezar, 2003 ASHE Program Chair, University of Southern California

THE ASHE PROGRAM PLANNING IS NOW COMPLETED! I want to thank the planning committee again: Lisa Lattuca, Teaching, Learning and Curriculum; Laura Perna, Policy, Finance, and Economics; Ben Baez, Context and Foundations; Scott Thomas and Anna Ortiz, Students; Roger Baldwin, Faculty; Christopher Morphew and Mimi Wolverton, Organization and Administration; and, Patrick Dilley, Methodology and Assessment. They all worked hard to manage the largest number of proposals ever received for ASHE! Also, special thanks to the ASHE Office – Barbara Townsend and Laarni Goma, the local arrangements host Christine Cress, and the graduate student

representatives – Katherine Garlough and Amy Metcalfe.

In the July newsletter I described the overall session offerings and the presidential and plenary presentations. I asked Patti Gumpert to preview her opening plenary comments in this newsletter to begin reflection on this year's conference.

By now you should have received notice of not only your acceptance to the conference, but also a letter from the chair or facilitator letting you know the date, time, and location of your sessions and reminding you that final papers are due to discussants, facilitators and session participants by October 13th. Please visit the ASHE website to view the entire conference program at:

<<http://www.ashe.missouri.edu/futureconf.htm>>

Just to remind you, we have a new role this year: Facilitator. The facilitator combines the previous chair and discussant role providing both cohesion to the session as well as facilitating the audience in understanding of the papers, but through more interactive questioning than through a set of prepared comments. This is accomplished through the following specific facilitator tasks:

1. Greet presenters the day of the session
2. Introduce session, speakers, and paper topics. Note that your role is to facilitate interaction and questions, not present a set of prepared comments.
3. Keep time for each presenter – brings note cards with five minute and one minute announcement.
4. After the presentation, offer some questions for people to consider or specific questions of the presenters. This will allow for a full 30 minutes of facilitated discussion.
5. Ask for and field questions from audience throughout the 30 minutes.
6. Keep time and end the session at the predetermined time.

Please visit the ASHE website for more information and guidelines in serving as a chair, presenter, discussant or facilitator. In addition, because we are experimenting with this role this year, we want your feedback. This role will be part of the formal assessment of the program.

There are also other innovations, such as grouping roundtables of like topic into one session, offering roundtables and posters on Friday to provide focus to those sessions within the program, invited sessions, not offering Sunday sessions, and so forth. These and other changes will be examined through an on-line evaluation after the conference and we hope you

will fill it out. I would like to thank the evaluation team again for their hard work: Marietta Del Favero and Barbara Johnson.

I look forward to seeing you in Portland.

ASHE 2003 Plenary Session: Higher Education Research Priorities

Patricia J. Gumpert, Stanford University

THE UPCOMING ASHE CONFERENCE WILL FEATURE A session entitled "Higher Education Research Priorities: Responding to the Needs of Funders, Universities, and Society." This session is a collaborative effort among Ben Baez, Marv Peterson, Gary Rhoades, and me.

Our goal is to focus on the factors shaping the future of higher education research: specifically, the choices we make as researchers about the content and conduct of our work. We will focus on changes in the external funding context, how external funding has become a prominent feature of our profession and professional lives, and how funders expect researchers to address their agenda. We will also discuss expectations from our universities: for our grants to support the infrastructure, including salaries and graduate student support in our higher education programs.

Knowing how difficult it is to generate discussion in a plenary session, we have built into our session perspectives from different generations within ASHE. We each will speak from our distinctive vantage points as researchers who came to the field at different times, with Marv bringing a perspective formed since the 1960s, Gary's since the early 1980s, mine since the mid-1980s, and Ben in the late 1990s. Besides being faculty in research universities, three of us have also directed graduate programs in higher education; and those have of course shaped our sensibilities about the opportunities and constraints related to externally funded research. Reflecting on our respective pasts, we will each draw out some lessons from our experience, as well as look to the future in terms of how we might respond to contemporary pressures.

