



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**

ASHE Post-AAHE

Sylvia Hurtado,
University of California,
Los Angeles



Due to recent events, I feel compelled to share some observations about ASHE, as a developing organization. I received a few emails from members when we heard the sad news about the end of AAHE, a long-standing organization dedicated to higher education issues and what some might call our "motherhip." ASHE evolved from the group of scholars who met annually at AAHE, along with administrators interested in the study of higher education. In fact, there is still an AAHE group that remains interested in research that might find a community within our organization.

It should be noted, however, that there were signs for a number of years that suggested problems on the horizon for AAHE and most of their major activities had found homes in other organizations long before their Board voted to shut down. For example, *Change* magazine is owned and operated by HELDREF Publications and only the editorship rested in AAHE. The editorship of *Change* was promptly transferred to the Carnegie Foundation on the Advancement of Teaching with approval of their board of directors. Conversations with the President of AAHE before their Board vote did not suggest anything that ASHE would likely inherit.

The demise of AAHE came, at first, as a surprise, and the event provoked some thinking about the void that is now left in the wake of its board's decision. It raises new issues for ASHE: How large of a membership do we want to achieve? Could we accommodate the participation of more administrators than we have in the past, or identify new ways to link administrators with the most recent

research in the field? A number of ideas were generated at the last ASHE board meeting via telephone, and this conversation is likely to continue over the next year. One thing is clear, we now know the consequences of attempting to achieve too many purposes. Remaining focused can be a strength for an association.

Given this historical event in the field of higher education, I want to assure members that ASHE is an organization that continues to grow and, in many ways, all signs indicate that we are thriving. We continue to establish much of the infrastructure necessary to sustain the organization over the long term. For example, it will be a little more than year now that we have employed a full-time Executive Director, a move that should enable us to become better organized and do more for the membership. Formal procedures are being developed for different aspects of ASHE business. We find ourselves in a good position to think about how to best invest our resources, we have an advancement volunteer (John Burkhardt, University of Michigan) to advise the President, and a new ad hoc committee was established to help determine policies relevant to funding and partnerships.

Most significantly, the ASHE Board recently voted to place the reserves in a series of accounts with higher interest rates under a plan that ensures flexibility. The plan, devised by Steve Desjardins and Diane Dean, with the assistance of Dennis Brown, will make our reserves work for the organization. Reserves are critical to maintain in case of a disaster with a major conference or the need to pay staff and creditors in the event that we too have to shut down (unlikely for ASHE at this stage but undoubtedly a real possibility with membership-based higher education organizations). We hope that this recent move will enable us to undertake new initiatives as well as attract speakers to our annual meetings (before this year, we did not have an actual budget for speakers at the national conference). ASHE continues to take many first steps as the organization continues to develop.

In addition to financial stability, we are 1,800 members strong, the Councils on Public Policy and International Education, and Committee on Ethnic Participation are lively intellectual communities. Moreover, we continue to invest in the development of young scholars in informal ways as well as formally through graduate student activities, the Graduate Policy Seminar, and Lumina Dissertation Fellows. In short, each year a new part of the foundation is laid by a group of committed

individuals (the President, Board Members, working committees, and committed volunteers throughout the organization) that work to ensure a solid future for ASHE. There is still a lot of work to be done in a developing organization, and it takes time to put into place, but all indications suggest an upward trajectory.

Finally, we are moving quickly toward an annual meeting that promises to be one of our most successful ever! With the assistance of the Association for Institutional Research, and the Executive office at Michigan State University, we have moved rather smoothly into an online, proposal submission process. Our national conference will feature public scholars who are attempting to further the social responsibility of higher education through research and practice: Amy Guttman (President the University of Pennsylvania and author of many works including *Democratic Education*) and Beverly Tatum (President of Spelman College and author of many works including *Why Are All The Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?*). In addition to our loyal members across the nation and globe, we hope to attract many local scholars and administrators from the tri-state area who may be new to ASHE. Deborah Carter, program chair, provides further details about how things have developed for the conference over the summer in this issue. I hope you are having a wonderful summer and are looking forward to a rejuvenating conference this fall.

**PHILLY 2005: ASHE Conference—
Bigger and Better than Ever**
Deborah Faye Carter, University of
Michigan

The past eight months, and particularly the last two, have been busy for the 2005 ASHE Program Committee. Since the proposal deadline of May 4, 2005, the Committee has worked nonstop to send proposals for review, receive, and evaluate reviews and make decisions about which proposals will be accepted and combined into coherent sessions for the November annual conference. As part of this process, the Committee met in Ann Arbor on June 24th to discuss proposal reviews and the final, accepted proposals. The ASHE Office sent out email notifications of proposal acceptances and rejections around mid-July. I would like to express my sincere thanks to the Program Committee for all of its hard work. It really has been a joy to work with the committee over the last year.

The 2005 ASHE Program Committee in charge of the main conference consists of: Vasti Torres, Susan Jones, and Karen Kurotsuchi Inkelas for the Students Division; Kevin Kinser, Jerlando F. L. Jackson and Brian Pusser for Organization and Administration; Lisa Lattuca and Thomas Nelson Laird for Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum; Elizabeth Creamer and Joshua Powers for Faculty; Andrea Walton and Marybeth Gasman for Contexts and Foundations; Michael Bastedo and Denise O’Neil Green for Policy, Finance, and Economics; and Wynetta Lee and Darnell Cole for Methodology and Assessment and “Open” Divisions. This is the second year that an “Open” Division was an option for proposal authors. Last year, the Open Division received more proposals than expected and the same phenomenon occurred this year.

We had some new challenges this year with the online system and the Committee handled the process with aplomb. With the exception of a problem with uploading tables and figures, the inaugural year of the online submission process went smoothly for most authors. The ease with which people were able to submit proposals may have contributed to the large increase in proposal submissions this year. Last year, approximately 540 proposals were submitted. This year, more than 700 proposals were submitted to the main conference!

The theme of the conference is “The Social Responsibility of Higher Education.” As part of this theme Sylvia Hurtado has designated six Presidential Sessions:

- (1) Public-Private Cooperation and Conflict in International Contexts
- (2) Collective Action: The Role of Higher Education Associations in Helping Institutions Meet Their Social Responsibility
- (3) Targeting Talented, Low-Income Racial/Ethnic Minorities for College: Results of the Gates Millennium Scholars Program
- (4) Access and Opportunity: Taking a Broad View
- (5) Academic Capitalism and Social Responsibility
- (6) Diversity and Democracy: Instructional Impacts.

In addition to the featured Presidential Sessions, the 2005 ASHE Conference will have two major addresses. Amy Gutmann, President of University of Pennsylvania, will give the keynote address on Thursday evening. The title of her address is “Educating for Citizenship: Locally and Globally.” Beverly Tatum, President of Spelman College, will give the second major address on Saturday morning.

As with previous years, there are specific sessions on the ASHE Program for newcomers and graduate students. Diane Dean and Kimberly Rogers, graduate student members of the ASHE Board of Directors, have been in charge of designing the sessions. Thursday at noon before the main conference, there will be a Newcomer's Orientation and Thursday evening is the Newcomer's Reception. Saturday features the Graduate Student Luncheon and Roundtables with graduate students and invited discussants chairing roundtable discussions on research topics, phases of the dissertation process, the job search, and other topics of interest. In addition to the orientation, reception, and luncheon, there are two topical sessions that may be of interest to graduate students: (1) Methods and Issues in Higher Education Research and (2) Follow the Yellow Brick Road: Non-Academic Careers in Higher Education.

