



Postsecondary Education Network

**A Publication of Division J
American Educational Research Association**

Christopher C. Morpew, University of Kansas, Editor Fall 2001

Table of Contents

[On Becoming a Scholar](#)

Vice-President Linda Johnsrud, University of Hawaii-Manoa

[Program Update -- Submissions, Reviewers and More](#)

2002 Program Chair, Linda Serra Hagedorn, University of Southern California

[Division J Awards -- Call for Nominations](#)

Awards Committee Chair, Michael Paulsen, University of New Orleans

[AERA Evaluations](#)

Adrienne Hyle and Kerri Kearney, Oklahoma State University

Responding to the World Trade Center and Pentagon Tragedies

[The relevance and role of a liberal arts education in the aftermath of September 11th](#)

Lee S. Duemer, Texas Tech University

[AAC&U's Redoubled Commitment to Liberal Education as a Response to National Tragedy](#)

[Graduate Student Seminar: Notes from the Ranks](#)

Pamela Eddy, Michigan State University

[New Appointments](#)

Vice President's Column

Linda Johnsrud, University of Hawaii-Manoa

Every fall for the past few years, I have been giving a short address to the new doctoral students in the UHM College of Education at their fall orientation. Every time I give this talk, my enthusiasm for higher education is renewed, and I am reminded of just how much I love working with doctoral students--our future colleagues. I share it with you as a reminder of why we do what we do.

On Becoming a Scholar

It is my pleasure to welcome each of you to the College and to the doctoral program in Education. I asked if I might speak to you today, because I think there is a topic that is rarely discussed with new doctoral students. And that is -- what getting a doctorate is really about. Now people get doctorates for all kinds of reasons. Some for career change, some for the credential itself -- it carries meaning in the workworld; it may mean a promotion, a new opportunity, or a pay raise. It may allow you to apply for positions for which you were not previously qualified. Some get it for pride, satisfaction, their mothers always wanted them to do it. Others get it because they love going to school, and it is the next degree along the way.

But you should know how it is viewed in the academy and how most faculty view it -- it is training to become a scholar. And notice I even said training as opposed to education. We call it training, because there is an instrumental component. You are being trained to do something: to make a contribution to knowledge, to expand the knowledge base in your field of study. That is what distinguishes graduate education from undergraduate education. I still remember my professor in graduate school who said that the knowledge in any field is like a brick wall that is not finished. Knowledge is added one brick at a time, and your job is to add a brick! Just one brick. We add knowledge slowly, brick by brick. That is why we have an inquiry core requirement for every doctoral student. That is the instrumental part of the curriculum; that is the training that you need in order to do a piece of research in a disciplined fashion, ultimately to add your brick.

And making that contribution demands new ways of thinking for most of us. Most of you would not be here if you didn't do well in classes, if you didn't write well, if you weren't bright, energetic, and determined. But what you need now is to cultivate a disciplined, inquiring mind. And that is the toughest part -- some people have the discipline, but they don't have the curiosity, the questioning mind; others have curiosity, everything intrigues them, but they don't have the discipline. You need to cultivate both. The faculty is here to help, but this is not an exact science. We know the experiences you need to have to

help you but much of your development is in your hands.

Now let me be candid. When I began my doctoral studies, I certainly didn't quit my job and move 1000 miles to cultivate my mind. I had just been passed over for an administrative job I wanted, and they hired someone with a Ph.D. I knew the writing was on the wall. I wanted the credential, but I had an advisor who wanted far more for me than that. My advisor immediately took an active interest in what courses I was taking, and she was less concerned with what was required and more with what she thought I needed. She wanted me to get out of the college of education and to take courses in other academic areas. She wanted me to work with some of the brightest minds that she knew; she wanted me to read broadly -- she was always giving me articles and books and references to stuff that she thought would be of interest. Now what I remember best, and probably because it was the most intimidating, was when she asked me to sit down and talk about a study I had read, and she always asked the same question: *Linda, what are the interesting questions that this study raises for you? What other questions might we ask about this topic?*

Now she began asking that question early on, and I was not very good at answering it. I didn't have an inquiring mind. So how does one become a scholar? How do you learn to ask the questions? It is a process, a process of socialization, and it is beginning here today. There are a number of steps for you to take as you work toward becoming a scholar.

