

ASHE

Association for the Study
of Higher Education

A Newsletter of the Association for the
Study of Higher Education

Michigan State University, 424 Erickson Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824, Phone: (517) 432-8805

President's Column

*Brown and the
integration of disparate
topical themes in
research, policy, and
practice*

Gary Rhoades, University
of Arizona



From the time I was in high school, from 1968-1972, I saw higher education as a site where major social struggles about foreign and domestic public policy were taking place and where social relations and patterns of opportunity were being defined. The *Brown v Board of Education* decision came one year before I was born. But from an early age, witnessing the advance of the civil rights movement, and being in the midst of the debate about school desegregation, its obvious significance beyond public schooling was evident. I can recall watching on television as a southern governor stood on the steps of the state's public flagship university, closed to Blacks, and declared that "they" (in the ugly terms of the time) would not enter those halls, not ever. Thus, it was not so hard, later, as a graduate student in sociology, to see the connection between international issues, public policy, educational curriculum, and the stratification of opportunity and attainment in the U.S.

I still see those connections. And the thematic focus I offer for the 2004 conference is intended to highlight those connections. *Substantively*, Ben Baez (the program chair for the 2004 conference) and I decided in Sacramento in 2002 that our theme should be the 50th anniversary of *Brown*, a theme that has since also been adopted by many professional associations, including AERA. *Brown* is more than a court decision about public schools; it is a landmark for our country in terms of defining conceptions of education and opportunity; its influence extends not only beyond public schools, but beyond the borders of the U.S. And that brings me to the analytical theme we offer for the conference; *analytically*, our theme is the interconnections, academically and in practice, among various topics around which distinct, specialized groups within ASHE have emerged and crystallized. From my perspective, such groups and the special focus they bring to particular issues are all part of a vibrant intellectual association. Yet there is also something very important to be gained by reintegrating the distinct topics we pursue, by moving to the gaps in these specialized literatures, by attending to the interconnections and interstices between and among our separate topical worlds. This, too, is a means by which to ensure the vibrancy and creativity of an academic association, as well as to contribute to its influence in the world outside the academy.

For the 2004 conference, then, Ben and I have identified speakers and developed selected panels that will highlight *Brown*, and interconnections. Indeed, *Brown* itself points to the need for us to move beyond the confines of our association's "higher" education boundaries to address K-12 issues and developments as well. In the current context, as in years past, there are very definite connections between what is happening in public policy at the K-12 and higher education levels. For instance, accountability in higher education is increasingly reflecting conceptions and mechanisms of accountability in public schools. Similarly, we make a wealth of policy and organizational choices in colleges and universities that affect patterns of policy, opportunity, and attainment in the K-12 world. In practice, and analytically, one cannot easily separate what goes on in these worlds; yet that is precisely what most of us do in our work, just as we do in the curriculum of our higher education programs and in the organization of our Colleges of Education.

I would make the same point about the distinctions some of us draw between “higher” and other parts of postsecondary education, or between higher education in the U.S., and higher education in the rest of the world, especially the so-called developing world. In my view, too few of us look to comparisons between four and two-year institutions to inform our larger understanding of various matters in society, particularly diversity and educational opportunity. Frankly, our failure to bridge these worlds academically and analytically represents an obstacle to fostering knowledge and practices that improve educational access; after all, community colleges serve as the first point of entry for many students of color and first generation students. Moreover in the U.S, few of us connect our interests in issues of public policy and diversity to global developments economically or educationally. Yet, we are shaped in profound ways on our campuses and in our society by global flows of people, ideas, resources, and jobs/careers, and by various international associations and agencies. That is true not only in borderland states like Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas, but also in most metropolitan areas and throughout the country. Moreover, the influence of such global flows is significant at all levels of postsecondary education, but is particularly true in graduate education. The very survival of many fields of science and engineering, and indeed of academic science and technology, is dependent on flows of international graduate students. And this is another area of investigation that is under-explored (relative to undergraduate education), including issues of diversity and social justice in graduate and professional education.

In Kansas City, then, we invite you to explore the meaning of Brown fifty years later, today and beyond, and to consider the various connections and gaps between the distinct, specialized communities of scholarship and practice in which we find ourselves. We hope the conference is a vehicle for stimulating scholarship that enhances our understanding of those connections and encouraging educational and social change in the spirit of Brown.

Ralph Waldo Emerson

"It is easy in the world to live after the worlds opinions; it is easy in solitude to live after our own; but the Great Man is he who in the midst of the crowd keeps with perfect sweetness the independence of solitude."

The ASHE Code of Ethical Principles

John M. Braxton,
Vanderbilt University
Immediate Past-President
of ASHE



Higher education as a field of study through the creation of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) has made great strides in its professional development. One of the major accomplishments of the ASHE Board of Directors during 2003 was the adoption of a Code of Ethical Principles. The adoption of this code stands as important marker of the professionalization of the scholarly study of higher education.

Unlike many scholarly associations, the impetus for the adoption of this code of ethical principles was not because of public incidents of ethical transgressions within the scholarly community of higher education as a field of study. Rather, the ASHE Board of Directors approved it because of its symbolic significance. This code symbolizes that our scholarly work matters and should be conducted within the boundaries of these ethical principles.

Although the website for ASHE posts the Code of Ethical Conduct, I take this opportunity to highlight this code in the ASHE Newsletter. The preamble to the Code and its tenets are listed below.

Principles of Ethical Conduct Association for the Study of Higher Education

The members of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) are subject to many sets of laws, regulations, standards, and codes of conduct related to their professional responsibilities. The principles presented in this document supplement these other sets in representing the high standards of conduct according to which ASHE members expect each other to conduct their professional lives. This list of principles should not be viewed as exhaustive, nor is it supported by a formal regulatory process. Rather, the principles

should be interpreted as hortatory reminders of the expectations and standards that support the professional work of the association and its members in their roles as scholars, educators, students and other professionals.

Credit: ASHE members should fully and appropriately acknowledge the contributions of others in their work, whether the contributions are made through collaboration, publication of previous work, or other means.

Responsibility: ASHE members should take full responsibility for all aspects of their work and other professional activities.

Honesty and accuracy: ASHE members should value and demonstrate the highest levels of honesty and accuracy in their work.

Originality: ASHE members should accurately represent the extent of originality in their work, as well as its dependence on their own or others' previous work.

Respect: ASHE members should maintain professional respect and civility in their relationships and interactions with others.

Fairness: ASHE members should fairly and carefully judge the merit of others' work and qualifications on their own merits, without discrimination or prejudice related to personal characteristics or professional bias.

Advancement: ASHE members should aim to advance the study of higher education and its contributions to its constituents, including through participation in and service to ASHE.

Responsibility to clients and to the public interest: ASHE members, as professionals, have a principal responsibility to serve as best they can the best interests of their clients and of the public interest.

Conflict of interest: ASHE members, as professionals, should declare any possible conflict of interest that emerges from any financial interest they may have with regard to any particular professional decision or judgment.

I express my appreciation to an ad hoc committee that worked to develop this code of ethics. Members of committee were Melissa Anderson, Leonard Baird, Alan Bayer, Nathaniel Bray, Sylvia Hurtado, Yvonna Lincoln, John Smart, and James Minor. Melissa Anderson served as the chair of this important committee.

I am confident that these ethical principles resonate with the values of the members of ASHE. Newcomers to our association in general and graduate students in particular should familiarize themselves with these ethical precepts. Embracing these ethical principles will further the maturation of higher education as an important field of study that is worthy of support by the various constituents that use our scholarship.

Featured Column

The 2004 ASHE Conference: Celebrating Brown V. Board V. Board of Education of Topeka

Benjamin Baez, 2004 Program Chair
Georgia State University

The 2004 ASHE Conference in Kansas City, Missouri, promises to be exciting and memorable. This anniversary will provide the major theme for the conference. Gary Rhoades and I are planning a number of keynote, presidential, and invited sessions celebrating this decision and its impact on higher education. Many of us know that this landmark decision reversed the doctrine of separate but equal in the public schools, sparked the civil rights movement, and provided the impetus for the dismantling of Jim Crow laws in the South and other inequalities in the United States. Few of us may know, however, that the NAACP cases leading up to the *Brown* decision were against colleges and universities. Indeed, the striking down of segregationist policies had been taking place in higher education before the Supreme Court did so for public schools in 1954. *Brown* still provides the legal precedent for challenging inequality in higher education, providing the justification for seeking to eliminate what are clearly vestiges of segregationist policies in public institutions of higher education in South and overall inequality in student admissions and faculty hiring everywhere in the United States. Our hope is not only to have the ASHE community

remember this decision, but to consider its impact on higher education today. We hope also to spark discussion about these and other questions: Are the issues and concerns that led to the *Brown* decision still relevant today? That is, have we reached a point of social equality, as that decision and its progeny assumed and promised we would? Should we speak of racial equality, diversity, and other forms of oppressions in the same way today?