I look forward to seeing many of you at the 2005 ASHE Conference. I would like to thank all the proposal authors, reviewers, and those who have agreed to be discussants and chairs. We will have an exciting conference in November, and it is because of all of your collective involvement in this process. See you in Philadelphia!

FEATURED COLUMN

The Federal Role in Shaping Contemporary Postsecondary Policy

Brian Pusser, University of Virginia

Over the past three decades a considerable amount of research and scholarship on postsecondary policy has focused on state-level initiatives. This is understandable, given that most postsecondary institutions in the United States have been chartered at the state level, enroll a significant portion of in-state students, and in the case of public institutions, receive essential funding from state block grants (Heller, 2001). In higher education research, the federal role has historically been treated in a more episodic manner, with significant attention turned to the Morrill Acts, the GI Bill, and the passage of HEA (Higher Education Act), while considerably less work has been devoted to events in between. More recent research on the federal role has primarily addressed the provision of financial aid, the allocation of research funding, and national efforts to increase access and equity (Savage, 1999; Garcia, 1997; St. John, 2003).

An argument can be made that the balance of attention in research on postsecondary policy is shifting in the direction of federal action. A number of factors are driving this new focus. The contemporary rise in the relative significance of federal financial aid and tax policy, the growing prominence of postsecondary lobbyists based in Washington, D.C., increased Congressional attention to institutional accountability and accreditation, the growth of multi-state provision of courses and degrees, emerging research on higher education in global and comparative national contexts, and the increasing importance of federal courts in shaping postsecondary policy have combined to heighten interest in the ways in which federal activity shapes the postsecondary landscape (Pusser and Wolcott, in press; Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004).

This increased interest in federal policy initiatives is not limited to higher education; scholars of health care, technology transfer, fiscal policy, community development, and myriad other arenas have also turned attention to the growing federal role in policy making, and to the state-federal dynamic in shaping institutional structures and processes. These efforts have also generated considerable interest in a specific aspect of federal activity, the increasing prominence of the executive branch. Although there are a number of emerging areas of postsecondary interest at the federal level, three are of particular interest to contemporary research in higher education: the fiscal allocation process, the negotiations over the current reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, and the impact of Presidential appointments on colleges and universities.

The President's Budget

One key component of the allocation of federal funds to higher education is the President's budget. The opening paragraph of the introduction to the Overview of the 2006 Budget states,

"The 2006 Budget builds on the progress the President and Congress achieved in meeting the priorities of the Nation during the first term. We are funding efforts to defend the homeland from attack. We are transforming our military and supporting our troops as they fight and win the Global War on Terror. We are helping to spread freedom throughout the world. We are promoting high standards in our schools, so that our children gain the tools they need to succeed. We are promoting the pro-growth policies that have helped to produce millions of new jobs and restore confidence in our economy.

And we are taking additional action to enforce spending discipline” (OMB, 2005).

While the administration’s future priorities are consistent with its first term in office, there is remarkably little attention to higher education. The reason for the relatively minor status of postsecondary education in the budget is further underscored by the three major criteria that drive the allocation process. The first priority is that a given program “meets the Nation’s priorities,” and the nation’s priorities are defined in the budget rationale as follows: “The Budget increases funding to strengthen our Armed Forces, improve our homeland defenses, promote economic opportunity, and foster compassion” (OMB, 2005).

The second priority addresses whether the program is an appropriate use of federal funds, that is, whether it serves an appropriate federal role. As one example, Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings was asked recently about whether she thought colleges and universities should “work more actively to make sure that multiple points of view are being heard in the classroom or in campus speakers.” She concluded, “There’s lots of institutions and lots of different cultures, and so that’s the kind of thing that parents need to be able to evaluate, and students themselves, when they make a selection. That’s not something that the federal government is going to get into. We’ve got the local-control thing. That’s something for states and governing boards and academic faculties to see about” (Burd, Field and Selingo, 2005). In contrast, late in 2003, Republican House Representative Jack Kingston introduced a measure to create an Academic Bill of Rights designed to “take partisan politics out of America’s colleges and universities” (Kingston, 2003). The extent of the federal role is similarly debated throughout the negotiations over the Budget and over HEA. How that issue is adjudicated will powerfully determine the future direction of national and state postsecondary policy.

The third priority in the President’s Budget also has significant implications for the future of federal influence on higher education, as it seeks to determine whether a program produces the intended outcome. The Bush administration has established a Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) that “measures the success of programs in meeting goals and identifies which are achieving their intended results and which are not” (OMB, 2005). In most cases where funding cuts are proposed for higher education in the President’s budget, at least a portion of the rationale for the reduction is a failure to pass

muster with PART. This raises some significant challenges going forward for those complex postsecondary programs and services that are difficult to measure.

The budget numbers themselves offer insight into the administration’s priorities for higher education. The 2006 Budget would raise the maximum Pell grant award from \$4,050 to \$4,150 with increases to \$4,550 over five years, a rate of increase considerably smaller than was achieved during the Clinton administration (Burd, 2004b). The budget also offered small increases in funding for research under the auspices of NIH and NSF, and designated \$250 million for a new program to improve access to community colleges. The President noted the proposed Pell grant increase and the community college initiative in his 2005 State of the Union address, yet the Bush budget also proposed cutting the Perkins Vocational and Technical Education programs, which provide over \$1 billion annually for community college vocational programs. The budget would also cut a number of existing federal programs designed to support postsecondary access for financially disadvantaged students, including all of the current funding for the Perkins Loan program (loans for students with lower family incomes), TRIO (assisting low income students to overcome barriers to higher education), GEAR UP (funds for middle-school outreach and preparation) and the LEAP program, a federal program for matching state need-based aid. Taken together these programs accounted for some 900 million dollars in FY 2005.

The magnitude of the cuts led one reporter to suggest that the Bush administration’s approach to student preparation, financial aid, and support for academic research would constitute “the most radical change in a decade” (Selingo, 2005). At the time of this writing the House of Representatives was taking a different - and somewhat more generous - approach to funding postsecondary initiatives. The Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations restored most of the TRIO, GEAR UP, and Perkins Vocational funding, while cutting the maximum Pell to \$4,050.

The Congress and the Higher Education Act (HEA) The most recent round of the reauthorization of HEA has generated considerable congressional action on key postsecondary issues. House members have questioned the rapid increase in college costs, direct student lending arrangements, accreditation practices, and the standards of credit transfer. Republican Representative Howard McKeon has been

particularly active on the issue of college costs, and has suggested that some forms of federal funding might be linked to institutional performance on cost containment. Republican Representative John Boehner has suggested the need for significant changes to student lending practices and the House education committee has supported legislation that would monitor and report on the rate of college tuition increases. Members of Congress have also been engaged in efforts to expand the reach and competitiveness of for-profit providers, a group that has been increasingly active in direct lobbying efforts. According to the Chronicle, in the most recent cycle, “Mr. Boehner received about \$136,000 from lenders, and \$102,000 from for-profit schools; and Mr. McKeon got about \$175,000 from the student loan industry, and \$126,000 from proprietary institutions,” (Burd, 2004a). Congressional Democrats also have received significant contributions from groups with interests in higher education policy.