First, you learn about your field of study. What does it mean to study curriculum and instruction? or foundations? or exceptionalities? or educational administration? Each of the specializations have clusters of courses; these are related in some fashion. The program's structure reflects the field of study; it reflects the body of knowledge that you are about to master. It is not just a matter of learning what is required, but learning how the field of study coheres. What are the bodies of knowledge that you are mastering and how do they relate to one another? For example, in higher education programs, there is often a cluster of courses around student services and student development. This very much reflects the field of study. There are faculty members who specialize in this area, there are journals devoted to this area, and there are jobs in this area in colleges and universities.

Every field has norms, and you want to learn them. For example, every field uses the language in special ways; sometimes it is just jargon, but you do want to master the use of the language. In higher education, we talk about the Carnegie classification system, faculty governance, scholarly norms, and peer review. Those are particular to the field of study of higher education, and if that is your field, you want to be able to talk the talk and understand the talk. You want to listen to faculty speak to one another, at colloquia, at national meetings whenever you get the opportunity. You want to pay attention to how articles are written, how the language is used. You will learn to think like a member of the discipline, and you will learn to speak and write in the manner particular to your field. Now you may suspect that your faculty is trying to clone you. You *can* reject the norms, but I suggest that you need to understand them before you reject them.

Getting to know your fellow students is a real bonus of graduate school. You will learn how each other think, how you view the world, what is intellectually stimulating to one another. Talk with one another--

and not just to grouse. Get to know one another. Get involved in student groups, the doctoral student association provides great opportunities to get together, both formally and informally. The more you get to know one another along the way, the more you can be resources for one another at later stages.

Getting to know the faculty members in your area of specialization is probably the most important thing you do. You want to know what areas of expertise and interest are represented among the faculty. You want to know what they are passionate about. You want to know what topical areas are best supported and which aren't. You don't want to choose a topic to pursue that just isn't very do-able, because the faculty members simply are not experts in that area.

One of the reasons for getting to know the faculty is to be in a position to choose an advisor. Now several of our programs are small; there are few choices, but you still want to know that you can work with that individual for the long haul. Look them up on the web, see if they have a homepage with their vitae listed. Or look up their research in the library. You want to have a sense of who they are intellectually, how active and engaged they are in the field of study.

If you have an opportunity to work with a professor as a graduate assistant, you will learn whether this is a person you can learn from, if this is a person who is interested in your development. If you don't have the opportunity or time to work as a graduate assistant, consider apprenticing yourself to a faculty member. Ask if you can get involved in a research project. The very best way to learn to do research is to do it with someone.

As you move through the program, you become more at home; you will learn how arguments are constructed in your field; you will know what it means to conceptualize a research study; to frame a study with an appropriate theoretical perspective. You *will* learn what that means.

And then along the way you will identify your particular interest; you will begin focusing, you will concentrate your coursework if possible, you will focus your choice of topics for papers around your interest.

You will choose a committee. In doing so, you are bringing together a group of scholars who can help you accomplish your interest; once you know your topic and your method, you choose faculty who can help you conduct your research, who are compatible, and who are interested in your development as a scholar.

And you will prepare for your examinations. Now I know this seems down the road for most of you, but I may not get another chance to talk to you so I want to say this now: preparing for exams is a significant part of your development. This is when you bring all that you have learned together. You are making sense of your field of study. You are demonstrating your readiness to make an original contribution, because your contribution has as its foundation all that has gone before. Remember the brick wall. Every brick is a contribution that someone else has made before you. The body of knowledge, the prior research, the literature in the area -- they all serve as the foundation for your contribution. One promise

that I will make to you: there will never be a time again that you feel so knowledgeable, certainly never again will you feel so up-to-date. You pass your exams and move forward to your dissertation.

