



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

Estela Mara Bensimon  
University of Southern California

Thank you Cheryl, Mimi, and Doug

The work of ASHE is largely sustained by the generous contribution of time by individual members and when they decide to step down we suddenly realize how critical their work is to the operations of the association. Three long-time volunteers have submitted their "resignations" and I want to use this opportunity to thank them for their dedication and commitment to ASHE.

Cheryl Lovell of the University of Denver has been the Chair of the Graduate Policy Seminar for several years. For many of the regular members their first introduction to ASHE has been through the Graduate Policy Seminar. When Cheryl announced that she was stepping down and we exchanged several email's about the responsibilities of the Chair I suddenly realized how much we depended on her. On behalf of the Board and the many graduate students who have had the good fortune to participate in the seminar I extend my most sincere appreciation to Cheryl for having shaped the seminar into one of ASHE's most successful initiatives.

Mimi Wolverton of the University of Nevada at Las Vegas has served as Editor of this Newsletter under

eight presidents. I imagine that if asked, she would say that the greatest challenge she faced as Editor was in getting the columns from the president and others on time. Under Mimi's leadership the newsletter has been a means of sharing information as well as a forum for publishing work-in-progress by newer scholars. Thank you Mimi for being firm and making sure that the newsletter was published and distributed on a regular basis.

When I officially became president at the Sunday morning meeting in November 2005 one of the greatest challenges I faced was convincing Doug Toma, our volunteer legal counsel, to continue serving for one more year. Luckily I succeeded. Doug has played a very critical role on the ASHE board. Both Sylvia Hurtado and I, and I am sure the same is true for the previous presidents, have called on Doug for advice on a variety of transactions and decisions, ranging from contracts with publishers to the review and updating of the By-Laws. I particularly appreciated Doug's willingness to respond in the moment, the wise advice, and the good humor.

### Money Matters

One of the roles of the President is to dedicate time to raising funds to underwrite many of the extra costs associated with the Conference, including invited speakers, receptions, materials, etc. This year we have been particularly fortunate to receive grants from various private foundations, including: the WKKellogg Foundation, The James Irvine Foundation, The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and The Lumina Foundation for Education. We are very grateful for the generous contributions from these long-time friends of higher education.

### ASHE Board holds Summer Meeting in Los Angeles

The ASHE Board of Directors held the annual summer retreat in June in Los Angeles. We had a very packed agenda but we worked very efficiently and collaboratively and by the time the meeting came to an end we were proud to say that we had made decisions on most of the items on our long agenda.

The retreat agenda was organized into three topic groups whose work was organized by Kelly Ward. The groups were:

#### 1. Structure and Organization

Members: Deborah Carter (convener), Diane Dean, Laura Perna, Sylvia Hurtado, and Judith Glazer-Raymo.

The structure and organization work group was charged with making recommendations on issues related to publications, the councils, the Graduate Student Policy Seminar, and the ASHE Community Meeting.

## 2. Budget and Finance

**Members:** Steve DesJardins, (Convener), Kimberly Rogers Frankie Santos Laanan, Ashley Sieman, Dennis Brown

The budget and finance work group was charged with making recommendations on issues related ASHE conference and membership fees; accounting system; financial audit; and the budget implications of the ASHE membership mix, e.g., faculty vs. students.

## 3. By-Laws

**Members:** Doug Toma (Convener), Linda Johnsrud, Michael McLendon, Susan Twombly.

The By-Laws work group was charged with making recommendations on the role of the Legal Counsel and need for professional legal services; and the relationship between the board and councils.

### Summary of key decisions made at the retreat

- The Chair of the Publications Committee and the Chairs of the four councils: Ethnic Participation, Policy, International, and Higher Education Program Directors will serve as ex officio member on the ASHE Board of Directors, providing direct access for its members and action on committee recommendations.
- Appointment of new or additional editorial board members should be given final approval by the Publications Committee and should not require Board approval.
- To place a time-limit on the tenure of individuals who are charged with coordinating the Graduate Student Policy Seminar in order to not take advantage of their good will as well as to increase service opportunities for other members of the ASHE community.
- To allocate a maximum of \$10,000 to the conference budget for the president's use for the honoraria and/or expenses to secure speakers for the annual conference.

- To raise conference registration fees to \$95 (pre-registration) and \$140 (on-site) for regular members, \$60 (pre-registration) and \$95 (on-site) for graduate students, \$60 (pre-registration) and \$95 (on-site) for emeritus, and \$125 (pre-registration) and \$150 (on-site) for non- members.

---

To avoid any appearance of a conflict of interest, the article from M. Christopher Brown, II has been temporarily pulled until the completion of the election for the Board of Directors.

---

## **ASHE 2006: Borderlands/Borderlines in Higher Education**

Brian Pusser

University of Virginia, Program Chair

It seems like just yesterday that ASHE President Estela Bensimon and I first organized a planning session for the ASHE 2006 program committee at the close of ASHE 2005 in Philadelphia. Nine months later the 2006 program is complete and we are looking forward to an exciting and enlightening annual conference in Anaheim. This year we received more proposals than ever, over 750 for the main conference and some 827 in total. It would not have been possible to put together the program without the support of the entire ASHE community.