We use the 50th anniversary of *Brown* to generate interdisciplinary and distinctive approaches to the study of diversity in higher education. We believe that issues of diversity in higher education cannot be separated from, and must be theorized within, discussions of these other serious concerns. In order to bridge the boundaries between subjects traditionally addressed during the conference and those which are not, we are planning sessions addressing globalization, privatization, the higher education canon, accreditation, for-profit institutions, and the connections between K-12 and higher education. In addressing these concerns, we hope to bridge the boundaries and divisions that have been evident at ASHE for some time now. Previous evaluations and discussions illustrate that the ASHE conferences reflect a scholarly community that may have become a bit too insular, separating itself from the traditional disciplines and foreclosing discussions of issues that are not specifically about higher education. As a consequence, Gary and I are planning sessions that highlight the interdisciplinary nature of research and scholarship on higher education and that address issues, methodologies, and forms of inquiry historically left out of previous conferences. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or suggestions. Thank you, and I will see you in Kansas City!

Invited Column

Partnering in Kansas City to Bridge K-12 and Higher Education: ASHE and BOTA

Jerlando F. L. Jackson, University of Wisconsin-Madison

During the 2004 Annual ASHE Meeting in Kansas City, the association will partner with the Brothers of the Academy Institute to implement several K-12 and Higher Education initiatives. This collaborative effort will be managed by a sub-committee of individuals who are members of both organizations (Timothy K.

Eatman, James T. Minor, and Jerlando F. L. Jackson). The Brothers of the Academy Institute was founded in 2000 to nurture productive and collaborative scholarship particularly toward the desired end of promotion and tenure among its members in tenure-track positions.

The inter-disciplinary group of members of this Institute (e.g., higher education, philosophy, computer engineering, and medicine) is primarily tenure-track professors, researchers, and graduate students preparing for the professorate. The programs, initiatives, and collective scholarship of the Brothers of the Academy Institute have been targeted at improving the conditions of African Americans and other people of color in education (i.e., schools and colleges), society, and communities. A core focus of previously published research (e.g., *Retaining African Americans in Higher Education: Challenging Paradigms for Retaining Students, Faculty, and Administrators*) by the Brothers of the Academy Institute is the examination of critical issues affecting African Americans throughout the educational pipeline.

The aforementioned research has materialized into the Institute's first Think Tank entitled **Deconstruct to Reconstruct** held in Kansas City, Missouri this past October. The Think Tank linked education, society, and communities in at least two ways. First, participants included concerned citizens, members of community-based organizations, university-based researchers, schoolteachers and administrators, and high school students, approximately 900 registrants. Second, the research presented at the Think Tank was aligned along three areas (i.e., education, economics, and health), with the education strand focused specifically on the educational conditions of African American males, both as students (e.g., schools and colleges) and service providers (e.g., teachers, school administrators, and faculty). The Think Tank has received very positive reviews through the formal evaluation process, and through articles focused on the positive impact of the Think Tank in *Black Issues in Higher Education*.

In closing, the ASHE President Gary Rhoades' vision to implement K-12/Higher Education initiatives to benefit the Kansas City community should be an exciting venture for both organizations. Drawing from the community connections established by the Institute and the research expertise of ASHE members, these efforts will be targeted at addressing

specific issues affecting Kansas City's education community. It is with great excitement that the sub-committee established by the ASHE President will tackle this important endeavor. The details of the collaboration and proposed initiatives will be solidified over the next several months.

The End of One Era: ASHE at University of Missouri

Barbara K. Townsend,
Former Executive Director
University of Missouri-Columbia

For six years prior (1998-2003), ASHE was headquartered in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Missouri-Columbia (MU), with Julie Caplow serving as Executive Director for the first four years and me for the last two. The following report highlights some of the changes that have occurred in ASHE over the past five years.

Membership and Conference Trends from 1998-2003: During the time ASHE was at MU, membership rose from 1,134 people in 1998 to 1,912 in December 2003, an increase of 778 members. Conference registrations also increased greatly, from around 700 in 1998 to 970 at the 2003 conference. This increase was greatly facilitated the past two years by ASHE having a full-time Managing Director, Laarni Goma. Attendance at pre-conference events has also grown with 59 taking part in the Graduate Student Policy Seminar, 153 in the International Forum, and 143 in the Public Policy in Higher Education Forum.

Membership Demographics: As of January 2004, members fall within the following categories:

Type of Membership	Regular	1,200 (63%)
	Student	675 (35%)
	Emeritus	37(02%)
Gender	Female	1,042 (55%)
	Male	817 (43%)
	Unknown	53 (02%)
Race/Ethnicity	Not reported	472 (25%)
	African-Amer	164 (09%)
	American Ind.	10 (01%)
	Asian/Pac Is	79 (04%)
	Caucasian	1,051 (55%)
	Mexican-Amer	44 (02%)
	Other Hispanic	35 (02%)
	Other	35 (02%)

Finances:

As of December 1, 2003, the balance in the combined operating and conference accounts was \$73,460.82. The balance in the reserve account was \$335,454.00.

The Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at MU has been proud to serve as ASHE's headquarters for the past six years, and I am pleased to have been of service for the past two years as ASHE's Executive Director. I look forward to ASHE's continued growth in membership and conference attendance and increased services to its members under the direction of its new, full-time Executive Director, Dennis Brown.

The Beginning of Another: ASHE at Michigan State University

Dennis Brown, Executive Director
Michigan State University

The ASHE Directorate has officially moved from the University of Missouri at Columbia to Michigan State University effective January 1, 2004. The Provost, Dean of the College of Education, chairman of the EAD Department, and faculty and staff of the HALE program are honored to house and support the ASHE Directorate.

Three key personnel that will be serving the ASHE membership are graduate assistants Christina Dokter, Melissa McDaniels and Wei-ni Wang. Christina Dokter is writing her dissertation in the HALE program and serves as GA for the ASHE office. Christina designs online instruction for the school of education and is specializing in online distance learning. Christina received her MA in Instructional Design from Michigan State University, and a BA in Political Science from UCLA.

Melissa is a first-year doctoral student in the HALE program and serves as the GA for the ASHE office. Melissa came to MSU after 11 years working in higher education in Boston, MA, most recently as a faculty member at Northeastern University's Department of Cooperative Education. Melissa received her BA from the University of Michigan and her MA from the Boston College Graduate School of Education.

Wei-ni (Winnie) is a third-year doctoral student in the HALE program at MSU. She was the GA to the HALE program coordinator for the past two years and will serve as the GA to the ASHE/Lumina Dissertation Fellowship Program. Winnie received her BA in Taiwan in 1999 and her MA in Adult and Continuing Education from Michigan State University in 2001.

Christina, Melissa and Winnie have proven to be great assets to the ASHE office already and are eager to serve the membership of ASHE in the coming years. We welcome their enthusiasm and wealth of experience. In the next few months, the ASHE office expects to announce some enhancements to the website and on-line membership applications and renewals that will make it easier to renew and maintain your ASHE membership.

ASHE office address:

ASHE

Michigan State University
424 Erickson Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824

Phone: 517-432-8805

Fax: 517-432-8806

Email: ashemsu@msu.edu

Website: <http://www.ashe.ws>

ASHE 2003 in Comparison . . .

This year I asked ASHE conference attendees to compare their experiences at the Portland conference to other conference experiences. The following commentaries provide an introspective examination of the ASHE conference experience.

ASHE with ASHE Over Time: *Bigger and with Better Food!*

Stan Carpenter, Texas State University-San Marcos

The title reflects the two easiest differences to spot when comparing this year's conference to those in the past. Reportedly, there were close to 900 attendees—a far cry from the 300-ish in Baltimore in 1987 or even the 600 or so in 1997. And the food

was much better than the Executive Director at that time (*Stan*) would have ever had the wisdom to order.

Size causes issues. Large events feel more crowded, even in suitable venues and it is harder just to move around, especially at passing times. More rooms are needed for more sessions. More and more options need to be added, like poster sessions and discussions to accommodate the increasing numbers of attendees and proposal submitters. Success spawns preconferences and meetings of ancillary (or even unrelated) groups during the conference. These are efficient, but they detract in some measurable way from the experience of the whole, as do the receptions that many sponsors are kind enough to undertake for the entire membership. Even though everyone is invited (ASHE tradition if an event is listed in the program), it's sometimes hard for newcomers to believe that the X University reception is truly "open." Larger size means more first time attendees and a smaller catch rate for continuing attendance. And, most importantly, it seems to signal a change to those who have been faithful for years—things just don't feel the same!