At the dissertation stage, you enter a time that can be lonely, but can also be exhilarating. The intellectual challenge of writing a dissertation is unmatched. Never again will you devote that amount of time to one project, most stretch over a year; never again will you have an entire committee willing to comment on your work and help you to develop it. As a faculty member, I am always wondering who can I intrude upon to read my work, but with student work, that is our job: to read your work and help you to move it forward.

And finally, you have a product that you will defend. You have made a contribution to knowledge, you have added a brick. And at the moment of your defense, there is no one else who knows as much about your work as you do. And you are on your way. When your committee shakes your hand after a successful defense, they are welcoming you to the community of scholars. Now not all of you will choose to continue scholarly work, but you *will* have the capacity, you will have the training. And I guarantee that some of you will be so engaged, so inspired, that you will choose to become faculty members so that you can pass on that legacy, so that you can have the honor of helping others become scholars.

I want you to know that the greatest thrill as an advisor is hooding a doctoral student at commencement. When I hood one of my students, I think of my advisor, my mentor, and how she helped me get here, and the way I pay her back is to help my students. And someday they may get to hood one of their doctoral students. And so the legacy goes.

I congratulate you on your admission to doctoral study -- and I wish for each of you the thrill of scholarship!

I want to give credit to Leonard L. Baird for his thoughtful comments on the stages of doctoral socialization in "Helping Graduate Students: A Graduate Adviser's View," a chapter in Pruitt-Logan, A.S. and Isaac, P.D. (eds.), Student Services for the Changing Graduate Student Population, 25-32. New Directions for Student Services, no. 72, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.

Submissions, Reviewers, and More

*Linda Serra Hagedorn, University of Southern California
Program Chair 2002*

This year, Division J received a total of 401 proposals. Frankie Santos Laanan and Teresa Makuakane-Dreschel are working with the 103 proposals submitted to Section 1 -- Students. Although Berta Vigil Laden has just moved to the University of Toronto, she has not let that minor detail deter her from her work with the 72 proposals submitted to Section 2 -- Faculty. The 70 proposals submitted to Section 3 -- Teaching are in the very capable hands of Laura Perna. Similarly, Celina Sima is working with the 63 proposals submitted to section 4 -- Administration. Finally, Patrick Dilley, who just moved to Carbondale, Illinois to begin his duties at Southern Illinois University is handling the 93 proposals

submitted to Section 5 - Political Contexts. Assisting me to oversee the process is my very capable graduate student, Phil Brocato.

As we all know, this was the first year that all proposals were submitted electronically. Although the fine folks at Michigan State University acknowledge that the system still retains a few "glitches", overall the process works. I thought I would sketch the steps necessary to process each proposal. The first duty of each Section Chair was to read each proposal and to ascertain if it was submitted to the right division and section. Those proposals deemed more suitable for another location were transferred. In addition, if a proposal was received in a questionable condition (i.e., gibberish), the author was contacted and provided instructions to resubmit the proposal so that it could be reviewed. The next task was to match proposals to reviewers. This year the reviewer pool contained close to 400 willing participants. Of course, this high number is due in part to the persuasive actions taken by each member of the Program Committee. Each proposal was assigned to 3 or 4 reviewers. The chairs monitored the process and answered questions. Once the reviews are complete, the Committee will assemble the program, notify all authors, and assign chairs and discussants. Although my short synopsis may make the process seem simple, I assure you that it is not. Each section chair has logged in many hours to assure that the 2002 program is a success.

If you have not signed-up to be a session chair or discussant there may still be time to do so. Log onto <http://www.aera.net/meeting> and click on "Electronic Proposal Processing Center." Next click on "Register to become a reviewer, session chair, or discussant for 2002."

In short, the 2002 program will be excellent due to the efforts of a dedicated Committee and a strong Division J membership. See you in New Orleans!

Division J Awards: The Call for Nominations

*Michael B. Paulsen, The University of New Orleans
Awards Committee Chair*

Annually, AERA Division J bestows two awards. One is the Outstanding Publication Award and the other is the Exemplary Research Award. This is a call for nominations for these awards. Please consider colleagues whom you would like to nominate for one of these awards.