My own perspective has also been influenced by running a national center for the past seven and a half years. As you may know, in 2001 the National Center for Postsecondary Improvement (NCPI) launched an extensive research priorities initiative, a process involving consultation with funders and other stakeholders, including federal and state policymakers, higher education leaders and researchers, employers, and members of the general public. The initiative was guided by three purposes:

to increase a sense of urgency about the condition of the postsecondary enterprise; to provide a persuasive rationale for developing state-of-the-art knowledge to further its improvement; and to identify a cohesive set of research priorities which, if pursued, will be of use to institutional leaders and to policymakers. We hoped that both the consultation process and the final report would prove compelling to an array of funding agencies that are both committed to improving American higher education and in a position to invest research funds to follow through on their commitment. Entitled *Beyond Dead Reckoning: Research Priorities for Redirecting American Higher Education*, the NCPI essay was released in November 2002. In the first eight weeks, over 30,000 copies were downloaded from the website, <http://ncpi.stanford.edu>.

Midway through our initiative, we also consulted with members of selected foundations that have funded higher education research over the past decade. Our primary goal was to enlist them in identifying research priorities that address the most pressing issues confronting higher education today. Our secondary goal was to gain insight into how foundations view and support higher education research. In addition to convening a meeting to obtain their advice, we engaged in informational interviews and reviewed their organizations' websites to gain insight into their grants for higher ed research.

In my remarks, I will not take the time to review the NCPI priorities, but I will summarize what we learned from the foundation staff members. I'll describe what they told us about their preferences for future research priorities, both the topics and the institutional settings that interest them. I will also characterize their critique of higher education research, the areas where it falls off their radar screen and why, and some of their expectations for how we might reorient our proposals to address their agenda.

The rest of the session will be devoted to a broader discussion of how we as higher education researchers can think carefully and creatively about our choices in terms of what research we do, and how we do it. The intent of this discussion is to underscore our potential to address questions of public interest and to yield findings that identify some leverage points for bringing about our desired changes and improvements in higher education. In addition to these all-important questions, we will address the pressure to frame grant proposals that respond to funders' interests; and for those of us who are faculty in research universities, the institutional expectation that we sustain, and even increase, the amount of funding we bring in from external grants. We welcome the audience's participation in identifying related issues that warrant consideration, both from

higher education researchers and in dialogue with our potential funders.

Council on Ethnic Participation (CEP)

Janet Guyden, Committee Chair, Florida A&M University

ON NOVEMBER 13, 2003, THE CEP BUSINESS meeting will mark the group's 15th year in service to the Association. The Committee on Ethnic Participation was created as a committee of the Association in 1987. The statutory language in Article VIII, Section 2, of the Association by-laws reads as follows: "There shall be a standing committee of the Association, namely the Committee on Ethnic Participation in the Association . . . "The Committee held its initial general meeting at the Association's annual meeting in 1988. At the 2002 Association annual meeting in Sacramento, the Committee became a standing committee of the Association.

As we look forward to our 2003 annual meeting in Portland, we want to re-affirm our commitment to the purpose of the Council on Ethnic Participation. That purpose is clearly delineated in the Association by-laws. ". . . It shall be the duty of the Committee to monitor the extent of diversity of ethnic participation in the affairs of the Association." In the fifteen years since its inception, the Committee has enjoyed a steady growth in membership and supported the increasing participation of diverse scholars in all aspects of the work of the Association.

Membership is open to Association members in good standing who are interested in operationalizing the Association's commitment to diversity. Please join us on Thursday, November 13, 2003, at 7:30 p.m. for the Committee's business meeting and dessert reception.

See you in Portland.

Point of View

Creating A New Narrative for Racial Diversity

Denise O'Neil Green, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

AS A GRADUATE STUDENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF Michigan, I often found myself locked into debates that were framed by the usual racial preferences rhetoric. It was ironic to me that the fight for "individual rights" often meant perpetuating a narrative that implied underrepresented minority

groups were not valuable to the educational enterprise or qualified enough to enter the most selective schools. Typically, social justice explanations countered with a different story line, linking our history of racial discrimination to our present and questionable future. But now there is a new narrative, one that is heavily reliant upon emergent research that affirms the benefits of racial diversity and contributions of students from all racial/ethnic backgrounds.