At the same time, there are good things that come only with success, as well, and they were evident at Portland. With the economies of scale that ASHE now enjoys, we can book better properties in more convenient locations (like downtown Portland!). We are more attractive to our exhibitor/sponsors, an important source of revenue and intellectual energy. We can continue to keep conference fees low and also keep our dues structure affordable. We can feature the kind of media that have become expected for general sessions in the past few years. Our growth and our membership numbers ensure that we are taken seriously as a venue for top scholarship and research. Arguably, larger numbers lead to continued vitality and variety in our program, our sessions, our membership, and our attitudes.

That's the real question, isn't it? Has size changed ASHE in such a way that we have lost or are losing the charm of our formerly intimate group? I have attended each of the stand-alone ASHE Conferences, beginning in 1986, except the one in 2002 during which I was not in the U.S. So, coming back to the 2003 meeting afforded me a chance to see things with a fresh (all right, a fresh-er) eye. The thing that struck me most was the sense of coming home, of a comfortable place with good friends and

acquaintances. After coming to ASHE for several years, most people will describe such a feeling—that we take up where we left off last year with little feeling of transition or dislocation. But there was also an energy, a bustle that didn't seem to be present in the same way years ago (or maybe I didn't notice it). I attribute this to the new generation of scholars that are arriving just in time to replace the aging cadre that are my contemporaries. I don't always like that feeling and I don't always like the concomitant new ideas, but maybe that's natural too. Besides, it kind of shakes me up and that's a good thing usually—for me, for people generally, and for organizations.

So, there's my comparison of this year's conference to past ones (which was my assignment). We haven't lost the old ASHE and I doubt we are in the process of losing it soon, although I suppose there is a size where that could happen. What I see now is sort of "ASHE-plus." The veterans are still in evidence, still warm and welcoming, still concerned about bringing in the newcomers who want to join us, still worried about exclusion and rigor simultaneously. There's also a more fluid, generally newer group that doesn't even understand the questions about "losing the old ASHE," but rather will attend as long as ASHE is relevant to their needs and interests. One group brings energy and fresh thinking and (I hope) the other lends perspective, patience, and the benefits of experience. From where I stand, the mix looks pretty healthy.

UCEA and ASHE: A Week Yet Worlds Apart

Edith Rusch, Rowan University

The January 2004 issue of the *New Yorker* included a clever cartoon showing bridge designs as metaphors for economic and political situations. The drawing of the Franco-US Friendship Bridge was an extraordinary representation of my ASHE experience as a conference attendee and a member of the professional association. The sketch shows a bridge solidly grounded on each shoreline, with each side arching mightily toward a different center, which results in each side ending abruptly just past the other. While traversing the expanse might be possible, smooth travel is not a possibility. It would take great athletic skills and complicated equipment to move between the two shores. No one would ever

call me an athlete and complicated equipment scares me, but my persistent attendance at ASHE is my attempt to foster an ASHE-UCEA Friendship Bridge.

Professionally, my primary affiliation is with UCEA, the K-12 portion of the system, but I have always worked in Educational Leadership departments that include Higher Education programs. In order to build collegial relationships, I had to struggle with learning the differences between schools and institutions, the differences in programmatic needs, and the differences in our student populations. I concluded that knowledge of college and university systems was a key factor in changing the access and achievement of students at all levels of the educational enterprise. Hence, ASHE became my personal classroom, a conference that provided me with a learning space. A decade ago, my ASHE experiences were similar to my first visit to France; I did not understand the language, the natives seemed less-than friendly, and I got lost on the Metro. Today I have professional and personal relationships with higher education faculty who help me navigate the unfamiliar, kindly answer my naïve questions, and provide a helping hand across our disconnected bridge.

While our bridge is still disconnected, I think it is important for ASHE members to know what I, a professor of K-12 administration, take away from the conference. I never lack for quality sessions that feed my interests in organizational change and gender politics. Research papers frequently are added to reference lists for my students, whom I hope will be more skillful bridge crosses. I marvel at the youth, and the racial and ethnic diversity within the ASHE community, always wondering how UCEA might achieve that rich cultural array within its ranks. One of the most energizing moments of ASHE is the poster session, the recognition and highlighting of emergent scholars. Most often, the research questions asked by these participants reflect challenging issues whose origins are found in the K-12 segment of the system. Those questions, too, find their way into my classroom discourse. I have always come away from ASHE with a new or enlarged set of questions and more refined understandings of the issues that our students face at various points in their education.

The bridge does not seem as challenging as it once did. For the past few years, a courageous group of ASHE members has attempted to talk openly about the lack of discourse between ASHE and UCEA members. The conversation is still in its infancy and

is frequently regarded as “not interesting to members” by both UCEA and ASHE proposal readers. We still have a long way to go before we understand how or why to connect the bridge. As a member of ASHE and long-term conference attendee, I can only encourage higher education professors to actively encourage your K-12 colleagues to attend and participate in ASHE. I also encourage you to navigate the bridge to UCEA. We have much to teach each other and the greatest beneficiaries of a more connected bridge will be the students who traverse our educational system.

ASHE to ASHE: New Role for Graduate Students

Soko S. Starobin, University of North Texas

Third time is a charm. My experience at the 2003 ASHE Conference was comfortable and definitely more engaging than my previous two conference experiences. Perhaps, the pedestrian-friendly downtown in Portland contributed to the positive part of my memory. Nonetheless, I was thrilled to serve as an ASHE Graduate Student Intern and work with Dr. Janet Guyden, Chair of the Committee on Ethnic Participation. On the first day of the conference, Dr. Guyden and I had an informal meeting at a restaurant where we shared our research interests as well as personal information. I immediately felt her openness to take me as a mentor during the conference. She was friendly and kind, yet professional. Next morning, I was invited to observe the Board meeting of ASHE Reader Series, where I learned roles and responsibilities of manuscript contributors, publisher, and the ASHE organization. The interactions among the board members certainly motivated me to pursue active participation on the ASHE Reader Series Board. In the evening, I was in the business meeting of the Committee of Ethnic Participation. By observing the meeting, I was again inspired to be a part of the member of the committee. My mentorship by a senior scholar made me realize just what many graduate students, of their own volition, miss in ASHE.

The membership of graduate students constitutes a significant part of the overall ASHE membership. In the past three years, I have seen more meetings and sessions pertaining to the professional development of graduate students. These opportunities are welcomed and much needed for the growing

membership of graduate students. What troubles me is that some graduate students cluster together during an entire conference. As long as we walk around the hallways as a group, we miss this once a year opportunity to interact with scholars and researchers in the field across the nation (and around the world). I assume that for senior scholars and researchers, it is not comfortable to approach a group of five to seven graduate students to greet or ask about their research interests. It seems that not the increased number of the graduate students, but increased number of the graduate student “clusters” may create a divide between scholars/researchers and students. As a new phase of the ASHE begins this year, a new role of graduate students – participation as individuals can be critical for creating more comforting and engaging conference experiences for both scholars/researchers and graduate students.

ASHE and CHER: A World View

*Tamara Welschot, Senior Publishing Editor
Kluwer Academic Publishers, the Netherlands*

As a publisher, I do attend various conferences. As such I have been asked to compare the ASHE conference with a European conference on higher education. Last year, I attended two conferences for the first time, ASHE and the CHER (Consortium for Higher Education Researchers), which was held in Porto, Portugal. For ASHE it was its 28th annual conference; for CHER, the 16th meeting. Both conferences have a seemingly similar focus yet remain distinct. I offer the following observations as a comparison of the two.

ASHE, a predominantly American conference, is much larger than CHER, which attracts about 100 attendees per year. ASHE has an international section, which draws researchers from outside the United States. Although fairly small, this section is growing in interest. CHER is intended for European researchers, but ironically has been attracting a growing number of attendants from the United States. The CHER conference organizers actually *joked* that for next year’s conference they will have to put a limit on the number of Americans attending!

Because of its size, the ASHE conference hosts more parallel sessions than does CHER. ASHE offers session topics areas—students; organization and administration; teaching, learning, and curriculum; methodology and assessment; faculty; contexts and foundations; and policy, finance and economics. The

ASHE conference also features numerous activities, receptions, and meetings. There are plenary symposiums, plenary paper sessions, concurrent paper sessions, major addresses, presidential addresses, workshops, graduate student meetings, and so forth. What I found interesting is that discussants actually take a role in summarizing what the papers are about. All in all, it can be quite overwhelming for a first timer, but very interesting.