The White House, Appointments, and Postsecondary Policy

Another key executive branch lever is the appointment process. The Bush administration has shaped postsecondary policy through appointments to myriad federal advisory boards and councils in the Department of Education, the Department of Health and Human Services, and to the federal courts. As would be expected, many of these appointments have generated significant opposition from Congressional Democrats. In remarks to a National Academies of Sciences committee on appointments, Democrat Representative Henry Waxman noted that to a degree unmatched in his experience over the past thirty years,

“The present Administration has a disturbing pattern of treating advisory committee appointments as politics by any other means. Nationally renowned experts have been dropped from panels without explanation, or after flunking ideological litmus tests. New advisors have been hand picked by political appointees despite having scant scientific credentials“ (AIP, 2004).

Presidential nominations to federal courts also have great significance for postsecondary policy and are contested accordingly. Three policies in particular, the use of affirmative action in postsecondary admissions and hiring, the implementation of Title IX provisions, and access to college campuses for military recruiting, are likely to be shaped over the next decade by recent or impending appointments.

The resignation of Justice Sandra Day O’Connor from the United States Supreme Court will also likely alter the postsecondary legal terrain. O’Connor sided with the 5-4 majority that voted to allow the use of race-conscious criteria in admissions decisions in *Grutter v. Bollinger*, and she has been instrumental in a number of other decisions shaping access and equity in public sector institutions.

The Federal Role in the Future

Policies shaping postsecondary education are currently enacted in an increasingly complex, competitive, and polarized political environment. The rise of federal influence in postsecondary policy making serves as a reminder that as the intensity of policy conflict increases, so does the terrain of contest. From an historical context in which postsecondary policy conflicts were likely to be adjudicated in unique arenas, institutional, local, state or national, we now find policies shaped across all of these sectors; and as Simon Marginson notes elsewhere in this newsletter, globally. Examples abound: the focus on outcomes and assessment that has been a matter of debate within institutions and state legislatures for over a decade has been given considerably more salience by the current conflict over the implementation of a key piece of federal legislation, the No Child Left Behind Act. The Bush administration’s longstanding effort to support charter schools and educational choice programs in local K-12 schools has recently informed the debate over state higher education voucher programs in Colorado and Texas. National higher education associations seek to influence Congressional legislation that would reshape regional accreditation and institutional curricula. As with most protracted and polarized contests with broad significance, these contests will increasingly be shaped by legal rulings that will emerge in sequence from local, state and national courts. The membership of ASHE, with its diversity of research perspectives and disciplinary lenses, and its strong support of policy-centered scholarship, has already begun to make significant research contributions in these various arenas, with the promise of much more to come.

References

American Institute of Physics (2004) “Rep. Henry Waxman’s Views on S&T Advisors in Policy Making.” *FYI: The AIP Bulletin of Science Policy News* FYI Number 108, p. 1. August 9.

Burd, Stephen (2004a) “Selling out Higher Education Policy.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education* Volume 50, Issue 47, Page A16

<http://chronicle.com/prm/weekly/v50/i47/47a01601.htm>

Burd, Stephen (2004b) "Where they Stand on Higher Education," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* Volume 51, Issue 4, Government and Politics. September 17.
<http://chronicle.com/prm/weekly/v51/i04/04a00102.htm>

Burd, Stephen, Kelly Field and Jeffrey Selingo (2005) "The Education Secretary's Knowledge Campaign," *Chronicle of Higher Education* vol. 51, #24, p. 24a.
<http://chronicle.com/weekly/v51/i24/24a02701.htm>

Garcia, Mildred (1997) *Affirmative Action's Testament of Hope: Strategies for a New Era in Higher Education* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Heller, Donald E. (2001) *The States and Public Higher Education Policy* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press

Kingston, Jack (2003) "Congressman Kingston introduces Academic Bill of Rights." Congressional website:
http://www.house.gov/kingston/rls_AcademicBill.htm

Office of Management and Budget (2005) "Overview of the President's 2006 Budget." Washington, D.C.
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2006/overview.html>

Pusser, Brian and David Wolcott (in press) "The New Politics of Higher Education Lobbying," in *Earnings From Learning: The Rise of For-Profit Universities*, Breneman, David W., Brian Pusser and Sarah E. Turner (eds.). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Savage, James D. (1999) *Funding Science in America: Congress, Universities, and the Politics of the Academic Pork Barrel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Selingo, Jeffrey (2005) "Bush Budget Takes Aim at Student Aid and Research." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, v 51, #21, pg. 24. February 18.

Slaughter, Sheila and Gary Rhoades (2004) *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State and Higher Education* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press

St. John, Edward P. (2003) *Refinancing the College Dream* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Thinking Globally: Where to Now for the World Bank?

Simon Marginson, Monash University, Australia

For those of us concerned with development education, comparative and international education, and the state of higher education around the world, Paul Wolfowitz's arrival as the George Bush-nominated President of the World Bank is a key moment. It raises fundamental questions about the orientation and policies of the world's largest multilateral lender.

Clinton's nominee James Wolfensohn (1995-2005) wanted another term as President of the Bank but was never going to get it. His efforts to drag the Bank back halfway toward the political centre, transform its internal culture, focus harder on the elimination of poverty and environmental issues, and build the capacity of states in developing nations so as to render them more effective local instruments of Bank policy, were only partly successful. The Bank inherited by Wolfowitz (who combines master diplomatic skills with a deep ideological commitment to the Bush administration's global agenda) is unstable and uncertain. This makes it more vulnerable to a programmatic makeover and a long lurch to the right.

Wolfensohn was an activist who promised to make the Bank more sensitive to the needs of developing nations. He instituted a process of self-criticism whereby the Bank at least partly acknowledged the failure of past 'structural adjustment' policies, which had left struggling states further in debt, and the failure of environmentally and socially damaging projects, such as the resettlement schemes in the Amazon and the large dams at Arun III and Sardar Sarover in South Asia. He focused on 'good governance' - though in practice, inevitably, the Bank found it impossible to break ties with key state machines that sustained wide scale corruption, such as the Suharto regime in Indonesia - and also emphasized the need for civil institutions in developing nations. Wolfensohn also strengthened the Bank's links with the non-government (NGO) sector. It was selective, favoring NGOs that could be more readily 'house-trained'.

In higher education the Bank's policy orientation was somewhat deepened and pluralized. Like all of the Bank's perspectives, lending regimes in education continued to be dominated by neo-classical economics, and by the power structures of steering from a distance, whereby the Bank sustained the autonomy of national governments while at the same time forcing them to reinvent their social policy and cultural agendas. The Bank's blueprints for reform in higher education continued to mirror Anglo-American norms of business models of university organization, competition and performance regimes, student charges in place of free education, and closer economic relations with industry, regardless of whether families or local industry had the private capacity to fund higher education. Everywhere the Bank encouraged the formation of a private commercial sector, often with subsidized loans and other government assistance, and the corporatization and often break-up of national public university systems.