Seminal publications, such as *Diversity and Higher Education* (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002), *Shape of the River* (Bowen & Bok, 1998), *Diversity Challenged* (Orfield & Kurlaender, 2001), and *Compelling Interests* (Chang, Witt, Jones, & Hakuta, 2003), were critical in shaping the narrative we now use to justify the need for racial diversity on college campuses. Ultimately, these works fortified the position that diversity benefits all students, majority and minority alike; but, we ought not rest upon the laurels of this preliminary research. Although the current narrative was born out of legal challenges pertaining to affirmative action admissions policies, creating a new narrative to drive systemic, institutional change on our campuses is the next step for the post-Grutter era. Shaped by on-going research and not political ideology, high education can lead the way to show the nation how inclusion and valuing individuals from all racial/ethnic backgrounds are essential to our future.

Longitudinal studies that examine changes in racial attitudes and perceptions of affirmative action among students and faculty are important for the ongoing dialogue. I also believe alumni and cohort studies that probe students' educational experiences, family values, and perceptions of fairness, substantively expose how student-student, student-staff, and student-faculty dynamics help us learn to value differences in one another.

Being a minority student at both private and public selective institutions taught me that faculty often underestimate what students of color have to offer. Fortunately, there are programs that provide opportunities to change those perceptions. The Summer Research Opportunity Program (SROP) and McNair Scholars are federally funded programs that afford talented minority students a chance to work closely with faculty on research projects. Both programs can help scholars determine how faculty interactions with undergraduate minority students positively change their perceptions of students of color and the scholarly contributions these students make.

Additional lines of inquiry require surveying student affairs professionals who are on the frontlines

working with students and seeing firsthand the natural formation and scenarios of intergroup dynamics. In particular, minority/multicultural affairs staff and administrators are untapped human resources who possess a wealth of knowledge, experiences, and insights. Research that focuses on this group gives voice to those who are important to shaping a new narrative, but have been traditionally left out of the debate.

Finally, styles of leadership, that are compatible with building and maintaining diverse and inclusive educational institutions should be explored. The activist leadership exhibited on behalf of the University of Michigan in *Gratz and Grutter* illustrates the power that we as educators have to change course in the face of losing odds. There is no doubt that educational leadership and its relationship to advancing diversity is critical to shaping this new narrative for our institutions, as well as our society.

In the *Grutter* Supreme Court decision, it is hoped that within 25 years affirmative action will no longer be necessary. If our society eradicates affirmative action 75 years after *Brown v. Board* and 50 years after *Bakke*, what will our new narrative regarding racial diversity be? How will the headline read? We, as educators have the key and must not hesitate to share it!

References

Bowen, W. G., & Bok, D. (1998). *The Shape of the River: Long-term Consequences of Considering Race in College and University Admissions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Chang, M. J., Witt, D., Jones, J. & Hakuta, K. (Eds.) (2003). *Compelling Interest: Examining the Evidence on Racial Dynamics in Colleges and Universities*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Gurin, P., Dey, E., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). "Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes." *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(3), 330-366.

Orfield, G. & Kurlaender, M. (Eds.) (1999). *Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action*. Cambridge: Harvard Education Publishing Group.

Grad Alert

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

ASHE INTERNS

THE ASHE INTERN PROGRAM IS IN ITS FOURTH YEAR and is open to graduate students within the discipline of higher education. ASHE internships are competitive and candidates must exhibit a potential for leadership at the national level within the field of higher education. The pool of candidates was large this year (31 applications) and was comprised of

doctoral students across the nation whose service, teaching, and research were exemplary.

The Interns are scheduled to assist at the ASHE General Conference at the registration desk. In addition, they are assigned to an officer of the Association, such as the president of ASHE, the president-elect, the program chair, the publication board chair, or chair of the Council for Ethnic Participation to job shadow during the conference. The next call for nominations will be in the spring of 2004.

ASHE Interns, 2003

Olga Rybalkina, University of Toledo
Evening Star Oosahwe, University of Oklahoma
Soko Suzuki Starobin, University of North Texas
Tasha Toy, Seton Hall University
Heather Hogle, Central Michigan University
Alternate: Waltrina Dufor, Indiana State University

GRADUATE STUDENTS ON PUBLICATIONS BOARDS

Every two years graduate students are selected to sit on ASHE publication boards pending ASHE Board of Directors approval. The call for nominations went out this summer and will go out again in the spring of 2005. By September, Amy and I screened 27 applications for four positions.