In contrast, the CHER conference focused on a single theme—"Reform and Change in Higher Education: Renewed Expectations in Improved Performance?" During the conference there were plenary lectures and parallel sessions. Its parallel sessions were organized around tracks (being young researchers; staff & students; institutional dynamics; and governance.) Presenters, however, defined addressed topics in ways not addressed by participants at ASHE. For example, governance was about financing higher education, the impact of internationalisation and national policy in higher education, and state versus market. Not surprisingly great attention was paid to national cases.

The conference venue in Porto was beautifully located in a park and one of the nice things was that every day we all had lunch outdoors surrounded by exotic birds that walked between the tables. There was time and space to mingle easily, and you could exchange ideas with all the people doing similar research before the conference was over. In contrast, ASHE was more of a *hotel* conference. You go from one session to the other and somewhere you try to fit in lunch. There are so many interesting sessions that it is difficult to make choices – at least it was for me. I really enjoyed being in such a dynamic, vibrant environment meeting all kinds of people.

Although distinctly different, I recommend them both.

NASPA—ASHE: *Theory versus Practice?*

Susan Poch, Washington State University

I have attended ASHE several times in my student and professional career. It has always proven to be helpful with research and ideas that are germane to a wide variety of topics related to academics in higher education. I also am a member of NASPA, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. For folks who work in the Student Affairs side of the institution, NASPA is the

professional organization to which people belong. There are some distinct differences between the two organizations. Most obvious is that NASPA is typically less theory-based and more practitioner-based. There are fewer presentations about methodology or statistical evidence of a study and more presentations that revolve around students and their out-of-classroom experiences. By way of example, the upcoming NASPA conference's theme is "*It's all about students. Period.*" ASHE's recent conference didn't really have a theme, but centered, as always, on solid scholarship in higher education. NASPA conferences support professionals who work with students one-on-one in academic advising, tutoring, counseling, career exploration, financial aid, and learning strategies. The NASPA conference reflects the helping behaviors of these professionals with workshops and paper presentations appropriate to these fields. ASHE supports its membership in similar ways—sessions and presentations that reflect scholarly activity in the field. Although the two organizations are different, there is a nice overlap of information and a good balance of out-of class versus in-class experiences for the professional who seeks scholarship in a student affairs setting.

Theory and Practice: *Do They Meet?*

David DiRamio, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

During a two-week period last fall, I added "frequent flyer" to my ever-expanding list of graduate student duties. And while attending national conferences on either side of the Mississippi in a matter of eleven days is certainly not unheard of (as many readers of this newsletter will testify), it does afford me a rather unique opportunity to reflect upon the experience. I attended the 8th Annual Conference on Learning Communities and Collaboration in Indianapolis, Indiana (November 5-7), followed by the 28th Annual ASHE Conference in Portland, Oregon (November 12-16).

As a relative newcomer to the study of higher education, I made sure to keep an open mind and resist the temptation to prejudge or stereotype the nature of the two conferences by labeling either as wholly "practitioner-based" or "research-based." You know how it is: seasoned and cynical (albeit well-intentioned) students and faculty at the university will warn you: "Oh... that's a good conference, but nobody attends the sessions" or "Get ready to be snubbed, kid!" I'm glad I didn't listen too closely because, as a presenter at both conferences, I found

most attendees genuinely interested in my research and how it might inform both their work and higher education.

At the first conference, in Indianapolis, the 300 or so attendees had a focused and purposeful scope—increasing student engagement through the innovative use of learning communities—and thus benefited from an obvious sense of esprit d' corps and unity. The research presented was tailored to inform specific problems, such as how to improve retention rates. Most conference attendees exhibited a passion for "the cause." A consistent theme resonated among this academic troupe: secure grant funding to attack specific problems on campus.

The focus of the Portland conference (900 strong) was much broader, and it was obvious that the best and the brightest were present. Here also an atmosphere of unity and comity was evident among participants, no doubt from relationships developed over years of attendance and working together. However, while both the research methods and writing at this conference were impeccable, I must confess (after attending the first conference) many of the topics covered appeared a bit obtuse and a few steps removed from current trends and problems in higher education.

Perhaps this is as exactly as it should be at the premier conference studying higher education. The vast majority of sessions encompassed intriguing and worthy basic research. But, as a freshly indoctrinated foot soldier from the previous week's conference, I couldn't help but wonder how much of this largely theoretical work could inform specific problems at colleges and universities, or secure funding in a climate of fiscal belt-tightening and scrutiny? Interestingly, several sessions (including an excellent ASHE keynote panel) did explore the theme of practicality and research. Moreover, I picked up on a bit of back-channel discussion about research and sources of funding, while munching on muffins at breakout areas between sessions.

At first glance, the two conferences seemed headed in diametrically different directions, but in actuality similarities exist. Both conferences exuded an excellent social dynamic and overall mood of collegiality. Perhaps equally as important for the future of higher education, the sub-theme of recommitting to tackling the more focused and specific contemporary problems faced by colleges

and universities today (with varying degrees of emphasis) ran through both conferences.

Post-script ASHE 2003 Conference

Adrianna Kezar, 2003 Conference Chair
University of Southern California

The 2003 conference probably seems like ages ago. But before we move on to the 2004 conference planning in Kansas City, I want to thank the planning committee again for all their tremendous work. The planning committee included: Lisa Latucca (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); Patrick Dilley (Methodology and Assessment); and Marietta Del Falvo and Barbara Johnson (members-at-large) who conducted the extensive post conference evaluation.

Next year's planning committee will be will served by the hard work of this year's planning committee in terms of the policy development, new processes put in place, and the detailed feedback from the evaluation. I thank the over 400 ASHE members that took the time to fill out the survey. The results have been helpful in making decisions about scheduling; roles of discussants, facilitators, and chairs; session formats, and the like.

As many ASHE members might be aware we received a record number of proposals in 2003 and the planning committee worked hard to process and provide detailed feedback to each ASHE member in a timely fashion. I felt the sessions were very conceptually tight this year and believe that having committee members with expertise in the area of review helped to create a solid program. I wish the 2004 planning committee and its chair, Ben Baez, good luck as they move forward. I also want to extend my gratitude to, John Braxton and the ASHE community for providing me the opportunity to serve as program chair.

ASHE 2003 CONFERENCE EVALUATION

Marietta Del Favero, Louisiana State University
Barbara J. Johnson, University of New Orleans

Participant feedback for the ASHE Conference was solicited electronically for the first time after the November 2003 meeting. A total of 466 responses, representing approximately 55% of all conference attendees, were received between November 17 and December 10. Seventy-seven percent (77%) of the 466 respondents were from doctoral/research institutions, 8% from master's college/universities, 4% from state or university higher education systems, 2% from baccalaureate colleges, 4% from policy or research institutes, 3% from baccalaureate or community colleges, and 2% claimed no institutional affiliation. Graduate students comprised 44% of all respondents while 30% were other academics (instructor, assistant/associate/full professor), and 23% categorized themselves as administrative/other. This was the first ASHE meeting for 39% of respondents, 26% had attended for 2-3 years, 15% for 4-6 years, 8% for 6-10 years, and 12% for more than 10 years.

Key Findings

While general satisfaction levels were high (86% felt welcome at the conference, 92% were satisfied with the conference overall, 83% expressed satisfaction with overall program coherence). However, respondent comments suggest improvement is needed in some areas. The following highlights pertain to selected aspects of the conference that were either new this year or area where responses reflected the need for improvement.

Proposal submittal and review: Overall, respondents were satisfied with the proposal submittal and review process and differences across categories of respondents were negligible in most cases. There was high satisfaction expressed with the **Call for Proposals** with 80% satisfied with clarity of instructions and 75% satisfied with the new division-specific submission process. Those who submitted proposals expressed satisfaction with the process (83% timely notification of acceptance/rejection; 65% reviewer comments adequacy). It is worth noting however, that 4% indicated they were very dissatisfied and 15% somewhat dissatisfied with reviewer comments.

Other findings related to proposal submittal and review suggest that newcomers were less satisfied with the process than were veteran attendees. For example, 91% of the academics and 73% of the administrator/other attendees were satisfied with **timeframe for proposal review**. Only 49% of the first-time attendees and 65% of the graduate students who were at the conference found the process satisfactory. The **match of reviewer interest to assigned proposals** also seemed better for some than for others (academics 88% satisfaction rating, administrator group 79% and graduate students 67%).

Organization of sessions by division: Overall, 86% were satisfied with the session format distribution, and 66% and 57% respectively were favorably disposed toward the **organization of roundtables and poster sessions by division**. Given the large numbers of respondents who expressed neutrality on the divisional organization—26% for roundtables and 31% for posters—these percentages suggest overall acceptance. Some comments indicated participant dissatisfaction that similar topics were scheduled concurrently for paper sessions and roundtables.