Space does not allow me to credit all of the individuals who reviewed proposals, agreed to serve as chairs and discussants or offered wise counsel in the process. To all of you whose volunteer efforts made setting the program possible, my sincere thanks. Thanks also to Dennis Brown and Shannon Brecheisen at the ASHE office and to Ben Baez and Deborah Carter for sharing their wealth of experience and enthusiasm as program chair emeriti. My deepest appreciation goes to the Program Committee members for their commitment and contribution. From steadfastly navigating the online review system to braving the summer heat of Charlottesville for the program meeting, the committee members were outstanding. The members of the 2006 program committee members were Robert Teranishi, Heather Wathington, Leticia Oseguera and Shaun Harper for the Students division; Joe Berger, Crystal Muhammad and Alma Maldonado for the Organization and Administration division; John Thelin and Kirsten Turner for the Contexts and

Foundations division; Judy Ouimet and Alicia Dowd in the Teaching, Learning and Curriculum division; Kenneth Redd and Paul Umbach in the Method and Assessment division; Marvin Titus and Frances Contreras in the Policy, Finance and Economics division; Ken Kempner and Joanne Cooper in the Faculty division; and Dudley Doane and Imanol Ordorika in the Open division. Kate Shaw served as program chair for the Public Policy Forum and Heather Eggins served in that role for the International Forum. Kimberly Rogers designed the special sessions for graduate students and Diane Dean coordinated the Newcomers' activities for this year, while Scott Lloyd provided assistance on a number of essential program projects. When you see these individuals in Anaheim please be sure to thank them in person for their contribution of time and energy on behalf of ASHE.

This year's conference theme of Borderlands/Lines served as the organizing principle behind the two major addresses and seven presidential sessions. Dr. Marcelo Suarez-Orozco, Courtney Sale Ross University Professor of Globalization and Education, New York University will give the keynote address on Friday evening, entitled "Migration and Education in the Global Era." On Saturday morning, Dr. Juliet V. Garcia, President of the University of Texas at Brownsville will present a major address, entitled "Blurring the Borders." This year we have also scheduled a keynote presidential session, entitled "Admissions and Omissions: How 'The Numbers' are used to Exclude Deserving Students," led by Dr. Darnell Hunt, Professor of Sociology and Director of the Ralph J. Bunche Center for African American Studies at the University of California at Los Angeles.

The conference presidential sessions incorporate a wide range of scholars of higher education arrayed in the following sessions:

- Promises to Keep: Financial Aid, College Access, and Democratic Participation
- Postsecondary Institutional Responses to Hurricane Katrina: Lessons One Year Later
- Behind the Borders of Access and Equity: Educational Disparities among College Men of Color
- Emerging Perspectives on Student Success
- Higher Education Journals in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century
- NAFTA and Higher Education Markets: The Invisible Hand Revealed

As in years past, we will have a variety of events at the conference designed to welcome newcomers to ASHE and to fully incorporate graduate students into the proceedings. We have also moved the ASHE business/community meeting from its traditional position at 7:00 a.m. on Saturday to 6:15 p.m. on Saturday where it will serve as a capstone gathering for the conference. Details on the various addresses, sessions and events, as well as conference registration and hotel accommodations are available at the ASHE web site. I would like to thank all of those who contributed to this complex and exciting conference program. I look forward to joining you in Anaheim for ASHE 2006!

---

To avoid any appearance of a conflict of interest, the article from Adrianna Kezar has been temporarily pulled until the completion of the election for the Board of Directors.

---

## **Policy and Politics in Higher Education:**

**Reflections on the New Accountability in Higher Education: The Potential of Performance Compacts**  
William Zumeta  
University of Washington

So, why all the talk about accountability in higher education in recent years within ASHE and in the larger world of higher education? The days of the isolated "ivory tower" distanced from the rest of society seem long gone. Although this chagrins some, upon reflection it is hardly surprising. The globalization of fierce economic competition focused on quality, rapid innovation and cost, and fueled by the stunningly fast pace of technological change, have had a profound impact on American business and more recently on thinking in government. This has raised expectations sharply for outcome-based performance by all kinds of publicly supported programs, including human services, such as health, welfare, and K-12 education. At the same time that performance expectations are ratcheted up, societal tolerance for high costs of operation per unit of output has declined. Increasingly, competitive global markets ensure this in the business sector, and market elements also play a role in parts of the public sector now, but, primarily, individual and corporate

taxpayers are sensitive to taxes. High costs in public services mean high taxes and taxes are decidedly out of favor.

In this climate one could hardly expect higher education, which still derives a large share of its revenues from tax sources, to be exempt from the pressures and expectations at work in the larger society and economy. Moreover, in higher education the costs, which taxes do not cover, are largely met by students and their parents and these groups have become highly sensitive to the long climb in prices, which have nearly tripled (after adjustment for general inflation) since 1980. The fact that the tax share of total higher education costs is down over this period while the student/parent share is up, widely lamented by higher education insiders and analysts, only enhances the political pressures on the enterprise to find ways to be more cost-effective.