Division J Outstanding Publication Award

The purpose of The Outstanding Publication Award is to permit Division J to bestow recognition on colleagues for a specific publication (book, book chapter, article) judged as making a substantial contribution to the literature of higher education. A substantial contribution is defined as scholarship that extensively revises our knowledge and understanding of a particular problem in the study of higher education or identifies a new problem for scholarly treatment. The nominated book, book chapter, or article must have been published between January 1, 2001 and December 31, 2001. Letters of nomination should provide a clear statement that the individual is being nominated for the Outstanding Publication

Award, all necessary bibliographic information about the nominated publication, and an assessment of the contribution made by the nominated publication and author. Please note that when appropriate, coauthors (2 or more) may be nominated for the Outstanding Publication Award.

Division J Exemplary Research Award

The Exemplary Research Award is a special honor our division can bestow on one of our colleagues. This award is presented to an individual whose published research has made an outstanding contribution to knowledge and understanding in the field of higher education. Letters of nomination should provide a clear statement that the individual is being nominated for the Exemplary Research Award, all necessary bibliographic information about the nominee's published research, and a description and explanation of the nature and quality of the contribution to the literature made by the published research of the nominated author, including information that will help the committee in its deliberation, such as references to selected publications of the nominee's research that illustrate and document the outstanding nature of the nominee's contribution.

The following policies apply for both awards: (1) nominators and nominees must be members of AERA Division J; (2) it is the responsibility of the nominator to submit all supporting documents for nominations -- such as a vita for the nominated individual or a copy of an article or other publication relevant to the nomination, as appropriate -- along with the letter of nomination, to the chair of the awards committee; and (3) in some instances, pairs or teams of researchers may be nominated for the Division J awards.

The deadline for nominations is December 31, 2001. Please forward your letters of nomination and supporting documents for either Division J award to: Michael B. Paulsen, Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling, & Foundations, 348 Education Building, University of New Orleans, Lakefront, New Orleans, LA, 70148 or e-mail: mpaulsen@uno.edu .

AERA Division J Online Evaluations

Adrienne Hyle and Kerri Kearney, Oklahoma State University

As a part of the evaluation of Division J activities and processes for the 2001 AERA conference, those who participated as proposers or reviewers using the new online process were asked to provide feedback. Using the AERA database for contact information, those who successfully submitted proposals and those who served as reviewers were sent an evaluation form via email and asked to return it either electronically or by printing and mailing to the address provided. Contact information for those who submitted a proposal that was rejected for the conference was not available from AERA so, unless these individuals also submitted successful proposals or served as a reviewer, they were not a part of the evaluation population. Respondents were asked to complete three sections: general information about Division J membership and use of the new session planner, questions for proposers, and questions for reviewers. We expected responses to at least two sections, possibly all three.

The AERA database for Division J included names of 885 people who had the opportunity to interact with the online proposal process. Of these 885 names, 379 were either duplicate emails (people serving in more than one capacity) or an individual for whom no email address was available. Given this, 506 evaluations emailed was 506; 46 of these were returned as bad addresses and 19 were returned as automatic emails indicating that the person was unavailable. For the purposes of this evaluation, we assume the other 441 emailed evaluations reached their intended recipient; the return rate was 22% (or 99 evaluations).

Division J Information

Respondents' years of membership in Division J averaged years per person with a reported minimum of under 1 year and a maximum of 25 years (interesting given that J has not been around that long). Of the respondents, 75 reported they served as a reviewer, 53 submitted a proposal that was accepted, and 17 submitted a proposal that was rejected. Since some respondents submitted more than one proposal and received both an acceptance and a rejection, duplicates were removed from the data leaving a total of 63 individuals who interacted with the system as a proposer.