Nominees for ASHE Publication Boards, 2003

Janet Holdsworth, University of Minnesota –
Review of Higher Education Board
Liliana Mina, Michigan State University -
ASHE Reader Series
Saran Donahoo, University of Illinois at Urbana-
Champaign –
ASHE-ERIC Report Series
Thomas Perorazio, University of Michigan -
Publication Committee

Alternate: Nataliya Ivankova, University of
Nebraska-Lincoln

These nominees are graduate students at exceptional levels of excellence. For example, they averaged twelve (12) presentations at national and international conferences and thirteen (13) book chapters and publications in peer-reviewed journals. Major Professors said these students were known as serious scholars, recognized through various awards, committed to a life as a scholar and researcher, uncommonly different and exceptionally talented, and outstanding students in their respective programs.

CONFERENCE EVENTS

Graduate Student Luncheon and Business Meeting

Saturday, November 15, 2003

11:30 am - 12:30 pm

Location: Galleria North, Ballroom Level

Tickets required for free lunch; inquire at registration. Seating is limited, so all graduate students attending conference are encouraged to reserve a ticket.

Graduate Student Sessions at Conference

ASHE from ABC to Ph.D.: Making the Conference Work for You

Graduate Student Session - Session A10

Thursday, November 13, 2003

1:00 pm - 2:30 pm

Location: Broadway III & IV, Plaza Level

Presenters: John M. Braxton, ASHE President, Vanderbilt University
Adrianna Kezar, ASHE Program Chair, University of Southern California
Katherine Garlough, Graduate Student Representative ASHE Board of Directors, University of Oklahoma
Amy Metcalfe, Graduate Student Representative ASHE Board of Directors, University of Arizona

The View from the Professional Side: The Job Search

Graduate Student Session - Session G10

Friday, November 14, 2003 4:00 pm - 5:30 pm

Location: Galleria South

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

Presenters: Veronica O. Chukwuemeka, George Washington University
Mary Grimes, Fayetteville State University
Greg Dubrow, Florida International University
Charlotte Sullivan, University of Texas at Austin
Debra Guitierrez, University of Oklahoma

Bobby Wright Dissertation of the Year Presentation - Session F11

Friday, November 14, 2003, 2:15 pm - 3:45 pm

Location: Parlor B, Ballroom Level

Winner to be announced at the Friday Awards Luncheon

New Professionals: First-Year Survival Tips from Recent Graduates

Graduate Student Session - Session J11

Saturday, November 15, 2003, 2:15 pm to 3:45 pm

Location: Council Suite, Third Floor

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

Presenters: Jim Eck, Rollins College
Lynette Danley, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Sarah M. Marshall, Oklahoma State University

Pre-Conference Meetings for Faculty and Program Directors

Karen Card, University of South Dakota

THE COUNCIL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF HIGHER Education Programs (CAHEP) is a standing committee of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE). The purpose of the Council is to enrich the teaching and learning experiences of students and faculty in the 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 will sponsor pre-conference meetings at this year's conference starting with a buffet dinner at 6 p.m. on November 12th followed by a panel discussion on balancing faculty work life. On Thursday morning, there will be a panel discussion on research requirements of different programs at 8:30 a.m. followed by the CAHEP business meeting at 9:30 a.m. and a final panel in the use of technology and distance education in higher education program at 10:00.

During the business meeting elections for new CAHEP officers will be conducted. Any ASHE member interested in serving as an officer CAHEP should submit their name to Karen Card by November 6th. For more information about this year's pre-conference meeting, please feel free to contact Karen Card, CAHEP Chair, either by e-mail at kcard@usd.edu or call at 605-677-5815. If you are interested in the buffet dinner, please RSVP to Karen by November 6th.

Survival in the Academy

Collaboration: The Good, the Bad, and the Truly Ugly

Linda Serra Hagedorn, University of Southern California

THE INVITATION TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE ON research and writing collaboration came at an

opportune moment. Literally, I had no sooner completed a conversation with a colleague wherein we lamented the *truly ugly* policies that discourage collaboration when an email invitation to write on that very topic appeared. So, either divine intervention or sheer serendipity can be blamed for the content herein.