As in the other sectors mentioned, public officials and business constituencies seek both lower per-student costs (or reduced cost growth) and better results. Indeed in higher education there are some special reasons for heightened interest in these because: (a) in many states demand for higher education is growing simply because the “baby boom echo” is swelling the ranks of high school graduates, and (b) these leaders have begun to get the message that postsecondary education—and academic R & D—are strategically important to the economic competitiveness of their states and regions and higher levels of participation are needed. These latter facts plainly point to the need for increased investment in higher education capacity but leaders facing tax resistance, constricted budgets, and many difficult-to-resist spending pressures from health care, criminal justice, and K-12 education look for indicators of efficiency and accountability as a *quid pro quo*. Policymakers want to see more *graduates* as well as greater enrollments, and business leaders call for better-prepared graduates and more in fields where workforce needs are greatest. Other outcomes, such as contributions to the competitiveness of local industries and to improving schools, are of interest to states as well.

In this context, the old mechanisms for ensuring social accountability of American higher education no longer seem fully up to the task. One key mechanism for this, dating back to the colonial colleges and much admired elsewhere in the world as an alternative to direct political or bureaucratic control of academe, has been the lay campus governing board of trustees. (Note that the word itself conveys their position of social trust.) This has been

supplemented in recent decades by similarly conceived statewide policy and governing boards for higher education made up of leading citizens. These devices have certainly had some success historically in buffering the campuses from the worst of political interference and micromanagement and for a long time seemed to provide generally adequate assurance that someone other than the academics alone was minding the store.

Professionally-based accreditation has also played an important role in institution- and discipline-level quality assurance with federal and state governments long requiring that institutions pass this test to be officially recognized or eligible for various government programs, such as student financial aid. Now, however, trustees and state boards are often seen as too infused with their charges’ perspectives to be capable of fully assuring public accountability. At the same time, accreditors are regarded as similarly partially captured and unable to push hard enough for quality. These tried and true accountability mechanisms can surely be criticized but they have shown signs in recent years of being capable of responsiveness to societal changes. Boards of trustees, with their heavy tilt toward influential business people, are certainly paying more attention to outcomes and efficiency and accrediting bodies have been, in the main, urging colleges and universities to focus on assessing student learning and other outcomes. These arrangements surely continue to serve an important purpose in the overall social accountability regime for higher education.

State boards of higher education have a role to play too. They can produce useful statewide data and can serve as a convening authority for coordinating activities among the institutions. They can also document the results of accountability efforts. Although hampered if too beholden to institutional interests, not supported well enough to keep quality staff, or if not fully representative of all postsecondary providers, at their best these bodies can provide credible policy analysis and advice to policymakers independent of the institutions. Most of them, however, seem to lack, even at the board level, the clout, and perhaps the perceived independence, to exercise true policy leadership in and for higher education. Something new is needed in many if not most states.

Turning to the specifics of accountability, the focus over the past decade has been largely on just that—institutional persistence and graduation rates, internal efficiency indicators, and such partial outcome measures as passing rates on occupational licensure

exams and, for universities, acquisition of extramural research grants. Also, some states' accountability efforts have given attention to enrollments or graduation of underrepresented students and a few to tuition containment. Some states became fairly aggressive about all this in the late 1990s but empirical studies—notably the series of annual surveys on accountability by Joseph Burke and colleagues at SUNY-Albany—show there has been a retreat in the present decade from efforts at linking performance on these indicators to substantial amounts of state funding. Indeed, there are sound reasons for *not* linking large shares of schools' basic funding too tightly to such inevitably partial measures.

Yet this has plainly *not* meant that generous state funding has been easy for institutions to come by recently in the absence of a clear demonstration that they are serving well and efficiently the interests and needs of those who support them. Instead a kind of stalemate has developed. On the one hand there is a growing acceptance that more broadly accessible higher education is critical in the modern economy and society but also a sense that neither simply funding the current structure more richly nor bludgeoning the current denizens of it with narrowly conceived efficiency mandates are attractive strategies. A capacity to articulate authoritatively statewide public needs regarding higher education, some of which go well beyond the scope of any single institution, and to envision *systemic* efficiencies—including better linkages to the K-12 sector and community colleges—seems called for at this point if necessary new investments in higher education are to be catalyzed. Crucial also are new, broadly acceptable approaches to affordability of higher education for students and to more stability of both tuition and state funding in the face of the inevitable ups and downs of state economies.

One possibility for encompassing the full range of pressing issues and the need for policy leadership in a novel way revolves around an idea circulating around the country under various names, here called the “performance compact.” While there is some variation across states, the basic idea is that state higher education and finance agencies, colleges and universities, other relevant stakeholders, such as K-12 education, workforce and economic development agencies, business and other key community interests, and most importantly the governor and key legislative leaders, come together to hammer out goals and performance expectations (and indicators) for higher education, as well as a commitment to adequate plans, support, and stability to reach the

goals. Goals and measures encompass matters that span across institutions and even sectors like assuring better pre-college preparation of students via alignment of curricula and testing that should reduce the need for remediation at the postsecondary level, creating more efficient linkages between 2-year and 4-year college curricula including preparation for specific majors, improving services to underserved communities and regions where a new campus is too costly, and reducing skills shortages in local labor markets; as well as institution-specific measures like improvement of student retention and graduation rates.