All respondents were asked about their use of the online planner. Those who used the planner (40%) were enthusiastic about it with comments such as "It was great. It made going through the program so much easier" and "This was a good way to organize my schedule." Sixteen percent replied that they looked at the online planner but chose not to use it; most respondents in this group reported that they continued using the paper program either due to time restrictions or ease of use. The remaining 34 percent of respondents did not use the online planner, and most comments from this group also reported a preference for the printed program.

Proposer Respondents

Respondents were first asked about the ease of posting proposals to the online system. Over half (60%) described the process as easy. "Some problems" with the system were reported by 30 percent of the respondents while 10 percent described their experience as "difficult." Respondents from all categories referred to the same two difficulties: submitting proposals close to the deadline and disconnections ("timing out") during the process which caused the proposer to "lose everything" and be required to start all over. Other critiques included difficulties with formatting and submissions of charts, tables or references. Several notes were made about the "helpdesk" assistance from AERA; each comment was quite positive, noting the quick response time and friendliness of those staffing this function.

Proposers were also asked about the timeliness of their notification of acceptance or rejection of their proposal(s). Over 90 percent said their notification was sent in a timely manner. Proposers also consistently reported easy access to evaluations of their proposals. Again the positive responses were overwhelming with 87 percent responding "yes."

Recommendations of criteria for evaluating next year's proposals were provided by a half of the proposer

respondents. Most addressed criteria for evaluating proposals such as "importance, method, [and] clarity of perspective" and "quality of data and analysis, relevance to policy or theory, [and] innovative approach." Other responses appeared to address the evaluation process such as "better reviewers, prompt response, [and] faster confirmation of acceptance or rejection."

Reviewer Respondents

Reviewers were first asked about the ease of retrieving and reading proposals online. Responses were overwhelmingly positive with 95 percent describing this part of the process as "easy." A few respondents noted difficulties with printing or viewing tables and graphs, as well as a dislike of reviewing proposals "on screen;" one respondent said the online process "transfers the costs of duplication (printing out) from the proposer to the reviewer."

Reviewers were also asked if the evaluations were easy to post online. Again the response was overwhelmingly positive; 96 percent responded "yes." One respondent did indicate concern that the online process made it impossible to "amend the [evaluation] form in any way to account for the actual nature of the proposal" and that consistent evaluation systems were not used across divisions.

Like the proposer section, the reviewer section included an opportunity to suggest criteria for future proposal evaluations. Again, less than half of reviewer respondents answered this question, and like proposer respondents, the same criteria emerged.

To the question of whether reviewers had adequate time to read and evaluate proposals, all but one responded that they did. Comments for this question were very few but most noted that their only difficulty related to the large number of proposals they received, not the time allotted. When asked if the proposals received were a good match, most (93%) said yes; some noted that it was easy to return a proposal that was not a good match, which completely resolved this problem.

Reviewer respondents were asked to identify all the ways that they were informed about the volunteer process for being a reviewer. The AERA website was listed by 33 respondents; 21 listed the AERA listserv, 12 listed the PEN, and 25 marked "other." Typical comments from those who marked "other" were that they were personally requested to serve by a chair, officer, or colleague. Ninety-two percent of reviewer respondents indicated their willingness to serve as a reviewer again; of those responding "no," comments indicated that this was due to temporary reasons and they would be willing to serve in the future. The list of recommended changes in the review process was diverse; the single repeated comment suggested a more systematic way of identifying reviewers.

While it is important to note that the respondent group for this evaluation was limited to those willing to interact with what was also an online process, the review of the online proposal and review process was overwhelmingly positive. Most concerns about the system related to technical and/or logistical issues, and a majority of respondents appeared to be quite enthusiastic about the move to an online process. As the system continues to be revised and refined, it is recommended that regular evaluations of the process

continue so that the opportunity for feedback is consistently provided.

Responding to the World Trade Center and Pentagon Tragedies

At the suggestion of Jim Bess (thanks, Jim), this edition of *The Pen* includes two submissions relevant to how higher education can or should respond to the tragedies that occurred in New York City and Washington, DC on September 11th. It seems particularly apt that higher education should play a role in helping all of us to better understand exactly what happened and, perhaps, how we can keep such terrible things from happening inside and outside the U.S. again.