Session participant roles: Session participant roles were generally well received. 77% of respondents were satisfied with the new role of facilitator (9% were dissatisfied). The quality of **discussant comments** received an overall satisfactory rating of 75%; 82% of respondents were satisfied with the **discussions following paper sessions**. Yet, the extent and tenor of some comments suggest weaknesses in participant performance, and raise recurring issues related to session quality. For example, we received comments like clarification is needed between the discussant/facilitator roles, the quality of contributions by individuals serving in these roles is lacking in some cases, and conference participants may need more information about role differences and what constitutes adequate preparation/feedback to presenters.

Poster session: More than one-half of respondents (56%) were satisfied with the poster sessions. Suggestions, such as extend display time, larger well-ventilated room needed to facilitate quality dialogue, water for participants, were offered.

Saturday night social event: The membership remains divided on the issue of whether ASHE should host a Saturday night social event. Thirty-two percent favored its reinstatement; 43% did not. Fifty-nine percent of respondents did desire more structured **opportunities at the conference for connecting with colleagues.**

Newcomer events: Only 28% of respondents viewed the **mentoring program** favorably, 24% were dissatisfied. Comments suggest that many were unaware of the program and that promised matching did not occur in some cases. The **Newcomer reception** was better received with a 51% satisfaction rating. Comments suggest that newcomer activities should be better structured to connect newcomers with veterans and that the newcomer program should be better publicized so it will be more inclusive.

Extending conference length and Sunday sessions: Overall, disinterest was expressed in this change of conference format. Specifically, 54% of first-timers and 57% of veteran attendees were not in favor of extension. Several participants noted that with the current pre-conference structure adding days to the conference would make it too long.

Awards luncheon: One-fifth of participants expressed dissatisfaction and mentioned seating availability and quality of food as primary dissatisfiers. Comments were overwhelmingly in favor of including all registrants, or all who want to attend the awards luncheon.

Electronic processes: Respondents were overwhelmingly in favor of electronic processes (92% favored online submission of proposals; 81% agreed with electronic access for review and rating of proposals; and 91% favored online evaluation of the conference).

Final Evaluators' Note

This summary is a condensed version of a 13-page report submitted to the ASHE Board and Program Committee and is intended to provide ASHE members with the overall tenor and substance of the findings. Conference planners however will find good food for thought in attendee comments presented in the longer report. It is important to note that given the high proportion of graduate students amongst total respondents (44%), conference planners would do well to consider comments overall

as potentially reflective of the sentiments of the future leaders of our profession. While veteran attendees may be more accepting of the status quo and thus tend to be more generous with their satisfaction ratings, the ideas of newcomers speak to the future of the association and should be well considered.

2003 FORUM ON PUBLIC POLICY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Scott Thompson, University of Georgia

November's Public Policy Forum marked the fourth year that scholars, policy makers, and policy analysts came together 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. Over 140 people registered for the Forum this year – making this the third consecutive year of a greater than 50 percent increase in participation. Session topics included the impact of key state and federal policies aimed at improving access to higher education, the influence of state higher education policies on graduates' migration patterns between states and regions of the country, emergent issues in the 2004 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and public attitudes toward higher education. We are indebted to Ami Zusman whose work as Forum program chair yielded such rich and engaging Forum.

The Forum's highlight was an invited plenary session, held jointly with the Graduate Student Policy Seminar, on "Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act: The Three A's -- Access, Accountability, and Affordability." The session brought together a distinguished panel of researchers and policy makers to discuss the major components of the reauthorization now formally underway on Capitol Hill. Keeping with practice at forums past, this session morphed into a joint reception with the Graduate Student Seminar and the International Forum.

With the installment of the Council's first elected officers, this was a most significant Forum for our group. Assuming office as members of the first official Executive Committee of the Council on Public Policy in Higher Education were:

- Scott Thomas (Chair), Institute of Higher

Education, University of Georgia,
slthomas@uga.edu

- Donald Heller (Vice-Chair), Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University, deh29@psu.edu
- Laura Perna (Secretary), Educational Policy & Leadership, University of Maryland, lperna@wam.umd.edu
- Jacqueline King (At-Large), American Council on Education, Jacqueline_king@ace.nche.edu
- Alex McCormick (At-Large), Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, McCormick@carnegiefoundation.org
- William Zumeta (At-Large), Public Affairs and Educational Leadership & Policy Studies, University of Washington, zumeta@u.washington.edu

We wish to extend our appreciation to all those participating in the election process—providing nominations, agreeing to candidacy, or simply taking the time to cast a vote. Special thanks are due also to members of the nominating committee: Elaine El-Khawas, Cheryl Lovell, Dave Leslie, Christopher Morphew, and Pat Terenzini.

As is often the case with efforts driving successes like the Council, there are a few people toiling persistently outside the spotlight to make it all possible. The Council owes its greatest debt to Pat Terenzini and the others on the Public Policy Forum planning group: Carol Everly Floyd, Toni Larson, and Ami Zusman. The vision and tireless work of these folks has made the Council a significant—and formal—feature of the ASHE.

We hope that you will join us for the 2004 Forum as we continue to develop an even stronger focus on public policy issues affecting higher education. There are several ways to become involved with the Council. The ASHE Call for Proposals contains details for those interested in having their work considered for presentation at this year's Forum. Registration for the Forum can be completed with your registration for the ASHE general conference. The Council for Public Policy in Higher Education listserv can be accessed by sending an email message with only SUB CPPHE-L in the message body to

listserv@listserv.uga.edu.

Finally, we will soon be launching a new website for the Council at which all manner of detail about the Council and its activities can be accessed. We look forward to hearing from you and hope to see you at this year's Forum in Kansas City on November 3-4.

UPDATE ON THE 2004 CONFERENCE

Benjamin Baez, 2004 Program Chair
Georgia State University

Hello. I want to give you an update on the upcoming conference in November in Kansas City, Missouri. The 2004 ASHE program committee made a few changes to the traditional ways in which proposals will be reviewed and the program developed. We decided to keep the submission process similar to last year, and so again this year authors are asked to submit their proposals to division chairs specializing in topic areas: students; organization and administration; teaching, learning, and curriculum; faculty; contexts and foundations; policy, finance, and economics; and methodology and assessment. We added an "open" section this year in order to accommodate some concerns about the topic areas; authors who feel that their proposals do not fit into one of the existing areas may send theirs to this "open" section.

We are also asking authors to rank their preference for presentation formats, giving the program committee more flexibility to balance the high demand for paper presentations with the need to accept a higher number of qualified proposals.

I'm excited about working with this year's program committee. This committee represents a diverse range of expertise and institutions. The division chairs are: Students - Karen Arnold, Boston College, Octavio Villalpando, University of Utah, and Deborah Carter, Indiana University; Organization and Administration - Jerlando Jackson, University of Wisconsin - Madison, Myron Pope, University of Central Oklahoma, and Philo Hutcheson, Georgia State University; Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum - Becky Ropers-Huilman, Louisiana State University; Faculty - Carol Colbeck, Pennsylvania State University; Contexts and Foundations - Amy Wells, University of New Orleans; Policy, Finance, and Economics - Michael Mills, University of South

Florida; and Methodology and Assessment and “Open” – Kristen Renn, Michigan State University.

The divisions chairs and I are being assisted by other committee members, including Adrianna Kezar, last year’s program chair; Diane Dean and Amy Metcalf, graduate student representatives; Marietta Del Favero and Barbara Johnson, conference evaluation; Carolyn Thompson, local representative; Scott Thomas, chair of the Policy Forum; and Dennis Brown and Melissa McDaniels, ASHE Office. I want to thank the entire Program Committee for agreeing to serve in this important capacity.

If you have any questions about the conference or how you can help, please feel free to contact the division chairs or me.

Thinking Globally

The world’s top universities: the view from China

Simon Marginson, Monash University, Australia

University rankings. We are all skeptical about them, but they won’t go away. Few can resist a table showing which universities are ‘better’ or ‘worse.’ The influence of the *US News and World Report* on student choice, donor behavior and career decisions must be great.

The *USNWR* methodology measures standing in the market rather than pure academic quality. Alongside quality of research, teaching, resources, and student graduation rates the *USNWR* includes the subjective rankings of peers, and student selectivity. In other words, *USNWR* measures status and like all such measures is affected by circular reputational effects that accumulate over time. High reputation feeds into student and faculty thinking and decisions, attracting social and economic investment to the university. This enhances high reputation, generating further reputational effects, and so on. Top schools must perform, but the hardest part is to achieve initial recognition – once a school has high market billing it should be able perpetuate this because the circular factors help to maintain market status.