Participants must also confront frankly the related problems of higher education capacity, affordability, cost, and funding stability for recent patterns in these do not facilitate accessibility. A broadly participative, authoritative arena for thoroughly addressing performance and resource requirements simultaneously may make it possible to get beyond the usual disjointed gamesmanship and short-term thinking that plagues higher education policymaking now. Typically also steps would be taken in a performance compact to free up institutions from cumbersome state controls on management decisions, as has been done in the recently negotiated Virginia compact. This step is based on the idea that public organizations functioning in today's fast-moving environments need the freedom to be nimble in responding and able to seek their own efficiencies but at the same time must be publicly accountable for results.

The crucial outcome of the process should be a new compact among the parties that codifies updated and specific understandings about what results will be achieved, by whose (often interdependent) actions, and with what resource expectations. If well led—in most cases determined gubernatorial leadership is probably required to move beyond business as usual—such a process has the potential to accomplish several purposes. It should educate the parties to see that current institutionally focused efforts often create a whole less than the sum of its parts. It should convey and build common ownership around the interdependent efforts required to establish and achieve state goals for higher education, which in turn are derived from goals for the economy and society. And, it should push all parties to confront realities about state finances. In the end the goal is to produce mutually reinforcing commitments that have some hope of surviving inevitable economic cycles and political turnover. External stakeholder involvement can play a particularly important role on

this last point as they can help hold all sides to their commitments.

The challenges and constraints facing American higher education, and indeed the states themselves, in the modern world seem beyond the reach of current institutional structures and standard venues for policymaking. Something new is required and the contemporary performance compact idea at least provides a framework and an arena to begin to create what is needed.

---

## Thinking Globally Immigrants, Globalization, and Educational Transformation in Japan

Ken Kempner

Southern Oregon University

Misao Makino

Mejiro University, Tokyo, Japan

As political and cultural forces in the US confront one another over immigration, Japan too is facing similar dilemmas. Whereas the US has historically relied on immigrants to help fuel its labor needs, Japan is only more recently importing labor. Although the quality of Japan's educational system in producing the high-end "salary man" is world renown, filling the needs of labor at the lower- and mid-levels is more problematic. With a declining birth rate, Japan must seek labor for the industrial and service needs of Japan, Inc. Of particular concern for us in this column is how this new immigration in Japan is affecting higher education.

The increasing demand for foreign workers in Japan has ramifications, of course, beyond who is allowed entry into universities. As other countries have found, foreign workers do not always go home when their visas expire, yet their continuing education needs and those of their children remain. What then are the cultural effects on the educational and social systems when foreign workers and their children cannot further their education? This is especially critical in a high tech country, such as Japan, where immigration is a relatively new debate. Currently, there are approximately 2 million foreigners living in Japan (127 million population). Although a difficult statistic to determine, estimates are that 43,000 additional workers are in Japan illegally, of which 30% are Chinese, 15% Filipinos, and 14% Koreans. Not surprisingly, with all this new immigration,

intercultural marriages have increased from 7,200 in 1980 to over 36,000 in 2000. So, why is this a problem for Japan?

Entry into higher education in Japan has been controlled through the infamous "testing hell." Students are tested for entry to the next successive level of education, beginning in nursery school. Some top-flight nursery schools even test the mothers for admission before the child is born. This system is obviously closed to non-Japanese speakers, and it is virtually impossible for a foreign-born student to enter higher education in the traditional manner. A declining birthrate is making entrance to higher education less competitive, however. Some universities, typically private, have relented and are accepting students who have not gained admission through testing only. Most institutions still require testing for admission, since such tests are a huge revenue source for universities that they are not eager to relinquish. The larger educational dilemma when considering immigration issues, however, is what is to happen to the children of foreign workers or cross-cultural marriages when they reach postsecondary or higher education? Is Japan to keep its current dual educational system: one for Japanese and one for foreigners?

Brazilian immigrants provide an especially interesting example in Japan of this dual cultural and educational system. The largest external population of Japanese decedents is found in São Paulo, Brazil, where over a million 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> generation Japanese-Brazilians reside. Japanese-Brazilian workers are readily accepted in Japan because they appear Japanese, although few are fluent Japanese speakers. Most of these Brazilian-born workers are on short-term contracts and return to Brazil when their contracts expire. Through intermarriage, extension of work contracts, or violation of their visas, some of these Japanese-Brazilians attempt to stay in Japan. In response to the educational needs of this growing population of Japanese-Brazilians, newly created Brazilian Portuguese-speaking schools now serve these children. The problem of how best to serve the Brazilian-Japanese is not some far-off concern needing an eventual solution. They are in Japan now and ready for school. The problem will only get worse as these children mature and attempt to move into higher levels of education. Although many Japanese-Brazilians are from the working class, their children need more advanced educational opportunities to maintain the increasingly advanced technology to run Japan, Inc. Advanced technical training at the postsecondary level, similar to such offerings in US community colleges, is an

educational need not just for the Japanese-Brazilians but the Chinese, Koreans, and other foreign workers and immigrants as well. Although Japan may not yet be a melting pot for cultural and educational integration, the looming problem is clear for the children of immigrants, especially in higher education.