I have subtitled this essay *The Good, the Bad, and the Truly Ugly* because I believe that the interpretation of the term and the policies that support or dismantle it are quite diverse. Let me first explain my stance. I believe in collaboration. Whoever can be credited with the phrase “Two heads are better than one” shall forever be memorialized as a wise person who recognized the value of diversity amidst a true belief in the power of individuality. Further, I know that collaboration can contradict the scientific axiom “the whole cannot be larger than the sum of its parts.” Indeed, when two heads are working together, the result becomes better than either individual could have done alone, making the whole much greater than the sum of its parts. All of us know the feeling of writing something truly brilliant only to hear a comment or question from a colleague that highlights glaring errors we never thought of but are embarrassing in their simplicity. Different heads, diverse hearts, and different approaches bring more quality to a topic. The good aspects of collaboration have long been acknowledged. Indeed, the word “college” is derived from the collegial methods of putting multiple heads together to gain more knowledge than the sum of the parts would yield.

The Good

Collaboration is especially good when it brings together different types of people engaged in dissimilar types of work. For example, my research involves the community colleges. Too often when giving a talk or presenting my work I will hear “you don’t understand our culture” or “you sit there in your ivory tower and then tell us what to do.” Sound familiar? In addition to the sting felt from the sentiments, I feel a special hurt due to the plain veracity of the statements.

Although I have a long history of employment at the community college, I could not possibly understand the day to day operations, the stresses, or truly understand the current environments. To bring credibility to my work and to just “get it right,” I do collaborate with administrators and faculty from the community colleges. I bring them into my projects and ask questions. Collaboration doesn’t always mean that my collaborator writes half of a manuscript for publication or presentation. Indeed, there are times when a co-author or collaborator wrote little of none of the final product. Rather, the collaboration is successful because my partner opened doors,

provided data, read and commented on drafts, and in short did the work that made the project a reality.

Another example of *The Good* is working with graduate students in a true collaborative relationship. Yes, graduate students are handy when articles must be researched, found, photocopied, and filed. Yet, collaboration goes beyond the “grunt work” and includes writing and commenting on drafts. Collaboration is the best form of mentoring because it raises the student to a common level with the mentor and demands a professional quality – something far advanced of what is generally acceptable as a class assignment. Collaboration allows the student to play the game with the professional rules and not just the watered down “junior league” expectations.

Lest I provide a picture of one-sided professoriate altruism, let me clearly state that collaborating with students can provide true and real rewards. Students have fresh perspectives and quick minds that can see problems unencumbered by the professional clutter that can accumulate from decades of work. Most students approach their future professions with little cynicism and a hefty will to succeed.

Of course one cannot deny *The Good* of collaboration with colleagues. No where is the “two heads” axiom more true than when two or more researchers or colleagues team up to create a better manuscript or project.

The Bad

So what can be bad about all of the good that I just detailed? The answer is in perceptions, innuendo, and accepted practice. While many in the academic circle pay lip service to the values of collaboration, they look with suspicion at folks who engage in it. The perception is that people who collaborate extensively must do so out of necessity since they must be lacking in the requisite skills to complete the entire project. They must not be smart enough, creative enough, or just don’t work hard enough. The perception is that collaborators cannot do it all and hence must rely on others to share the load.

Another “*Bad*” about collaboration is all of that nasty baggage connected to author order. Accepted practice is that the order of the names on a manuscript has great meaning and indicates the level and value of the contribution. This practice has dissolved many collaborative teams and has created very negative repercussions. Practice “forces” collaborators to vie for order so that their contribution will be apparent. Perceptions have necessitated that a collaborative arrangement begins with a sort of “pre nuptial agreement” that clearly

states the order of authors BEFORE the union of colleagues. This “*Bad*” stifles collaborations before they begin and creates an atmosphere of distrust (I cannot provide my best work in a collaborative piece. I want full credit).