At the same time under Wolfensohn the Bank began to admit that past education policies had not worked and that different approaches might be needed. There were encouraging signs, for example the 2000 report of the Task Force on Higher Education in the Developing World, *Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and promise*. The Co-Chair of the Task Force, Mamphele Ramphele, was Vice-Chancellor of the University of Capetown in South Africa and an articulate critic of past Bank policies. The Task Force's report argued against the Bank's traditional formulaic reliance on economic calculations of the rate of return to education which (because of incomes forgone by students, and the downplaying of collective benefits) always produced the conclusion that lending resources should be channeled into primary education rather than upper secondary and higher education. More than two decades of such policies had led to impoverished higher education systems all over the developing world, undue reliance on American and European doctoral training, one-way patterns of brain drain affecting many nations, and negligible research. The report was particularly harsh on the Bank's failure to augment education in Africa.

Ramphele was appointed to a senior position in the Bank and its reports began to develop a more plural policy consensus, emphasizing public as well as private investment, and acknowledging market failure and the need for public institutions in some areas. At times the Wolfensohn World Bank found itself polemicizing against low quality, low unit cost strategies that it had used itself. Take, for example,

its comments on online distance education provision in the report on *Constructing Knowledge Societies: New challenges for tertiary education* (2002).

How deeply these more social democratic strands entered the thinking of the Bank economists, and its officials on the ground, is another matter. Under Wolfensohn, for the most part, despite the Bank's occasional forays into indigenous knowledges and the wider sweep of some appointments like that of Ramphele, its officials remained culturally bound by Washington-generated agendas and perspectives. The Bank never really stopped being steeped in the belief that it always knew better. More importantly, as an institution, it never set aside the comfortable illusion that permeates Washington, liberals and conservatives alike, that the inherent superiority of the 'Western' lifeworld and value set is proven by the global dominance of the USA. This mind-set ensured that after all, the Bank under Wolfensohn would continue trying to achieve results by suborning local governments, and reducing nationally distinctive cultures to subaltern status. A development meta-strategy, which forces the recipients of its beneficence to choose between taking the money and retaining their self-determining identity, is one that in the end is guaranteed to fail. This is heart of the matter.

The politics of Wolfensohn's tenure shows the limitations of strategies for renovating the Bank that destabilized its structure and activities, yet failed to dig really deeply into what was wrong with it. Wolfensohn wanted to maintain the authority and continuity of the Bank while steering it in a new direction on several fronts. It couldn't be done.

The February 2000 report of the Commission on International Financial Institutions Advisory Commission headed by Alan Meltzer produced the finding that 70 percent of the Bank's lending was concentrated in only eleven of the 156 member countries. Similarly, 80 percent of the Bank's resources were paid out to the better-off nations that enjoyed positive credit ratings and could raise their own funds in the international capital markets. The failure rate of the Bank's projects was not only high, it was higher in the poorest societies (65-70 percent) than overall (55-60 percent). Wolfensohn might have used the Melzer report as devastating evidence of the Bank's failure to reduce poverty and driven hard to reform the institution root and branch. Instead, he cast round for allies to defend the Bank. Wolfensohn's much trumpeted efforts to scale down developing nations' indebtedness also ran into trouble. In the end, the circle of eligible nations

dramatically shrunk, only 6.4 percent of the total debt of the world's poorest countries was covered, and less than half of the eligible nations could meet the increasingly restrictive conditions imposed on them.

Wolfensohn's Poverty Reduction Strategy Programs began to look increasingly like the much discredited structural adjustment programs they had replaced. The Bank also continued to back environmentally damaging programs, such as the Chad-Cameroon pipeline and the China Western Poverty Reduction Project. In addition, environmentally destabilizing dams and power plants continued to secure support. On some calculations the proportion of lending monies applied to bona fide environmental improvement actually fell during Wolfensohn's Presidency.

Meanwhile, inside the Bank, Wolfensohn never obtained complete authority. He was resisted by many of the technical economists at the heart of the Bank, seen as an outsider, a publicity seeker, a loose cannon who would have to be outlasted. Because Wolfensohn left much of the structure of the Bank intact, his own appointments never secured full policy control.

The outcome is that Wolfowitz has been provided with dream conditions as he starts his tenure. Within the Bank, he can pose as restorer of sound policy and organizational stability, as he strips away the more unorthodox and less neo-liberal strands of rhetoric, shuts down those programs more independent of unilateral American interests, and moves to support the export of Bush-style democracy and the suppression of self-determination in the Middle East.

The question posed by Wolfensohn's tenure was 'Can an institution with a flawed program like that of World Bank change its spots, yet keep on being the World Bank?' Judging by Wolfensohn's tenure, the answer is 'no'. The World Bank is too big and too politicized and too central to global capitalist interests, especially to Western interests, to be changed by a single individual with a more enlightened set of values - even an individual that is as charismatic, determined, energetic, and occasionally cunning as was James Wolfensohn.

ASHE Policy Seminar for Advanced Graduate Students

The Twenty-Eight Annual Graduate Student Seminar on Higher Education Policy will be held immediately

prior to the ASHE Annual Meeting in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on November 16-17, 2005. Each higher education program may nominate advanced doctoral students who have a demonstrated interest in higher education policy. Please submit nominations by September 26, 2005.

The Policy Seminar provides advanced graduate students with opportunities to meet and interact with researchers and other individuals who are knowledgeable about critical policy issues in higher education, policy formation and formulation, as well as state politics.

This year's Policy Seminar will be held at the Wyndham at Franklin Plaza in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, which is the headquarters hotel for the ASHE Annual Meeting. The Graduate Policy Seminar will begin at 1:00pm on Wednesday, November 16th and conclude shortly before noon on Thursday, November 17th (just prior to the start of the Annual Meeting). The seminar fee of \$45 per person covers materials, dinner on Wednesday, breakfast on Thursday, and refreshment breaks.

Please complete the nomination form (nomination form will be on the ASHE website, conference 2005 information) and send no later than **Monday, September 26, 2005** to:

Cheryl D. Lovell, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Higher Education Program
Associate Dean, College of Education
University of Denver
2450 S. Vine St.
Denver, CO 80208
cdlovell@du.edu

POINT OF VIEW Legitimacy and the Quality of our Work

anthony lising antonio,
University of Stanford
2004 ASHE Researcher of the Year
Award Recipient

"You really should publish more pieces outside of those higher ed journals. The quality of those journals is just not that good. I've chaired a tenure review committee for a higher ed person, and I've read those journals. The quality of the stuff in there is really a notch below."

As I listened to his words, I wondered, where did *that* come from? One of my AERA colleagues -- not a Division J member -- was giving me very sincere advice for my career. He seems to respect me as a scholar, and he wants me to succeed. Are our primary professional journals -- the Review of Higher Education, the Journal of Higher Education, and Research in Higher Education really "a notch below"? Does higher education research lack rigor, sophistication, and significance?

I have reviewed manuscripts for the three aforementioned journals and have reviewed regularly for a handful of others, including AERA publications (American Educational Research Journal and Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis) and a disciplinary journal, Psychological Science. In my experience, the standards for publication are quite similar across them. Of the manuscripts I have reviewed over the years, I estimate an acceptance rate somewhere between one in seven and one in ten.