The depth of the educational problem immigrants are now posing for Japanese K-12 education and will soon pose for higher education is not lost on Japanese policy makers and intellectuals. In response, Japan is attempting to meet the globalization needs of international students by expanding opportunities in Japanese universities. For example, the number of international students in Japan has doubled from 64,000 in 1990 to over 120,000 in 2004. As with worker immigration, the predominance of international students comes from China (66%), Korea (13%), and Taiwan (4%). Although most of these international students return home, some students attempt to remain in Japan illegally, having gained entry as students.

To gain a better understanding of Japan's struggles with the benefits and disadvantages of globalization, particularly immigration, we have conducted a series of interviews with over 75 Japanese and international students, teachers, parents, business professionals, and foreign workers. Our goal in this study is to seek the perspectives both of Japanese and immigrants on the larger cultural and educational issues brought about through globalization. For this ASHE column we highlight, briefly, several responses from our interviews that illustrate the prominent globalization and educational problems immigrants face.

Responding to our inquiries about globalization, a Japanese student noted, "We are living on an island and we don't really know what is going on outside so well." Another Japanese student commented, similarly: "For many years Japanese institutions didn't have to think about anybody else being here....We are at the beginning of this whole transformation." From our observations and interviews regarding Japanese education, particularly higher education, we find also that this "whole transformation" is now underway. Almost as in an experimental study, Japan is the "before" and the US is the "after," regarding the dilemma immigration poses for education. Not that the US has solved the problem, but the US has already experimented, for example, with monolingual-German schools a century ago and is now in the midst of a battle over bi-lingual education and in which language the national anthem may be sung.

With respect to the educational problems immigrants face one international student explained: "There is no doubt foreigners have problems with the educational system." Similarly, a Japanese teacher observed: "If an immigrant student comes to school with no Japanese ability they are sure to fall behind. This makes their situation difficult later in life."

Immigrants are not the only students who have problems with the Japanese educational system, however. For example, a Japanese parent explained: "Bringing our children back to Japanese schools was very frustrating since they had been gone so long." Many returning Japanese children have no choice but to enroll in an international school instead of the Japanese system. Since they cannot survive the testing hell upon graduation they must also seek higher education elsewhere.

Both the Japanese and immigrants we interviewed do see great benefits accrued from globalization in education, however. One individual summarized these thoughts well: "Immigrants show us how to become part of the world community." Immigrants also provide cultural and intellectual enrichment beyond what is possible by drawing only on domestic talent. US universities and businesses have benefited enormously by attracting the best global talent. Whereas US policy has debated the benefits of immigration to enrich the knowledge and labor pool, Japan is only now facing this question.

To conclude this brief analysis we pose several unanswered questions for educational policy makers: How will immigrants receive higher levels of education in Japan? Is a dual educational system advisable or even sustainable? How will the needs for advanced professional/technical education be met in Japan—not just for its immigrants but for its working and middle classes? And, finally, how will Japan avoid squandering the potential intellectual and educational contributions of its immigrants, as the US is apparently doing? Both countries are in danger of ceding the intellectual wealth of immigrants to others—at their peril.

---

## **Celebrating Diversity: The Council on Ethnic Participation Building Upon our Sense of Community through Mentoring**

V. Barbara Bush  
North Texas University  
Consuella Lewis  
University of Pittsburgh

The Council on Ethnic Participation (CEP) supports the ASHE membership by facilitating ethnic participation, thereby expanding the sense of community among higher education scholars. Building on our established communities calls for every part of the organization to become involved in the professional development of each individual. A major part of full participation is mentoring--providing opportunities colleagues to learn from each other. In establishing a mentoring program, CEP calls upon ASHE members to contribute to the ongoing development of the membership. Only then do we become a full circle of scholars, supporting each other by providing one or our best resources—the willingness to share our professional experience.

The CEP invites the ASHE membership to participate in its mentoring program introduced in spring 2006. The focus of the program is to provide graduate students, new doctorate recipients, assistant professors, and associate professors with support and helpful information as they transition through various stages of their careers. You can serve as a mentor and/or as a protégé. If you wish to participate, complete the appropriate application/survey located on the CEP Web site, and return it as an e-mail attachment to Consuella Lewis ([lewisc@pitt.edu](mailto:lewisc@pitt.edu)). Completed surveys will be posted on the CEP Web site where protégés will select from a listing of participating mentors.

If you have questions, please contact the co-chairs of the CEP mentoring committee; Consuella Lewis, [lewisc@pitt.edu](mailto:lewisc@pitt.edu) or V. Barbara Bush, [bbush@coe.unt.edu](mailto:bbush@coe.unt.edu)

Join us in building upon our sense of community!

---

## **Graduate Student News**

Kimberly R. Rogers  
State University of New York at Buffalo  
Ashley Mouberry Sieman  
University of North Carolina

Conference Intern Program – We would like to remind all graduate students (master's or doctoral levels) who are ASHE members that they are eligible to apply for the ASHE intern program for the 2006 annual conference in Anaheim, CA. Each year, a minimum of four interns are selected to assist at the ASHE General Conference in exchange for conference fee waivers. This program is a wonderful way for students to meet ASHE staff and members, contribute to the Association, and defray some conference costs. Applications should be emailed to *both* Kimberly ([krrogers@buffalo.edu](mailto:krrogers@buffalo.edu)) and Ashley ([mouberry@email.unc.edu](mailto:mouberry@email.unc.edu)). We anticipate an application deadline of September 15, 2006, with decisions made by September 30, 2006 to enable our interns to make travel arrangements in a timely fashion.