The Truly Ugly

I began this essay by referring to a conversation about *Truly Ugly* procedures. I must apply an important disclaimer. Although I am citing specifics of my institution, the practices I include apply equally to virtually ALL institutions. My university is certainly no worse than others. I use my institution as the illustration ONLY because it is the most familiar to me and thus provides an easy illustration. I do not wish to berate my employer or to upset my administration. I present an example of practices that extend to most institutions like mine.

At my School of Education, salary, promotion, and tenure are determined by a point system. Faculty accrue points in three areas, research, teaching, and service. Of course research points reach the farthest when determining promotion and tenure. Faculty accumulate points through many activities including publishing and presenting research at conferences. Traditional books are given more points than edited books, articles provide more points than chapters, and more points are provided for articles in the top referred journals. Across all categories, less points are accrued for joint authorship. This practice sends a clear message, “don’t collaborate if you want the maximum number of points.” I find the discouragement of collaboration to be *truly ugly* because it discourages faculty from including graduate students on papers and projects. It also discourages faculty from going outside of the academy and working with others. It denies the fact that 21st century discoveries do not take place in a single researcher’s office or laboratory, but rather by teams of researchers. Who expects that a cure for cancer will be discovered by a lone scientist working without the support of colleagues? Does anyone REALLY expect that the automobile to end air pollution and dependence on foreign oil will be created by a lone designer? Why then, do we expect that great educational breakthroughs will be done by the lone researcher without benefit of colleagues or students?

In this era of belief in collaborative learning techniques and in using collaboration in the classroom, it is paradoxical that barriers are erected that stymie collaborative work on the professional level. I strongly urge policymakers at all institutions to reconsider the rules and policies that erect barriers to effective faculty collaboration.

By the way, any readers of this manuscript who would like to collaborate with me on a project focused on the success of community college students should contact me. I have a great dataset and am always interested in learning new techniques and new points of view from colleagues across the globe. However, let me make one thing perfectly clear; I plan to go up for promotion soon so I have to be first author!!

Board of Directors 2003 Election Results

Vice President/President-Elect:

Sylvia Hurtado, University of Michigan

Board Members:

Ana Martinez-Aleman, Boston College

Susan Twombly, University of Kansas

Graduate Student Representative:

Diane Dean, University of Maryland,
College Park

Soft Money

Raphael Guillory, Eastern Washington University

\$OFT 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 \$oft Money columnist, Dr. Raphael Guillory, at (509) 359-2274 or rguillory@mail.ewu.edu.

ACE Fellows Program

The American Council on Education (ACE) fellows programs offers a year-long fellowship experience with the goal of preparing leaders who are skilled in the management of change. Candidates should have demonstrated records of leadership in institution-wide contexts. The program includes flexible off-campus learning experiences of one academic year, one semester, or other time frame to advance the learning focus of the fellow and the nominating institution; a year-long experience for the fellow designed around an issue of key strategic importance identified by the nominating institution; participation in a national institutional network designed to focus on the institution’s key strategic issue; a mentor-intern relationship with a college or university president and other senior administrators, combining observation and participation in all aspects of institutional administration; and leadership curriculum of three-week long national seminars throughout the fellowship year. Application deadline

is November 1, 2003. For more information contact Marlene Ross, Director, at (202) 939-9420, fellows@ace.nche.edu, or visit the website at <http://www.acestate.pdx.edu/ACEFPBrochure.html>

Jacob K. Javits Fellowship Program

This program is funded in order to award fellowships to eligible students of superior ability, selected on the basis of demonstrated achievement, financial need, and exceptional promise to undertake graduate study leading to a doctoral degree or a master of fine arts (MFA) at accredited institutions of higher education in selected fields of the arts, humanities, or social sciences. Eligibility is limited to students who at the time of application have not yet completed their first year of graduate study or will be entering graduate school in academic year 2003-2004. Eligibility is also limited to students pursuing a doctoral degree or MFA degree in fields selected by the Jacob K. Javits Fellowship Board at accredited institutions of higher education. Stipend amount is **\$21,500**. Application deadline is December 11, 2003 but may be subject to change. Contact Carolyn Proctor at (202) 502-7542 or by e-mail at ope_javits_program@ed.gov. More information can be found <http://www.gwu.edu/~fellows/javits.html>