Subjective market rankings can have perverse effects. For example, the pro-private sector bias in American culture, which is underpinned by national policies that favor the leading private schools, feeds into the

subjective status market. All else equal, when a private university and a public university perform at the same level in research and teaching, the private university tends to be seen as superior. This pro-private bias in the culture is also associated with circular reputational effects, so that all else being equal, the relative standing of the private sector tends to rise over time, as the successive *USNWR* rankings show. Thus in the 2003 *USNWR* national rankings of doctoral universities, the highest placed public was UC Berkeley at only 20th. Virginia came next at 23 followed by UC Los Angeles and Michigan-Ann Arbor tied at 25. The commanding heights are controlled by private non-profits.

‘So what,’ you might say. A market is a market is a market. Market ratings might be highly subjective, based as much on fashion as on real substance, but such ratings are a fact of life. That is true; but substance also matters. We would like to believe (even if it is not always the case!) that a school that sustains itself more on reputation than substance will be found out eventually. To this end, more objective measures than *USNWR* should be encouraged.

Recently the ranking game received a new twist when the Shanghai Jiao Tong University Institute of Higher Education in China compiled a list of the top 500 world universities based on research performance. The first 100 were ranked in individual order. The Shanghai Institute uses narrower indicators than *US News and World Report*, focusing on research alone without regard to professional schools or teaching quality. At the same time its rankings are more objective. The criteria of research performance, each with 20 per cent loading, are:

- the number of Nobel laureates associated with the university since the inception of the Nobel Prizes, with a loading in favor of recently awarded prizes
- the number of highly cited researchers (1981-1999)
- articles in *Nature* and *Science* (2000-2002)
- articles in cited in the science index expanded, and the social science index
- research performance per academic staff member, using the above indicators.

Arguably, this is a sound measure of universities’ contribution to knowledge, providing it is recognized that like most measures of research performance, it

privileges quantity of output.

The data in the table are interesting, for two reasons. First, the Shanghai Institute rankings of American universities on research performance can be compared with *US News and World Report* ranking of American market power. Second, the Chinese rankings help to show which universities and which nations make major contributions to the global flows of knowledge.

Using the Shanghai Institute method, by comparison with the *USNWR* 2003 rankings, several American private universities fall sharply. Princeton drops from first American university to sixth American university, Duke University from fifth to 25th, Dartmouth College from ninth to equal 63rd, Rice University from 16th to 43rd, Brown from 17th to 49th, Emory from 18th to 61st, and Notre Dame from 18th to outside the American top 100. Meanwhile inclusion of universities from the University of California system moves from two universities in the top American 30 according to *USNWR*, to six universities in the world top 30 according to Shanghai. UC Berkeley jumps in the rankings from 20th in the USA to fourth in the world. It is noticeable that with a few exceptions, such as the University of Virginia that slips from *USNWR* 23rd to Shanghai 45th, the public universities tend to do better when the measures of university standing are confined to research excellence and the contribution to knowledge.

In relation to the global comparison, it is bad news for other nations, except for the UK and perhaps tiny Switzerland. Of the top 20 universities, 15 are from the USA and four from the UK. There is only one other nation in the top 20, Japan. Harvard and Stanford are on top. Cambridge UK, the home of many path-breaking initiatives in science and philosophy is perhaps surprisingly low at fifth. Of the world's top 50 research universities more than two-thirds are American, with 20 percent in California alone, which has three of the top four.

English speaking countries constitute almost three quarters of the top 101 universities once Canada (four) and Australia (two) are added to the US and UK. Most other nations in the table are from central and northern Europe: Germany, Austria, Switzerland, the low-countries, and Scandinavia. These European universities are not associated with market ideologies and have achieved high academic excellence through

public sector and state-led organization.

Of the Asian nations, Japan has four universities in the top 100, and eight in the first 150. Of the emerging East Asian nations, the National University of Singapore (a fast-rising star), National Taiwan University, and Seoul National University in Korea are in the top 200. Tsing Hua in China is in the top 250, and Beijing and the University of Hong Kong the top 300. The Chinese government has announced its intention to create a world-class doctoral sector and given China's economic weight and capacity to concentrate resources its universities will move up in future tables.

UNAM in Mexico and the University of Sao Paulo in Brazil place highest of all universities in Latin America, both in the top 200 on research performance. The University of Buenos Aires in Argentina is in the top 350. Around the world, many great national universities fall outside the top 500 rankings.

What should we conclude from the dominance of American institutions? That Americans are smarter and more creative than people from other nations? Not likely. The dominance of American universities reflects the material weight of American education. US universities have the highest levels of both private and public funding in the world – a situation ultimately sustained by the worldwide economic, cultural, and technological power of the United States, backed also by American political strength and from time to time, military force.

The dominance of American universities in the worldwide flows of knowledge resembles the dominance of the American film and TV industries. From a global point of view this is unhealthy because it is unbalanced and it crowds out other cultures and means of identity, reducing diversity. In essence, global knowledge is too much shaped by American perspectives.

Ironically, the world leadership of American universities is partly sustained by bright doctoral students and faculty from other countries who flock to the leading university system. It is to the credit of American universities that they open their doors to foreigners with contributions to make. The downside is that the flows of people are largely one way. While foreign faculty contribute to American and worldwide higher education by migrating to the US,

their mobility subtracts from university capacity in their own countries.

This suggests that American universities could make a better contribution not by drawing all the global talent to themselves, but by working with universities and national governments in Latin America, Asia and Africa to build research capacity in those countries. If there were more nations and less American universities in the top 100 and top 500, we would all benefit.

World's top 50 universities ranked on research and publications, according to the Shanghai Jiao Tong University Institute of Higher Education, 2003

You can access the complete Shanghai rankings at <http://ed.sjtu.edu.cn/ranking.htm>

A summary list is given on the next page:

	<i>institution</i>	<i>nation</i>
1	Harvard	USA
2	Stanford	USA
3	California IT	USA
4	California - Berkeley	USA
5	Cambridge	UK
6	Massachusetts IT	USA
7	Princeton	USA
8	Yale	USA
9	Oxford	UK
10	Columbia	USA
11	Chicago	USA
12	Cornell	USA
13	California – San Francisco	USA
14	California- San Diego	USA
15	California- Los Angeles	USA
16	Washington, Seattle	USA
17	Imperial College	UK
18	Pennsylvania	USA
19	Tokyo	Japan
20	University College London	UK
21	Michigan–Ann Arbor	USA
22	Washington, St. Louis	USA
23	Toronto	Can
24	Johns Hopkins	USA
25	Swiss Fed IT Zurich	Switz

26	California – Santa Barb	USA
27	Wisconsin Madison	USA
28	Rockefeller	USA

29	Northwestern	USA
30	Kyoto	Japan
31	Colorado - Boulder	USA
32	Vanderbilt	USA
32	Duke	USA
34	Texas – SW Med Centre	USA
35	British Columbia	Canada
36	California - Davis	USA
37	Minnesota – Twin Cities	USA
38	Rutgers – New Brunswick	USA
39	Karolinska I - Stockholm	Sweden
40	Pennsylvania S – U Park	USA
40	Utrecht	Netherl
40	Southern California	USA
43	Edinburgh	UK
44	California - Irvine	USA
45	Illinois – Urbana Champ.	USA
45	Zurich	Switzerl
47	Texas - Austin	USA
48	Munich	Germany
49	Brown	USA
49	Australian National	Australia

Graduate Student News

Amy Metcalfe, University of Arizona
Diane R. Dean, Teachers College, Columbia University

At the writing of this article, the *Chronicle of Higher Education* featured a front-page headline on the alarming rates of graduate school attrition (Smallwood, 2004). Among the myriad of underlying causes that were suggested by administrators and researchers, one pointed to isolation from peers and faculty as an important contributor to student attrition, isolation in both the physical and intellectual sense (Lovitts, 2001). The success, or failure, of many graduate students is based in their ability to connect both with their academic departments and institutions, as well as with the larger discipline of professionals and scholars of which they are a part.

The involvement of graduate students in the governance and life of the Association has been the purpose and mission of the graduate student members of the Board of Directors, and we continue that tradition. Graduate students have strong involvement in ASHE. As of November 14, 2003, there were 678 ASHE student members (35% of the membership overall) (Townsend, 2003). Over 332 students attended the 2003 Annual conference; 87% of those graduate student attendees who provided 2003

conference feedback reported high satisfaction levels with their conference experiences (Del Favero & Johnson, 2004).