Board of Director Elections – ASHE Board of Director elections will soon be underway, we want to remind all graduate students to vote! Graduate student members of the Association are \*voting members\*, and may vote for all available positions on the ballot (Vice President/President Elect; Member-at-Large; and Graduate Student Member-at-Large). This is your opportunity to help shape the leadership of the Association. Remember to check your email for the announcement from the ASHE office, which will include a link to the ASHE election ballot.

Upcoming news: In the fall 2006 newsletter, we will include detailed information on the graduate student sessions for the 2006 annual conference. These sessions have been created and scheduled completely on the basis of your feedback from the 2005 conference in Philadelphia. As always, you should feel free to contact us with questions, suggestions, or concerns.

---

## Surviving in the Academy At the Crossroads in the Tenure Process: Making Career Decisions Calvin D. Phillips

I spent most of my experience in higher education as an administrator and was overjoyed with the opportunity to land a teaching position after I had finished my doctoral degree. I felt with my practical experience in student affairs that I would make a difference as a faculty member in a student affairs master's program. I looked forward to doing so in lives of future professionals in the field as well as making a contribution to our field

The teaching opportunity I sought materialized as it offered a chance to develop my skills as a faculty member. What I did not realize was that I had no idea what I was getting myself into. For the first time I found myself working alone and in isolation. I was in a department made up of three different programs in which only two of us were responsible for teaching the student affairs program. I did not see a great deal of interaction or the encouragement of interaction among people. It was as if I were left in the middle of a busy intersection in a major city searching for some direction with no idea of how to get to my destination.

The "road map" I received consisted of a packet of information about the tenure process, but no one seemed to have time to explain what pieces I needed to have in place in order to pull together a solid tenure packet. In addition, I was told that the university valued teaching first and then research. I was given general idea that I should have a section that reflected scholarly work, service, and teaching.

### Scholarly Work

The scholarly work is an area that caused me the most concern. Trying to develop a true research agenda that would not only produce articles but one that would expand over a period of time is an endeavor that I had no idea what I was getting myself into. I actively sought others in the department to determine what my approach should be. In the end I obtained a variety of models that added to my already frustrated state of mind. I meshed their concepts with a framework that I thought was doable. I identified research that I would work on as well as looked at projects that I could work with others. I started to put together an aggressive timetable to complete the research and the articles. What I found in the process is that the demands of teaching took a toll on my

research. Other factors hindering my progress were lack of graduate assistants and funding sources, and I soon realized that I lacked the necessary tools to be successful.

### Service

This is one area that was not clearly defined, so I spoke to my colleagues to find out what they considered service. Once again, I found numerous ideas to fill this area of my tenure packet. I decided to actively engage with student affairs division at the university. I felt it was important that I have a connection to this area. At the same time I was getting the message from my department head to not over indulge by serving on too many committees or projects. They felt my focus should be on teaching and research. I found that by connecting with the student affairs division I could get projects that I could use for articles. The reason I was thinking like this is the fact I had no research monies and I had no support in identifying research dollars. In addition, I wanted to be more involved with my professional organizations, but once again that ugly word "money" became an issue. Also I started to notice in my yearly evaluation that my department head was concerned that I was not involved enough in any faculty governance structure. He wanted me to take a greater role in faculty focused committee work. Our chair was right about needing to get on a few faculty committees; he, however, did not realize that I had no connections to the faculty governance structure and did not seem to have any potential mentors. I couldn't get elected. I even volunteered for a committee but wasn't chosen. Breaking through this barrier was not likely to happen any time soon.

### Teaching

I have been trained as a teacher as an undergraduate. I understood that it would take at least three times teaching the same subject matter before I could put together an effective course. I believe we fail to communicate to new faculty that placing equal emphasis on developing courses, viable research, and service does not work. You have to choose in that first year or two what must be the first, second, and third tasks to be completed. I spent a great deal of time on my teaching and developing my research agenda knowing that it would be a trail and error method. I was so overwhelmed that I could not get a handle on teaching and research. I decided to put my energy into the teaching first and slowly build my research with the hopes that by my fourth year I would have a research component developed. Midway through my third year in the position, I began to question why I decided I wanted to be a

faculty member and I had no one to talk to about my frustration.

#### Decision Making Time

In my third year I started to see my teaching blossom. I realized that when you work for a small student affairs master program that you have to be willing to balance a number of things at the same time. You have to be able to teach a number of courses in the field because of the small staff, therefore development of courses to where they are solid is a much longer process. Mentoring is a must for those who are new to faculty status. Money also matters. I realize that being a part of a small program has its disadvantage as well. You have tendency to be overlooked by your college. For instance, it is much harder to gain political status within an organization in which the main focus of the college is k-12 education.

#### Conclusion

If you are planning to create a plan to retain faculty of color, I would suggest that you look at recommendations identified by Arredondo and Castellanos (2003). The first recommendation is to assign two senior faculty members to mentor the new faculty member. The second recommendation is develop a performance evaluation with timelines that address scholarship. The third is to help this individual develop connections on campus with various committees as well as with faculty of color. The fourth is to help this person make connections to the people of color in the community. The fifth is to help this person to get involved with professional organizations as well as a present at conferences.