AERA Postdoctoral Fellowship Program

Postdoctoral fellowships are available for researchers within 10 years of receiving a higher degree (Ph.D., Ed.D., or the equivalent) who show potential or demonstrated capacity to perform educational research and who have teamed up with mentors who are established members of the education research community. Fellows must be in residence at the home institution of the mentor. The postdoctoral fellowships will take place preferably within a school of education at a host institution of higher education of the applicant's choice. The host institution, however, may not be the applicant's doctoral degree granting institution. Awards for postdoctoral fellowships include a stipend of **\$40,000** for 12 months and health insurance, plus 8% overhead to the host institution. Awardees will also receive up to \$2500 for relocation expenses and \$2500 for travel to professional meetings. Deadline is January 10, 2004. For more information call (202) 223-9485 or visit <http://www.aera.net/grantsprogram/subweb/PDFly-FR.html>

Ford Foundation Dissertation Fellowships for Minorities

To increase the presence of underrepresented minorities on the nation's college and university faculties, to enhance diversity on campuses, and to address the persisting effects of past discrimination, the Ford Foundation offers dissertation completion fellowships to members of six minority groups whose under-representation in the professoriate has been

severe and long-standing. The dissertation fellowship program provides individuals with demonstrated ability the opportunity to complete the dissertation required for a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) or Doctor of Science (Sc.D.) degree. The stipend amount is **\$21,000**. These successful scholars then inspire other students of color to pursue an academic career in teaching and research. Application deadline is December 3, 2003. For more information call (202) 334-2872 or visit <http://www7.national-academies.org/fellowships/forddiss.html>

Notables

Joni Montez, Lewis-Clark State College

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 and snippets to Joni Montez, email address: jmontez@lcsc.edu.

Now Back in Print

Bess, James L. (ed.). *College and University Organization: Insights from the Behavioral Sciences*. ISBN 0-8147-1056-5 (Originally published by New York University Press.)

This highly respected volume of readings by internationally known scholars is available once again for use in graduate courses in college and university organization, administration and governance, as well as in background preparation for practicing administrative leaders. These outstanding authors examine core issues with imaginative insights using straightforward language.

Table of Contents

- * Karl E. Weick -- Contradictions in a Community of Scholars: The Cohesion-Accuracy Tradeoff
- * Kim S. Cameron & David A. Whetten -- Models of the Organizational Life Cycle: Applications to Higher Education
- * Barry M. Staw -- Motivation Research Versus the Art of Faculty Management
- * Greg R. Oldham & Carol T. Kulik -- Motivation Enhancement through Work Redesign

* Edwin A. Locke, William Fitzpatrick & Frank M. White -- Job Satisfaction and Role Clarity Among University and College Faculty

* Victor H. Vroom -- Leaders and Leadership in Academe

* Michael Driver -- Decision Style and Organizational Behavior: Implications for Academia

* Cynthia Hardy, Ann Langley, Henry Mintzberg, & Janet Rose -- Strategy Formation in the University Setting

* John Van Maanen -- Doing New Things in Old Ways: The Chains of Socialization

Selected Endorsements

Marvin Peterson, University of Michigan: "This collection features conceptual insights into the organizational dynamics of higher educational institutions by a group of renowned sociologists and organizational psychologists."

John M. Braxton, Vanderbilt University: "[This book] makes an important contribution to the study of colleges and universities as organizations. This volume contains chapters which outline important and promising lines of scholarship. College and university administrators will also find chapters useful to practice."

To Purchase

Available directly through the publisher only. No credit cards. Send checks or money orders to:

I & I Occasional Press
186 Harkness Road
Amherst, MA 01002

Single copies -- \$27.50 plus \$1.84 postage -- Total: \$29.34. Ten percent discount on orders of 10 or more. Delivery within two weeks. No returns. No examination or desk copies. To review for adoption, check university libraries, most of which own copies or will borrow through Interlibrary Loan. For further information, call (413) 253-0459 or fax (413) 253-0458.

Distinctly Notable

NOTE FROM THE EDITOR: This month's Notables column features Joni Montez, who received the 2002 Bobby Wright Dissertation of the Year Award, which was presented at the ASHE Conference in Sacramento, California in November 2002.