But to compare acceptance rates misses a more important issue. Whether or not my estimation of the quality of higher education research or the estimation of my colleague is accurate, what is certain is that my (respectful) colleague takes a dim view of our field. And based on many conversations over the years with (non-higher ed) education scholars, sociologists, psychologists, and economists, his view is not unusual.

Nationally, the reputation of educational research has taken a serious beating since the introduction of No Child Left Behind. The bill called for "evidence-based policy and practice" and consultation of only "scientifically-based education research," implying that the majority of research on education was poor, and furthermore, untrustworthy for policy development. The theme continued with the reauthorization of OERI, a bill said to "improve the quality of federal scientific research in education by requiring that research be based on valid, scientific findings" and "bring education science up to the standards of scientific inquiry that has given us the most advanced medical system in the world." As higher education researchers -- a relatively young community of scholars sitting in the shadows of the larger educational research community -- I believe we suffer from a reverse halo effect. If most research in education (read K-12 education) is wanting of scientific standards, then higher education research must have no standards whatsoever.

We all have spoken with other education scholars and with "disciplinarians" (those working in a traditional

discipline) about the research in our fields; most do not hide their assessments of quality. The disciplinarians view educational research as lower forms of work in their subfields. In their view, the "best" (most scientifically rigorous and trustworthy) research on education is published in the American Economic Review, the American Sociological Review, and the American Psychologist, not AERJ or RHE. And, it is conducted by scholars residing in traditional departments, not colleges and schools of education. Within the education community, our status as scholars is similar. Many of our K-12 colleagues are unfamiliar with our journals but hold articles published in Educational Researcher and the Harvard Educational Review in high esteem. So it is not surprising that my colleague wants to see me publish more regularly in journals such as those above -- non-higher education journals.

The issue of status and legitimacy within and outside the world of academics and scholars is complex. Restructuring a status system is not a task we can easily tackle with a few tweaks of our professional processes and a quick chat with neighboring scholarly communities and skeptical policymakers. We can, however, begin with a bit of self-examination. As a professional community, we can examine more closely our scholarship-producing structures, from the training in our graduate programs to the review processes for our conferences, journals, and books. And as individual professionals, we can monitor our own work.

With regard to our own work, I am sure we are all aware of our weak spots. I have seen my share of blind reviews, and I try to catalog the faulty areas in my head in an effort to submit increasingly better quality papers in the future. As a blind peer reviewer, a lot of rejected manuscripts have also passed across my desk. The flaws that befell them were no more egregious among those targeted for a higher education journal than for a general education journal or a disciplinary journal. The problems I encountered in those ill-fated manuscripts, however, seemed entirely avoidable if some due vigilance was taken somewhere in the research process. Here is my catalog of some of the more common problems I have come across:

- Use of convenience samples: Convenience samples are typically ill suited to answer the research question. Common missteps include inappropriate generalizing beyond a particular population or context, conducting statistical analyses on small samples with low power, and drawing conclusions on variables with little or unique variation in the sample.

- **Poorly framed research problems:** Problem-framing is perhaps the most important step in the research process. The most poorly framed research problems are presented as either self-evidently significant or with little framing beyond, "no studies to date have looked at X." Assessing the contribution of a study that is poorly framed is practically impossible. It should be the first step in an investigation, yet it appears to be one often skipped.

- **Loose connections between conceptual framework and methodology:** For those studies in which a conceptual framework is appropriate, frameworks are essential for drawing conclusions about the relationships under study. When they are absent or loosely defined, it is difficult to judge how the researcher considered alternative explanations or counterevidence in the design of the study. Conceptual frameworks are also critical because they are the theoretical anchors to the raw data. Even an appropriate framework that is poorly operationalized into constructs and/or variables can severely limit interpretation of the most careful analyses.

- **Lack of qualitative methodological detail:** Qualitative research has certainly grown in popularity and acceptance in our field, and the content of our journals and conference programs reflect that growth. Concurrent with that growth is the submission of either poorly conducted or poorly documented qualitative studies. Documentation is extremely important, as it is the primary way that validity is established. When methodological details such as sampling method, number and length of interviews, analytical method, and strategies used to establish credibility, dependability, transferability, and confirmability are given short shrift in a manuscript, the quality of the research is suspect.

- **Overdrawn conclusions and implications:** It seems that there is an overwhelming amount of pressure among educational researchers to make their work relevant to policymakers and practitioners. While it is in our purview to affect the practice of education, not all of our work is particularly well-suited to do so. We all want to make impactful statements and recommendations about things we care about, but without solid empirical footing, such statements can read more like lines out of an op-ed column than from an academic journal.

With these examples I don't mean to imply that higher education manuscripts submitted for publication or conference presentation are subpar or that a great number of them fully exhibit any of these

problems. I have encountered various problems along these lines in manuscripts outside of our field as well. My point here is that many submissions arrive in the reviewer's mailbox in need of a fair amount of improvement, and it seems clear that some due diligence is in order. If we are to take proactive steps to remedy a most serious issue of credibility and respect outside of our community -- where it counts most for influencing policy -- then an important first one is for each of us to monitor the quality our own work.

As a community we should begin a conversation regarding the legitimacy of higher education research in other scholarly communities and in the minds of policymakers as well as the general public. As individual scholars we should take steps to ensure the quality of our work is the best possible. We should not easily accept compromises to our research designs without exhausting all alternatives to gain access to the proper population, collect the type and amount of data necessary to answer the research questions, and use the most appropriate analytical methods available. We should take pains not to submit that paper for publication or presentation that is not quite ready. And we should take such pains for ensuring quality whether we are writing a journal article, a conference paper, or an op-ed piece for the newspaper.

At stake is nothing less than our voice in educational reform and the relevance of our profession in a society that is increasingly distrustful of social science.

PERSPECTIVE

From the Other Side of the Fence

Diane R. Dean, Illinois State University

I received an enthusiastic email from one of my students. She wrote to tell me that she had co-proposed a paper to the ASHE 2006 Annual Conference based on her collaboration with one of my faculty colleagues. A graduate student who has a solid career in university administration and who, until now, projected her future along that same career path, she had been excited by the world of scholarship she witnessed at the 2005 Annual Conference in Kansas City (her first). Eager to return this year, "Thank you for introducing me to ASHE!" she gushed.

I well remember my own first ASHE Annual Conference in Richmond. It stands out not because of

its relative recentness, but because of the deep impression the Association made on me as a newcomer. An advanced doctoral candidate, I had joined ASHE later than some students might have. Like the student in my course, my career path had been in university administration and pointed down an administrative path. My primary professional association was AAHE. On a graduate student budget (remember that?) I couldn't afford multiple memberships. Joining a second association was a luxury.

I came to ASHE partly out of intellectual thirst – the desire to hear first-hand current and critical scholarship in the field of higher education – and partly out of sociological curiosity. Having grown increasingly attracted to scholarly life through serving as a research assistant to two professors, I wanted to see and experience the culture of an academic association and discover whether or not it would resonate with me. I came ... and I fell in love.

That first conference was an exciting experience, intellectually and socially rewarding. I appreciated ASHE's many structures and traditions for socializing newcomers and facilitating interaction among members, from the special newcomer's orientation and mentoring program to the array of events and receptions (on that grad student budget, I assure you I was at all of them). I also discovered and connected with the Association's vibrant graduate student membership. A warm and welcoming culture, I was deeply impressed by the approachability and general good will among ASHE members.