I decided to transition back to administration. I realized that I missed a number of things that being faculty could not fulfill in me. I need to have colleagues that I can interact with on a daily bases. I like working together to solve problems and create programming for students. I missed working as well as making a difference in lives of our undergraduates. I even missed the late night calls and challenges that come with administration. I felt in administration I can make a difference. I knew as an administrator I did not win every battle but I was able to win some. I could see the difference I was making and it gave me a sense of accomplishment. I am fortunate to have had the opportunity to gain the experience as a faculty member and hope that in the future I will continue to teach in the field but remain an administrator.

#### Reference

Arredondo and Castellanos (2003). Latinas and the professoriate: An interview with patricia arredondo. In Castellanos, J, & Jones, L. (Eds.). (2003), *The majority in the minority: Expanding the representation of latina/o faculty, administrators, and students in higher education*(pp.221-239). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

---

## ASHE Higher Education Monograph Series

The ASHE Higher Education monograph series publishes 6 monographs a year. The monographs offer definitive analyses of tough higher education problems based on thorough research of pertinent literature and institutional experiences. The quality of each report is ensured via an extensive peer-review process. The ASHE monograph series is proud to announce the recent publication of the following monographs.

- *Rethinking the L Word in Higher Education* by Adrianna J. Kezar, Rozana Carducci, & Melissa Contreras-McGavin
- *From Main Street to Wall Street: The Transformation of For-Profit Education* by Kevin Kinser.
- *Professionalizing Graduate Education: the Master's Degree in the Marketplace* by Judith Glazer-Raymo.
- *Liberal Arts Colleges and Liberal Arts Education: New evidence on Impacts* by Ernest Pascarella, Gregory Wolniak, Tricia Seifert, Ty Cruce, & Charles Blauch.
- *The Uses of Institutional Culture: Strengthening Identification and Building Brand Equity in Higher Education* by J. Douglas Toma, Greg Dubrow, & Matthew Hartley.
- *The Challenge of Diversity: Involvement or Alienation in the Academy* by Daryl Smith & Lisa Wolf-Wendel.
- *Beyond Grade Inflation: Grading Problems in Higher Education* by Shouping Hu.
- *Who Calls the Shots? Sports and University Leadership, Culture, and Decision Making* by Suzanne Estler & Laurie Nelson.

Individual monographs can be purchased through the Wiley-Interscience/Jossey-Bass web site (<http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/Section/id-101783.html>). Subscriptions to the series are also available for purchase for \$165.00 per year (<http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-AEHE.html>). If you are interested in authoring

a monograph please contact the series editors Kelly Ward ([kaward@wsu.edu](mailto:kaward@wsu.edu)) or Lisa Wolf-Wendel ([lwolf@ku.edu](mailto:lwolf@ku.edu)).

---

## **Soft Money**

David DiRamio, Auburn University

Soft Money investigates contemporary issues in grant funding and higher education research. This includes offering 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 (334) 844-3065 or [diramio@auburn.edu](mailto:diramio@auburn.edu)

*Note from David:* In order to get a different perspective on our profession, I have asked a guest columnist to contribute to the newsletter. Establishing a solid relationship with the office of research on campus is part of a comprehensive approach for obtaining external funding. Internal review boards are usually a part of that effort. Niki Johnson is the director of human subjects research and doctoral student in higher education at Auburn University. Niki earned her J.D. at Loyola University (New Orleans).

### **Human Subject Research?**

Niki Johnson

I have discovered during my time working in university research compliance that there are incorrect beliefs about statutes and guidelines regarding ethical requirements for the use of human subjects in research, which have been passed on among faculty by anecdotal "rumor."

Some of these that I and other professionals in my field continue to hear are:

"Classroom activities do not require IRB approval."  
"I don't have to obtain IRB approval for this study because it is for educational purposes."  
"I need IRB approval for my study because I am asking people to complete a questionnaire."

In many instances all three of these statements are incorrect.

All university researchers should know that Institutional Review Boards review human subject

research. It is prudent for a researcher to begin work with the primary assumption that IRB approval is required when personal information is obtained about an individual subject with the intent to publish or present the findings. It is the purview of the IRB to determine whether the proposed research protocol meets the definition of "human subject research" and requires IRB review at a given institution.

The definition of human subject research is found in the Code of Federal Regulations. The statute defines a two-prong test for whether activities are "human subject research."

First, "research" is defined as: "a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge..." 45 CFR 46.102.

Second, "human subject" is defined as: "a living individual about whom an investigator (whether professional or student) conducting research obtains 1. data through intervention or interaction with the individual, or 2. identifiable private information..." 45 CFR 46.102.

The words "classroom" or "education" do not appear in the statute. Further, the statute does not indicate that all data collected from persons, regardless of type or purpose, fall under the Code of Federal Regulations.