We wish to thank all of those who volunteered their time, service and support to make the various graduate student sessions and activities held at the 2003 conference a success. We especially wish to thank: John Braxton, for his service as President and his support of graduate student involvement in the Association's governance and activities; Adrianna Kezar, for her service as 2003 Program Chair and her efforts to give greater inclusion and visibility to graduate student programming; and Katherine Garlough, for her service as a graduate student member of the ASHE Board of Directors, and whose energy and efforts in strengthening and improving graduate student involvement at the annual conference were greatly appreciated. As the 2004 conference-planning season unfolds, we will work with the current Program Committee to build upon this legacy of involvement and inclusion, incorporating feedback from the 2003 conference to refine offerings and focus our efforts.

One objective in the coming year is to foster greater communication and connections among all graduate student members of the Association through use of the graduate student listserv. For this purpose, the listserv is relocating to a new host at Teachers College, Columbia University and will be overhauled to increase subscription rates. When it debuts in February, all ASHE graduate-student members will be subscribed. Look for a welcome message and instructions arriving in your emailboxes next month. Those students who recently joined the Association or whose email addresses were not available in the ASHE database may subscribe in late February by sending a blank email message to lyris@listserve.tc.columbia.edu with the following words in the subject line: sub ASHEGrad

As always, we welcome your comments, questions and suggestions. Best wishes for a successful academic semester, Amy Scott Metcalfe, amysm@email.arizona.edu; and Diane R. Dean, drd20@columbia.edu

References

Smallwood, Scott. (January 16, 2004). "Doctor Dropout." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50 (19), A10-12.

Lovitts, Barbara E. (2001). *Leaving the Ivory Tower; The Causes and Consequences of Departure from Doctoral Study*. Rowman and Littlefield.

Townsend, Barbara K. (November 2003). ASHE Executive Director's Report.

Del Favero, Marietta and Johnson, Barbara (January 2004). ASHE 2003 Conference Evaluation.

ASHE/LUMINA Foundation for Education

Dissertation Fellowship Program

Application Deadline: postmarked by April 1st, 2004

With support from Lumina Foundation for Education, the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) announces the ASHE/Lumina Foundation Dissertation Fellowship Program. Lumina Foundation for Education is interested in enhancing access to postsecondary education, increasing opportunities for better student retention and attainment, and improving programs for nontraditional students. More specifically, Lumina Foundation wishes (1) to stimulate research on topics related to financial aid, student retention and success, and adult learning and learners; (2) to improve the higher education research community's involvement in research on these topics; and (3) to inform improvement of institutional, state, and federal policies and programs that promote and support access and retention.

To that end, Lumina Foundation has provided ASHE with funding for fellowships in the amount of \$12,500 to support dissertation research on the broad topics of financial aid, student retention and success, and adult learners and learning. The fellowships will support up to one year of activity that will be conducted through the students' home universities and can be used to support costs of supplying data, dissemination of project results, travel, tuition, and salary for the fellows.

ASHE/Lumina Foundation Dissertation Fellows will be assigned an ASHE/Lumina Foundation Dissertation Fellowship mentor during the year-long fellowship. The ASHE/Lumina Foundation Dissertation Fellowships Awards Committee will

consult with the fellow and possible mentors to arrange mentorship by an ASHE member with expertise related to the dissertation topics.

WHO MAY APPLY

Doctoral students affiliated with any accredited doctoral program may submit a proposal. Students in doctoral programs outside the United States may apply if their study is about student financial assistance, student retention and success, and/or adult learning and learners in the United States.

Applicants for the fellowship must have completed their course work and any required qualifying examinations and have their dissertation proposal accepted by their institution. Participating universities are encouraged to pay for the tuition of ASHE/Lumina Foundation Dissertation Fellows (provide tuition remission) during the one-year fellowship period.

WHERE TO SUBMIT

Dr. Dennis Brown, Executive Director
The Association for the Study of Higher Education
ASHE/Lumina Foundation Dissertation Fellowship
Michigan State University
424 Erickson Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824

Detailed information is also available at:
<http://www.ashe.ws/fellowship/aboutfellowship.htm>

Point of View

The ASHE Special Session on Higher Education Research Priorities: The Historian's Response

Marybeth Gasman, University of Pennsylvania
Amy E. Wells, University of New Orleans

Historians – like philosophers, sociologists, and economists – value and use key concepts and approaches from their disciplines to focus their writing and research in higher education. Through affiliation with associations, such as the History of Education Society (HES), Division F (History and Historiography) of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), and ASHE, higher

education historians not only reconstruct the past but inform the present and future by exploring the development of contemporary policy and practice. For instance, higher education historians have been creating a robust body of scholarship on individual and foundation philanthropy to colleges, universities, institutes, and scholars. Such scholarship is essential if we are to understand and respond to contemporary directions in funding for higher education.

A special session at the 2003 ASHE annual meeting, entitled “Higher Education Research Priorities: Responding to the Needs of Funders, Universities, and Society,” sought to provoke a broad discussion about how we as researchers can think more carefully and creatively about what research we do and how we do it. However, much of the session focused on the “pressure to frame grant proposals that respond to funders’ interests” (Gumpert, 2003). Each of the presenters discussed their history of pursuing and receiving funding for their own research. And, a few expressed concern over the “increased” interest of funders, namely foundations, in shaping higher education and higher education research.

Yet, in this presentation something was missing – the historian’s voice. In fact, the pressures placed on researchers are not new at all but are strikingly similar to the actions of funders in the early and mid 20th century. In fact, foundations (and before them, individual philanthropists) have been shaping higher education for over a hundred years. Rather than simply being alarmed by this new-found interest, we think it would be beneficial to look at past university/foundation involvement and learn from the mistakes, successes, and purpose of philanthropy.

Most scholars of higher education recall the influence of the famous “Flexner Report” on professional training. In 1910 the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CFAT) began a “professionalizing campaign” in an effort to “define and institutionalize nationally uniform, science-based, training paradigms that would serve as prerequisites for entrance into the professions” (Lagemann, 1983). The CFAT implemented its program through the selective appropriation of research funds. For example, with the Foundation’s monetary support, Abraham Flexner’s *Medical Education in the United States and Canada* evaluated all 155 medical schools in those countries. His report was quite critical of medical education, called for new priorities, and in concert with other social

trends, led to the demise of many smaller schools and all but two of the historically black medical schools. Likewise, the CFAT hired Joseph Redlich, an Austrian Scholar and Alfred Z. Reed, a graduate of Columbia, to produce a similar study aimed at professionalizing training in the legal profession. Although their reports were rejected in their original state by the American Bar Association (ABA), they prompted the ABA to call for higher standards for legal certification – thus changing institutional approaches to legal education.

In addition to critiquing higher education and orchestrating reform, major foundations such as the Rockefeller Foundation have influenced the ascendancy or decline of entire fields of study or of departmental politics and appointments. For example, in the 1930s Rockefeller disillusionment with the results produced by faculty researchers in well-funded research institutes at Chicago, Harvard, UNC-Chapel Hill, Virginia, Iowa, and Stanford, to name a few, led to the end of broad-based funding for the social sciences in favor of narrowly-tailored support for individual projects in international relations, social security, and public administration. And at Fisk University, a historically black college in Nashville, Tennessee, the Rockefeller Philanthropies, specifically the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (LSRM), were sufficiently influential as to handpick the director of Fisk’s social science department. The Foundation agreed to fund a new social science department if the Chicago-trained Charles S. Johnson was selected to lead it. Once Johnson accepted the job, his research was generously funded for the next twenty years. Although Johnson initiated the ideas for his research, the LSRM had a heavy hand in the goings on in the Fisk social science department. Only through shrewd negotiations and a keen observation of foundation strategies, was Johnson able to maintain autonomy and secure funding for his ideas (Gilpin & Gasman, 2003).

Similar examples could be found at numerous institutions around the country, and with other foundations’ interventions. To those of us following philanthropic trends over time these historic examples from higher education philanthropy potentially instruct. Foundation-led reform initiatives teach that when the higher education industry does not regulate, critique, and reform itself others will step in to do so for us.

The lesson of fluid funds re-directed from broad-

based social sciences research institutes and universities suggest that for philanthropists, tracing the specific results of research funding or conducting social re-engineering remains difficult and that specific gifts to individuals might be more practicable. Perhaps the recent funding of individuals through the Millennium Scholars Program of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation rather than outright grants to certain programs or institutions reflects the apparent soundness of this approach. The case of Charles S. Johnson at Fisk suggests that talent and good relations do not insulate scholars from the ideas and oversight of program officers as well as the accountability measures intended to protect the interests of donors.

Beyond the previous examples, the scholarship of historians of higher education in ASHE and other academic associations begs the attention of those interested in measuring the tenor and tone of philanthropic strategies, policy, and practice. In concert with the voices of higher education scholars and experienced grant recipients, the historian’s viewpoint has the capacity to temper our contemporary alarm about research priorities. The history of philanthropy to higher education suggests that contemporary directions toward critique, accountability, and reform in funding for the academy, especially in an era of scarce resources, plays out as the familiar refrain that “everything old is new again.”