Intellectually, the conference was everything I had hoped it would be. The meeting rooms and hallways hummed with critical discourse on higher education. I heard presentations and engaged in conversations that both strengthened and challenged my own thinking. I met like and disparate minds; heard new ideas and heard old ideas reexamined from new perspectives. My faculty mentor, to whom I am forever grateful, introduced me to many of the men and women whose works I had read and whose thinking I admired. I likened that experience to meeting higher education's rock stars.

I left that first conference with my luggage jammed full of conference papers, business cards, newly purchased books, flyers, and notepads scribbled with thoughts and with a deep sense of having found a new home. I wanted to get involved and, since that first year, have continually sought out ways to participate in the life of the Association through both scholarship and service. It's been my privilege and

pleasure to support various aspects of ASHE life, such as conference programming, publications, and the governing Board, and to begin to add my own voice to the discourse. Each small step of involvement has opened up new possibilities and the opportunity to make new friends and colleagues.

It was the modeling and influence of ASHE members that wooed me from administration to academe.

I'm on the other side of the fence now, having entered faculty life in fall 2004 as a new Assistant Professor and moved from graduate student to full Association membership. One of my missions as an advisor has been to encourage student participation in ASHE. As in most higher education programs, the majority of students in my University's program are full-time professionals. I support their involvement in their various professional national associations, of course, but I encourage them to get involved in their academic association as well. I emphasize that it's critical for practitioners to be connected to the source of scholarship for their fields. I also believe we benefit from the perspectives of the practitioners among us.

The feeling on this, the other side of the fence, is a sense that ASHE really belongs to me and I to it. Along with that feeling is the newfound responsibility to be generous to those behind me, mindful that first impressions matter, that we influence new member retention and thereby perhaps shape the future generations of our field, just by how we welcome and integrate graduate students and newcomer-practitioners. Now when I seek out ways to increase my participation, I do so not only to encounter ideas and opportunities but also to increase my capacity to give to those who will come after me.

I've enjoyed bringing my students to ASHE, connecting them with graduate student networks, encouraging them to participate in sessions and add their own voices, and introducing them to colleagues including the same men and women who first welcomed me.

I read the email over again. "Thank you for introducing me to ASHE!"

As I typed out my reply, I thought of my own first ASHE conference and smiled with deep satisfaction, pleased with the impression we had made upon her. I wondered whether to suggest that she bring a bigger suitcase. She may need it for all those papers...

CAHEP CORNER

Dianne Avery Brown Wright, Florida
Atlantic University

CAHEP (Council for the Advancement of Higher Education Programs) was founded in 1997 as a standing committee of ASHE. The primary purpose of the Council is to enrich the teaching and learning experiences of students and faculty in the Association's constituent Higher Education programs. It is the duty of the Council to advance the welfare of degree programs in the United States and Canada, and to bring forth recommendations as it sees fit before the Association and its Board of Directors.

This year's meeting agenda will begin with Wednesday evening roundtable discussions related to issues pertinent to the advancement of higher education programs and a dinner speaker and culminate Thursday morning beginning with a continental breakfast and the election of next year's leadership team.

Please join us!

CAHEP PROGRAM AND BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday Evening

November 16, 2005, 5:30 pm

Roundtables 5:30 – 6:30 pm

Dinner 7:00 pm

Dinner Speaker 7:30

Thursday Morning

November 17, 2005

8:30 am Continental Breakfast and Welcome from
the President, ASHE

9:00 am Roundtables – Reporting Out

10:30 am Business Meeting and Election of Officers

11:30 am – Adjourn

Attention

**Higher Education Program Leaders, Directors,
Coordinators!!**

Call for Proposals

2005 CAHEP Roundtable Discussions

Deadline for Proposals: August 31, 2005

The Council for the Advancement of Higher Education Programs is hosting its 8th annual program meeting on November 16, 2005 at the 30th Annual ASHE Conference being held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania November 17-19, 2005. CAHEP invites Higher Education program leaders, directors and coordinators to submit proposals for roundtable discussions on the following topics:

- Marketing Higher Education Programs
- Mentoring New Higher Education Faculty
- Higher Education Program Standards and Guidelines
- Supporting Small Higher Education Programs
- The Higher Education Core Curriculum
- Dissertation Advising Strategies
- Collaboration and College Partnerships

Proposals should be sent (as an e-mail attachment) to **Dr. V. Barbara Bush**, University of North Texas, bbush@coe.unt.edu by Wednesday, August 31, 2005.

Policy & Politics in Higher Education: Another Steamy Summer in Washington

Scott L. Thomas, University of Georgia

Having struck out in the 108th Congress, those waiting for a reauthorization of the Higher Education Amendments of 1965 (HEA) are hoping that the 109th Congress proves more decisive on the single largest piece of federal legislation impacting higher education. As of July 1 the House continues to trumpet reports of its progress within Rep. Boehner's, an Ohio Republican, *Committee on Education and the Workforce*. Indeed, there has been a fair amount of activity. Among the more interesting events taking place within Boehner's committee was a hearing in which a rather sharp difference of opinion emerged between the CPPHE's own Don Heller and Professor Mark Vedder (economics, Ohio University) over the role played by federal student financial aid in rising college costs. Transcripts of the testimony can be found at <http://edworkforce.house.gov/hearings/109th/fc/collegeaccess041905/w141905.htm>. The testimony speaks for itself. Nice job, Don.

However, despite the claims of progress in the House there still seems to be more smoke than fire. Most of

the serious work on the House side remains targeted on language that would expand eligibility for federal student aid—an expansion accomplished largely through a relaxation of the regulations governing distance education enterprises' participation in the HEA's Title IV student aid programs. Although the Senate has been relatively quiet on HEA, individual senators continue to promote related legislation (e.g., Senators Graham, a Democrat from Florida, and Rodham Clinton, a New York Democrat, introduced the Non-Traditional Student Success Act).

Perhaps more telling than the activity in Boehner's committee and scattered rhetoric and proposals in the Senate is the recent action within the House Appropriations Committee subcommittee on education. In a clear swipe at President Bush's proposal to eliminate a number of programs seen as key to ensuring access of students unrepresented backgrounds, the Republic controlled appropriations subcommittee took an opportunity to signal the priorities of House Republican leadership—priorities that are on many points sharply divergent from those of the President.

While still far too early to gauge the ultimate success of these actions, they nonetheless suggest that Congress is really interested in maintaining its commitment to programs, such as Gear Up and TRIO, which prepare students from low-income backgrounds for college. Perhaps more surprising is the subcommittee's continuation of support to the Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership, a program that has been on the endangered species list for the past several years. This may serve as a sign that Congress believes it can indeed make effective use of such matching programs to influence policy at the state level. (I call your attention to a thoughtful piece on a related topic by Sandy Baum, which appeared in the March 4, 2005 issue of the *Chronicle*).

From all of the above one might safely conclude that it's far too early in the game to predict anything, including a successful reauthorization in the 109th Congressional session. However, clearer—perhaps telling—patterns of behavior and activity are beginning to emerge.

While movement in Washington proceeds in what seems like geological time, relative speed of movement within the CPPHE might be better measured in Galilean Space-Time. You will recall that the Council sought nominations for three positions this year: Vice Chair, Secretary, and Member at Large. Nominations closed on May 16.