There are situations where one prong of the two prong test is met, but the other fails. Unless BOTH definitions are met, IRB approval would NOT be required. A common case in point is when, during curriculum activities, students are required to collect personal data from individuals as a classroom or laboratory activity. It is clear that human subjects are involved (Test One), but is this actually "research" (Test Two) according to the statutory definition? Primary considerations are: 1. Will the student use the data for a thesis or dissertation? 2. Does the student or professor intend to use the data for a publication or presentation outside of the classroom or to individuals not involved with the course? If either of these questions is answered in the affirmative, or if there is a probability that data gathered in this setting may be desired for use in a later study which may be published or presented for the purposes of "generalizable knowledge," IRB review is the proper and prudent course of action.

A common misconception involves research where data is collected from human participants for the

purpose of publication or presentation, but the data collected is not ABOUT the individual. The two-prong test would not be met. For example, it **WOULD NOT** be human subject research if the data collected from an individual were entirely about the content of company software or benefits packages. It **WOULD** be human subject research if the same studies included inquiries regarding whether the employee believes that the software provided by the company is appropriate to conduct their assigned duties or whether the employee believes that the benefits are adequate to meet their needs. (Protection of a subject's identity who's employment status might be affected by the publication of their personal opinion.)

Researchers' understanding of the statutes and guidance is critical to the proper design of research protocols and should be instilled from the undergraduate level up. Faculty and student researchers will be well served by contacting the research compliance or IRB administrative offices of their institution during the planning stage of any project involving human subjects.

---

## NOTABLES

Michelle Nilson  
Simon Fraser University, Canada

This column 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: [michelle.nilson@gmail.com](mailto:michelle.nilson@gmail.com)

### Distinctly Notable

**Gregory M. Anderson**, Associate Professor of Higher Education at Columbia University's Teachers College, will also be serving as the Program Officer for Education & Scholarship at the Ford Foundation Beginning in Fall 2006.

**James Forest** has been promoted to Associate Professor and Director of Terrorism Studies at the U.S. Military Academy.

**David Leslie**, of William and Mary, & **Robert Berdahl**, Emeritus, University of Maryland, will deliver a paper at the August conference of the European Association for Institutional Research in Rome. Their paper is titled: "More Freedoms, More Controls: The Virginia Experience in Restructuring"

**Patricia McDonough**, Professor of Higher Education & Organizational Change in the Graduate School of Education & Information Studies at UCLA received the 2006 UCLA Award for Distinguished Teaching.

**Katrina Rodriguez**, Assistant Professor of Higher Education and Student Affairs Leadership at the University of Northern Colorado, has been selected Outstanding Teacher of the Year by faculty in the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences.

**Michael W. Simpson** has been awarded a Carl Albert Congressional Research Center Visiting Scholars grant at the University of Oklahoma. Michael plans to research Senator Fred Harris and American Indian education with a focus on secondary education. The Carl Albert Center was established in 1979 to provide instruction and promote scholarship related to the history, structure, processes, personnel, and policies of the U.S. Congress.

**Frances K. Stage**, New York University, spent the 2005-2006 academic year as a Visiting Scholar in the Department of Educational Studies at the University of West Indies, Mona Campus, Kingston, Jamaica.



**Dennis Brown**: having a great time in the San Francisco. ASHE Board meetings seem to be getting more interesting.

### Notable Moves

**Lyle Gohn**, former NASPA President, has retired as Associate Professor of Higher Education at the University of Arkansas.

**Jason Laker** has been appointed Associate Vice-Principal and Dean of Student Affairs at Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada. Previously he was the Dean of Campus Life at Saint John's University in Collegeville, Minnesota, as well as an adjunct instructor in the Gender and Women's Studies Programme there.

**Jennifer M. Miles** has been named assistant professor of higher education in the College of Education and Health Professions at the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville. She previously was the Director of Academic and Student Services at Nova Southeastern University.

**Crystal Gafford Muhammad** will join the faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership at East Carolina University as an Assistant Professor this fall. She brings expertise in law, policy and research; all-important areas in the preparation of educational leaders. She will be teaching doctoral research courses and providing support for dissertation research. We are looking forward to having her on board.

**Glenn M. Nelson**, long-time ASHE member, has retired from the University of Pittsburgh where he was an Associate Professor of Higher Education.

Michelle Nilson, former UNLV student, joins the faculty at Simon Fraser University, Surrey Canada, as an assistant professor.

#### Notable Reads

**James Forest & Philip Altbach**, editors, are pleased to announce that *The International Handbook of Higher Education* (2 volumes), published by Springer, is available at various bookstores and websites. For a list of chapters and topics covered, please see: <http://www.higher-ed.org>.

The Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Iowa State University is pleased to share the inaugural issue of *Education Policy and Practice Perspectives*, EP3, with the ASHE community.

This issue of EP3 focuses on one of Iowa's most serious challenges in higher education—declining college enrollments, especially in the three Regent Institutions: Iowa State University, the University of Iowa and University of Northern Iowa. However, we hope that this report is also useful to other states and institutions, which are confronting the same challenges of recruiting and enrolling larger numbers of students.

We welcome inquiry and dialogue as we seek to impact the broad agenda of educational transformation in the years to come. You can download the EP3 at [http://www.elps.hs.iastate.edu/News/document/EP3\\_Inaugural\\_Issue.pdf](http://www.elps.hs.iastate.edu/News/document/EP3_Inaugural_Issue.pdf)