References

Patrick J. Gilpin and Marybeth Gasman, *Charles S. Johnson. Leadership beyond the Veil in the Age of Jim Crow* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003).

Patricia Gumport, “ASHE 2003 Plenary Session: Higher Education Research Priorities,” *ASHE Newsletter*, fall 2003.

Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, *Private Power for Public Good* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1983), 159.

ASHE Awards Committee Report

Carolyn J. Thompson, Chairperson
University of Missouri, Kansas City

Congratulations to the 2003 ASHE award recipients. The committee’s role was a difficult one, selecting

from among over one hundred worthy choices. Your letters in support of your nominations were most welcome and made a big difference. The awards went to (1) Ernest Pascarella, Howard Bowen Distinguished Career, (2) Ann Austin, Distinguished Service, (3) Kathryn Moore, Leadership, (4) Michael Nettles, Research Achievement, (5) Laura Perna, Early Career/Promising Scholar, and (6) The University of Michigan, Special Merit.

It is never too early to send a nomination for 2004. Your letters and emails are welcome now. Please visit the ASHE website for descriptions of award categories and past recipients. Nominations should be directed to Carolyn J. Thompson, Associate Professor, University of Missouri-Kansas City, 5100 Rockhill Road, Kansas City, Missouri 64110; or thompsonc@umkc.edu, by May 1, 2004. The Awards Committee members are: Carolyn J. Thompson, Marilyn Amey, Anthony Antonio, David Chapman, Joanne Cooper, Donald Heller, and William Trent.

Surviving in the Academy column: *Beyond surviving to thriving in the academy*

Gary Rhoades, University of Arizona

I am all for survival, though not only of the socially constructed fittest. I can remember when my own survival and career within the academy were very much in question. Upon graduating from UCLA with a PhD in Sociology in 1981, which was a horrible time in the job market, I sent out nearly 100 applications, with no positive response for months and months. The one job offer I received and accepted was for a postdoc, working in Bob Clark's Comparative Higher Education Research Group. Four years later I entered the job market for a faculty position again. This time, no offers came my way. The following year I took the first job offer I got, at the University of Arizona. So I know what it means to question and worry about whether you can gain entry to and survive within the academy.

But I don't think survival is much of a goal in an academic career. If your principal goal and guiding concern is how to survive, then in my view you have

missed the point. And if you find yourself not pursuing certain lines of work or not asking certain questions because for now you just need to do what is necessary to survive, then in my view again, you are missing out on the benefits of an academic career.

Individually and collectively it is important for an academic career to consist of asking interesting, important, and challenging questions, and contributing to social improvement and change. At an individual level, I believe that among the most significant benefits of an academic career are the flexibility and freedom it provides, to pursue questions and ideas where they take you. In my view, if you are going to sacrifice those very special benefits then you might as well be in a profession or occupation that offers more obvious material benefits.

Focusing primarily on survival has a cost not only for individuals but for society as well. It is important, I think, for faculty members to be playing an important role in promoting positive social (economic, political, cultural, scientific, and other) change. This is true not only in the research of faculty members, but also in their service. Ben Baez, for instance, has made this point with regard to faculty of color and service oriented to social justice. A "survival" approach to such service, from an individual perspective, would be to "protect" yourself against time consuming and potentially dangerous service. One "equity" approach to such service from a collective perspective would be to protect faculty of color against the inequity of such service, which might disadvantage them in the competition for career success. Both perspectives reduce the likelihood of institution changing service, argues Baez. I agree, not simply for faculty of color, but for all faculty. My view is that all faculty have a social responsibility to make the world a better place, with some sort of service that goes beyond the duties of research and teaching. And in their research and teaching, all faculty have a social responsibility to follow their ideas and findings where they take them, including when they challenge established beliefs, practices, and structures of power.

I am not naïve. I realize that service takes time, and that in a time of increased emphasis on productivity and accountability, it takes time that could be devoted to research or to instruction and students. I also realize that research and teaching that are out of the mainstream can be in some sense "risky," though

I think too often we overlook the individual and collective risks and costs of not pursuing such work. I do not advise new faculty to devote large amounts of time to service to the detriment of research and teaching, nor do I advise them to simply work against the mainstream in order to be different. But here is what I do communicate to them, and to you.

Being an academic is in part about pursuing what is in your heart. What questions, issues, and ideas do you care about? What contribution do you want to make to the world, academic and real? What do you think is important to explore and understand? These questions are not guided by considerations of how best to construct an academic career; but they are the foundation of what I see as a valuable and meaningful academic career. Too often, I think, senior faculty communicate to junior faculty a sense of uncertainty, of always having to do more to ensure job security. In response to questions about “p & t,” I prefer to communicate a clear sense of reasonable, feasible goals that will lead to promotion and tenure, to allay diffuse fears and to assure people that good work leads to security in at least some academic setting, even if not their immediate one. But what I really prefer to do is to focus most attention on what is most important about an academic life, to discover the driving passion to explore and pursue ideas, issues, and questions where they take you. A major part of graduate education, and the early part of one’s academic career is searching for what those driving, anchoring, orienting questions and conceptions are for you. And as you move through your academic career, the idea is to be flexible enough to discover new (or rediscover old) ones, to not be so set in your ways that there is no learning curve to what you are working on.

In closing then, my advice to aspiring and junior faculty is this. Rather than prioritizing above all else what you need to do to survive, focus more on what you need to do, by way of research, teaching, and service, to thrive in the academy and to enhance the world in which we live. For therein lies the essence and point, and the foundation of a meaningful academic career.

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

Funding and Grant Resources

Whether it is research grants, fellowships, internships, scholarships, or a project that you want to have funded; locating *where* the money is can sometimes be as difficult as writing the grant itself. Don Orlich, author of several grant-writing books, once claimed that when it comes to searching and securing grant funding, approximately 90% of your time should be spent monitoring funding sources to match your project idea or need with an appropriate funding agency. The remaining 10% should be spent on the actual writing of the grant. The idea being that it is easier to write a successful grant if your funding need closely matches the mission of the funding agency. Time spent on monitoring funding databases is worth the effort. Below are excellent funding databases and resources to help get you started. Happy hunting!

[Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance](#)

[The Chronicle of Philanthropy](#)

[The Council on Foundations](#)

[Economic Development Administration](#)

[Government Nonprofit Gateway](#)

[The Foundation Center](#)

[Foundations Online](#)

[Grant Seeker's Guide](#)

[Grants Web](#)

[Internet Nonprofit Center](#)

[National Charities Information Bureau](#)

[National Science Foundation](#)

[NETSource](#)

[Nonprofit Resources Catalogue](#)

[Pitsco Technology Education](#)

[Researchnet](#)

[U.S. Department of Commerce](#)

[U.S. Department of Education](#)

[U.S. Department of Educational Federal Register](#)

[Documents](#)

[U.S. Department of Education – Funding](#)

[U.S. Department of Education - Grants &](#)

[Contract Information](#)
[U.S. Government and Grant Resources](#)

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. Beginning March 1, 2004, a membership-wide message will be emailed to all ASHE members asking them to provide current news, whereabouts, recommendations, kudos (yours, others), new book titles, announcements, awards, and website information to keep others up to date. Please take time out of your busy schedule to toot your own horn or to pay homage to others--send your articles and snippets to Joni Montez, email address: jmontez@lcsc.edu.

Monthly email to ASHE membership:

Dear ASHE Member: In the "Notables" column of the ASHE Newsletter, we would like to include news about colleagues' and friends' awards, tributes, and publications. If you would like us to include something about you or someone you know, please reply to his message and we will see to its inclusion in the upcoming Newsletter. Thanks!

Most Notable

ASHE thanks Phillip Altbach for eight years of service to the organization as editor of the *Review of Higher Education*, and we welcome Amaury Nora as its new editor. Phil will continue to contribute to the world of academic journals as an editor of the newly launched *Journal higher Education in Africa*. Amaury's involvement with the *Review* as a member of the editorial board and a contributor is longstanding. He brings valuable experience garnered from his work with the *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education* as well. We can look forward to exciting times for the *Review*.

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

Dennis Brown, Michigan State University

NEWSLETTER EDITOR

Mimi Wolverton, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

GRADUATE ASSISTANTS

Christina Dokter

Melissa McDaniels

Wei-Ni Wang

REMEMBER
ASHE CONFERENCE PROPOSALS ARE
DUE
MAY 3, 2004
SEE [ASHE WEBSITE](#) FOR FURTHER
INFORMATION