The Nominations Committee (Jim Hearn, David Leslie, Bruce Johnstone, and Cheryl Blanco, chair) will review the submissions and assemble a slate of candidates. Voting by the ASHE membership will take place in September and results will be announced during the Council's meeting in November. Please take time to give thought to the slate when it appears and VOTE! I will step down as the current chair of the Council at our November meeting in Philadelphia and our vice-chair, Don Heller, will assume the chair position for the 2005/2006 year. I know I speak for the entire Council (Don Heller, Laura Perna, Jaci King, Alex McCormick, and Bill Zumeta) when I say we look forward to seeing you in November.

Graduate Student News

Diane R. Dean, Illinois State University
Kimberly R. Rogers, State University of
New York at Buffalo

Although the summer has officially just begun, we need the graduate student members of ASHE to start thinking about the annual conference in Philadelphia this November. We hope that students have helped us fulfill some of the objectives we noted in the January 2005 newsletter by submitting proposals for review, volunteering to chair a session, and making plans to attend and participate in the Graduate Student Luncheon and Business Meeting at ASHE this fall. Last fall was the first time that the meeting featured roundtables by students who presented overviews of their interest in topics ranging from curriculum to organizational theory. As per your numerous and helpful suggestions, this fall, we are extending the concept of the roundtables by having one to two students per table spend five minutes discussing their dissertation research, their methodology, and the manner in which they chose their dissertation topics. In addition to having students "chair" several roundtables, we have also invited panelists to discuss the dissertation process, searching for the first job after graduate school, as well as other topics that are of interest to advanced graduate students.

We are pleased to announce that the upcoming annual conference will once again feature a session on non-academic careers. This session is back by popular demand, and we have recruited some wonderful individuals from federal and state policy organizations and private foundations to discuss their job responsibilities, as well as the career and educational paths they took to their current positions.

We encourage students who do not seek careers in the academy to come and bring their questions.

All graduate students who wish to participate more fully in ASHE as a conference intern should monitor the ASHE listserv announcements carefully during the summer. Conference interns, in return for a waiver of the registration fee, will assist with registration for a few hours during the annual conference. In August, we will send out a call, soliciting nominations. Once again, we would like faculty to nominate their students for these positions and students to seek nominations from their faculty advisors if they have an interest in serving in this capacity.

We are working closely with Dennis Brown, the Executive Director of ASHE, to update the website to include a link with all the pertinent information for graduate students. Once the website has been updated, students should be able to find information specific to graduate students concerning ASHE membership, past and future conferences, and detailed contact information for Kimberly and Diane.

Finally, please do not forget to cast your vote for a new graduate student representative later this summer when the ASHE Executive Office sends the announcement to the listserv (please remember that only current members have voting privileges). Diane Dean is completing the second year of her two-year term, and we will soon welcome a new graduate student as a voting member of the ASHE Board of Directors.

Enjoy a wonderful summer break, and as always, feel free to contact Kimberly or Diane if you have any questions about ASHE or need additional information.

Diane R. Dean, drdean@ilstu.edu
Kimberly R. Rogers, krr154@psu.edu (after August 1st, Kimberly can be reached at krrogers@buffalo.edu)

Soft Money

David DiRamio
Auburn University

Soft Money investigates contemporary issues in grant funding and higher education research. This includes helpful tips designed to give the reader a competitive edge when searching and applying for grants. In addition, information about useful Web sites,

fellowships, and scholarships is periodically provided. If you have any questions or would like additional information, contact the Soft Money columnist, David DiRamio, at (702) 256-8236 or diramdc@auburn.edu

AERA session: Funders and Funding Opportunities in Higher Education

I set out to be your eyes and ears at an important AERA session in Montreal. Division J - Postsecondary Education hosted an informative question and answer gathering with representatives from three foundations: Lumina Foundation, W.K. Kellogg Foundation, and The Spencer Foundation. This session was recorded (see www.aera.net/annualmeeting/?id=300 for ordering information). In this issue's **Soft Money** column, I've identified some themes that emerged from the session.

Focus on Student Success and Access

Each representative spoke to the notion that a majority of the next wave of funding dollars will target higher education research focused primarily on students, access, and outcomes. Much of the emphasis will be on underserved populations, especially students of color, rural students, GED recipients, recent immigrants, adult learners, and incarcerated individuals. Tony Berkley from Kellogg spoke of "engaged partnerships" between communities and postsecondary institutions (see www.wkkf.org/Pubs/YouthED/Pub665.pdf for more information). Michael McPherson from Spencer discussed grant opportunities for higher education researchers in topics, such as "learning organizations" and research, perhaps tying back to K-12 students. See the "areas of inquiry" page at the www.spencer.org Web site for more information. Spencer also features a "Small Research Grants Program," which might be ideal for junior faculty or researchers.

Databases and Decision Making

Dewayne Matthews from Lumina talked about the possibility of grant opportunities in database development and use for higher education decision making. He noted that continued efforts to incorporate software, such as Global Information Systems (GIS), for displaying information from large databases was desirable, because it enhances the value of the information for use as a strategic tool. Of course, Lumina continues to have a program focus on community colleges "aimed at improving the success

of students, particularly those in groups that have been underserved in higher education." For more information see www.luminafoundation.org/newsroom/Jan2005/AtD.html.

NOTABLES

Michelle Nilson,
University of Nevada Las Vegas

This is ASHE's posting place for news about people, places, publications, and other items of interest in higher education. Keep your friends and colleagues apprised of your news, whereabouts, recommendations, kudos (yours, others), new book titles, announcements, awards, and website information. Please take time out of your busy schedule to toot your own horn or to pay homage to others—send your articles, snippets, and photos to Michelle Nilson, email address: nilsonm@unlv.nevada.edu

Distinctly Notable

Dr. Elizabeth G. Creamer, Associate Professor in the department of Educational Research and Evaluation at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University recently received the Excellence in Research and Creative Scholarship Award from the College of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences.

The awards committee acknowledged Elizabeth at a ceremony this past April, stating, "Elizabeth's work in recent years has focused on the way in which faculty members conduct their work. Specifically, she has explored the intersections of faculty productivity and collaboration. She has been described as a faculty member who engages in important work, conducts complex analyses in the most rigorous manner, and disseminates her findings broadly and convincingly. She is a nationally recognized expert whose ground-breaking work has laid the foundation for new avenues of exploration."

Archie W. Earl, Sr., Associate Professor of Mathematics was selected for the University of Alabama Summer 2005 Research Program in Metallurgical and Materials Science. The workshop is designed to provide faculty members in the physical science disciplines (e.g., math, physics, chemistry, astronomy, etc.) with an in-depth introduction to Materials Science and Engineering. It is expected that they, in turn, will return to their

respective institutions and incorporate some of the knowledge and skills they gain from the workshop, into their courses (where appropriate) and inform their undergraduate students about the graduate school and career opportunities available in Materials Science and Engineering.

John Foubert just received a \$273,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Education to conduct a 2-year study of the effects of a rape prevention program on first-year, male college students. The grant will cover a study of 600 first-year men, and includes some support funds for an "RV Tour" to spread this evolving program to campuses across the country. More information on the RV tour can be found at www.nomorerape.org.