I asked Joni to put her thoughts about winning the Bobby Wright Dissertations of the Year Award down

on paper. She reluctantly agreed, believing that to do so was self-serving. To the contrary, I do not believe that it is self-serving but rather eye opening for students who aspire to complete their degrees and do the best work that they can. Below are her thoughts and reflections on the award and the study for which she was given it.

This award is given by ASHE each year to "one or more dissertations that serve as exemplary models of the methodology employed [and] . . . the significance of the dissertation topic." The process of producing this dissertation was about discovery of knowledge, thought, and self; it was about delving through stacks and heaps of sometimes blinding and brain-numbing rhetoric; it was about encountering setbacks and forward surges, and, eventually, it was about the revelation and delight of "getting there." What lay beyond the final defense of this study were thoughts of spinning papers from it, landing grant money to further it, finding a niche in a research university to continue with it. Winning an award for it was certainly not one of my goals.

And so when Mimi Wolverton said she was nominating it for this award I greeted this announcement with ambivalence—proud to know that she thought enough of it to send it into contention with others; fearful of the scrutiny it would receive. However, as I wrote the chapter summary for submission to the award committee, the fear subsided as I recalled how much more this project tested than the hypotheses of the study. It tested my spirit at 3:00 a.m. when I was jolted from one of my rare REM sleep phases by a brilliant thought, only to find myself sitting in the dark study with the glow of the monitor as the sole source of light, and realizing that somewhere between bed and study the thought dissipated into thin, dark air. It tested my resolve when the fourth draft was still unacceptable to one of my committee members, and the notion of quitting hung silently in the back of my mind. It tested my orientation to my family, friends, employers—where do I stand in all this and what am I losing as I do it?

When news came that my dissertation did, in fact, win, I was at first dumbfounded. More than anything else, though, I was so very proud to receive this award. It validated the work I did; it made every little quirk and obstacle that I encountered through the years of graduate study all worth it.

I began graduate school in 1996, after spending 20+ years as a law firm administrator and litigation paralegal. Through the course of my professional experience, I found joy in working with people who brought their legal problems to us for resolution. My service in the legal profession also included teaching

paralegals and law students about legal practice, management, and policy. I returned to graduate school because I wanted to branch out and reach more people through teaching in higher education. It was easy to weave my experience in law and administration into the foundations of higher education. My legal research and investigation background developed the requisite curiosity that drove my search for truth. My life experiences richly influenced the substance of my writing; no matter what discipline I engaged, I sought to connect it with the outside world.

My involvement with ASHE provided considerable insights to the world of higher education and the paths of opportunity to “give back” by way of scholarly service. Seeing higher education constantly criticized and scrutinized, I opted to undertake a study of attributes of higher education leaders and the development of an instrument to assess them. The work was daunting. But as I asked the question about my orientation to others—where do I stand in all this?—I knew that I was definitely not alone. Mimi Wolverton chaired my committee and Marvin Wolverton directed my research. Walt Gmelch and Dennis Warner were supportive committee members. My family—Pete and Carisa—never wavered. There was no way I could fail.

So I have this to say about winning the Bobby Wright Dissertation of the Year Award. Though my name is on the dissertation, I won the award with my team of colleagues, family and friends, all without whom the experience would have been tedious. There is a message in all of this for aspiring scholars—focus upon making the process of your research one that is challenging and inspirational. Finally, winning reminds me that nothing is impossible.

Endcap

The **ASHE Newsletter** is published three times a year. If you would like to submit material for possible publication, please note the following deadline dates: Summer, April 15; Fall, August 15; Winter, January 1.

Send material for publication to:

MIMI WOLVERTON

Box 453002

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Las Vegas, NV 89154-3002

Email: mimi.wolverton@ccmail.nevada.edu

Phone: 702.895.1432

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Barbara K. Townsend, University of Missouri-Columbia

MANAGING DIRECTOR

Laarni D. Goma, University of Missouri-Columbia

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

Jeremy S. Bloss, University of Missouri-Columbia

NEWSLETTER EDITOR

Mimi Wolverton, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

GRADUATE ASSISTANT

Daniel D. Lefever, University of Missouri-Columbia

NOTICE:

**Submissions for the next newsletter are due to
Mimi Wolverton no later than
January 1, 2004.**