Marshall Gartenlaub received the honor of this year's Mertes Award for Excellence in Community College Research presented by the Association of California Community College Administrators-ACCCA. Each year ACCCA honors the author(s) of a substantial research project that has significantly contributed to our understanding of the effectiveness of community colleges and higher education. Named for Dr. David Mertes, former Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, the Mertes Award acknowledges and honors outstanding research - either a dissertation or topic-specific project on community colleges and to encourage continued research on substantive issues facing higher education.

Jeanne L. Higbee, University of Minnesota, received the American College Personnel Association's Voice of Inclusion Medallion at ACPA's 2005 annual conference.

Brian Pusser was selected as the recipient of an AERA Division J Outstanding Publication Award for his journal article "Beyond Baldrige: Extending the Political Model of Higher Education and Governance." The article was published in *Educational Policy*, Volume 17, Number 1. The award was presented at the 2005 AERA conference in Montreal.

The Center for Assessment of Higher Education (CAHE) is the latest addition to the research centers housed within the College of Education at the University of Maryland, College Park. The mission of the new center will be to develop and foster collaborative, interdisciplinary research focusing on assessment of the quality of education and research in university settings. It will also have a role in

providing consultation services in other areas of assessment. CAHE is co-directed by Chan M. Dayton, chair of the Department of Measurement, Statistics and Evaluation, and Dennis M. Kivlighan, Jr., chair of the Department of Counseling and Personnel Services. The center's associate director is Rachelle L. Brooks. For further information on CAHE, contact Brooks via email: rlbrooks@umd.edu.

Notable Moves

Robert Berdahl, Professor Emeritus of the Higher Education program at the University of Maryland, has been invited to serve as Visiting Scholar in September and October at the University of Oslo. The Higher Education program there was chosen as one of a group of five locations for the European Union Erasmus Program Master's Degree in Higher Education.

Brent Cejda has accepted a position as Associate Professor at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. He was previously an Associate Professor of Higher Education at Texas Tech University.

Marietta Del Favero will join the University of New Orleans, Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling and Foundations as an Assistant Professor. She is moving from Louisiana State University, Department of Educational Leadership, Research, and Counseling.

David DiRamio has accepted a position as Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology (EFLT) at Auburn University.

Harold V. "Hal" Hartley III joined the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) in January as Director of Research. Hartley comes to CIC from Nashville, where since 1995 he had been with the General Board of Higher Education & Ministry of the United Methodist Church, most recently as director of student ministries, vocation and enlistment.

Stephen Katsinas has accepted a position as Professor and Director, Center for Educational Policy at the University of Alabama. Prior to this position, he was a Professor and Chair of the Priest Center for Community College Education at the University of North Texas.

Dongbin Kim has accepted a position as an Associate Professor at the University of Kansas. She was previously a Research and Policy Analyst at the

National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities.

Larry Leslie has joined the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia as a Distinguished Senior Fellow in Residence.

Michael T. Miller has been promoted from Associate Professor to Professor, Higher Education Program at the University of Arkansas.

Regina Mitchell has accepted a position as the Director of Distance Education at Mid Michigan Community College. Previously, she was the Coordinator of Off-Campus Programs for the Faculty Center for Innovative Teaching at Central Michigan University.

Christopher Morphew has accepted a position as Associate Professor at the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia. He was previously an Associate Professor at University of Kansas.

Daniel P. Nadler has accepted a position as the Vice President for Student Affairs at Eastern Illinois University. Previously, he was the Associate Vice President for Student Affairs at Tulane University.

The Graduate School of Education (GSE) at the University of Pennsylvania is pleased to announce the addition of **Laura W. Perna** to its faculty. Dr. Perna will join the Policy, Management, and Evaluation Division as an Associate Professor this year. Her strengths in quantitative methods and higher education policy, as well as, her commitment to social justice complement the strengths of the Penn GSE faculty and will be welcomed by students.

Myron L. Pope has been promoted from Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs to Vice President for Enrollment Services at the University of Central Oklahoma.

Laura I. Rendón has been appointed Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. She can be reached at lrendon@iastate.edu. She previously held the Veffie Milstead Jones Endowed Chair at California State University, Long Beach.

Kimberly Rogers has accepted a position as Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy at SUNY-Buffalo.

Sheila Slaughter has been selected as the Louise McBee Professor of Higher Education at the Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia. The

Louise McBee Endowed Professorship was established to honor state Representative Louise McBee for her more than 25 years of service to the University of Georgia. Previously, Dr. Slaughter was the Program Director, Societal Dimensions of Engineering, Science, and Technology, National Science Foundation, and Professor of Higher Education Administration, Science, Technology, and Policy Studies, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona.

Dr. Terrell L. Strayhorn recently accepted a position at The University of Tennessee-Knoxville as Assistant Professor of Higher Education.

Jon Travis is now the Assistant Dean in the Office of Graduate Studies and Research in addition to his position as professor of Higher Education in the Department of Secondary and Higher Education, at Texas A&M University-Commerce.

Notable Reads

Michael W. Galbraith, Professor of Leadership Studies at Marshall University Graduate College, was guest editor of on "Mentoring Adult Learners" in the *Adult Learning Journal*, volume 14, (1). Instructors and administrators will find useful information and alternative viewpoints on the topic of mentoring. The majority of articles are focused toward higher education.

"Creating Knowledge, Strengthening Nations: The Changing Role of Higher Education" has just been published by the University of Toronto Press. Edited by Glen A. Jones, Patricia L. McCarney and Michael L. Skolnik, this collection is an important contribution to the literature on how universities advance economic growth and entrepreneurialism while contributing to strategic societal goals of equity and redistributive justice. Contributors include Peter Scott, James Duderstadt, George Subotzky, Ruth Hayhoe, and David E. Bloom. More information is

available at:

<http://www.utppublishing.com/pubstore/merchant.ihtml?pid=8285&step=4>

George Keller's 2004 book, "Transforming a College" (Johns Hopkins Press), has gone into a fourth printing. His essay on international leadership, "Higher Education Management Challenges and Strategies", will soon appear in *The International Handbook of Higher Education*, edited by ASHE members Phil Altbach and James Forest. And another contribution, "The New Demand for Heterogeneity in College Teaching", can be read in the forthcoming Vol. 24 of "To Improve the Academy", an annual publication of the Christian Johnson Institute for Effective Teaching, based at Rollins College in Florida.

Higher Education for the Public Good: Emerging Voices from a National Movement Adrianna J. Kezar (Editor), Anthony C. Chambers (Editor), and John C. Burkhardt (Editor) ISBN: 0-7879-7382-3, Hardcover, 384 pages, April 2005, Jossey-Bass.

Robert Rhoads and Carlos Alberto Torres have a book coming out this fall titled, "The University, State, and Market: The Political Economy of Globalization in the Americas" to be published by Stanford University Press. The edited volume focuses on the changing context of university reform, given the growing influence of neoliberalism and the marketization of the academy. It includes chapters from Noam Chomsky, Atilio Boron, Boaventura de Sousa Santos, Marcela Mollis, Sheila Slaughter and Gary Rhoades, Estela Bensimon and Imanol Ordorika, Ken Kempner and Ana Loureiro Jurema, and Daniel Schugurensky.