The relevance and role of a liberal arts education in the aftermath of September 11th

Lee S. Duemer, Texas Tech University

Many generations face a test of their character. For my father's generation, it was the Depression and World War II. For some of my colleagues, it was the Korean War, Civil Rights or the Vietnam War. The most recent challenge was issued on September 11, 2001 when the United States was attacked on a most heinous and destructive scale. The challenge for this generation will be just as important, but far subtler than the challenges faced in the 20th century. The new challenge will be to ensure the security of our nation, while concurrently preserving the liberties of our citizens. We will have to make some difficult decisions focusing on how we balance our need for security with our desire to preserve our freedoms, since it has been made clear to us that our internal security can no longer be taken for granted. How do we decide what our important liberties are? Which of our liberties are we willing to limit or sacrifice in order to have a greater sense of security? What measures should we undertake to strengthen our security? How do we make sense of our new way of life? Where do we turn for help to understand and answer these questions?

I propose that we turn to the liberal arts to help us address these and other questions, and by doing so reorient the liberal arts toward addressing questions that are practical, affect all of us, and influence how we live our lives and make choices. A common criticism has been that the liberal arts in general, and philosophy in particular, have lost their sense of mission. Such criticism is grounded in the ideas that the liberal arts are no longer a common part of our lives and have become isolated as source of intellectual or academic inquiry; that they lack practical relevance to contemporary issues and questions; and that the liberal arts are primarily directed toward personal fulfillment and growth. We must reemphasize how the liberal arts inform us how to make sound moral choices if we expect the liberal arts to regain their place as the focal point of undergraduate education. The liberal arts are about human experience, how to make sense of it, and how to make wise use of our existence. In order to help students understand the liberal arts and how to make sound choices we must relate the liberal arts to important contemporary questions and issues.

For Socrates, the important question was the development of a universal definition for the meaning of virtue. For Plato, it was how to develop a culturally relevant system of education within the larger context

of some universal norms. For Aristotle, it was the nature of the good life and how to negotiate behavior within the "mean." All of these questions have to do with values and how to make important decisions about the values one should live life by. We can use recent events as contemporary comparisons and examples to examine the central question of making good moral choices and interpreting events. Such a reorientation would help to give the liberal arts a sense of purpose and help us address some of the difficult moral choices that lie ahead of us. A new direction in liberal arts teaching would also orient individual thinking away from a pervasive self-centered focus and toward a broader understanding of our common responsibility to the larger society. It may be that the continuation of our democratic society requires us to engage in a continual discussion about moral choices and decisions about values. In doing so we must not be afraid to address political issues and related moral choices. The academy is an intensely political institution, and we must not be afraid of examining how politics and moral choices are related. As citizens of a nation we are the products of social and political factors that influence our lives on a daily basis. The questions that we, as citizens, will have to address concerning security and freedom are inherently political in nature. An informed and intelligent inquiry will call on many of the same skills involved in the political process, such as debating with skill and civility, and recognizing different points of view.

AAC&U's Redoubled Commitment to Liberal Education as a Response to National Tragedy

As educators, it is both our privilege and our responsibility to contribute to the nation's response to our recent tragedy by helping our students and, indeed, our entire society engage the larger meanings and implications of the seismic events. Even as we comfort the wounded, higher education also is turning a beacon on the qualities and commitments that make our democracy inspiring and resilient. The academy both embodies and imparts democracy's finest principles of intellectual freedom, reasoned inquiry, civil liberties, openness to a full range of views and experiences, and the determination to comprehend issues in all their complexity. As a society torn from its accustomed moorings, we now need our commitment to these principles in their fullest measure.

Valuing diversity and enabling constructive intergroup learning have become hallmarks of the contemporary academy as well as essential features of a contemporary liberal education. As we face the current crisis, we must redouble our efforts to build broad understanding of the diversity that is a wellspring both of our democracy and of our intellectual vitality.

The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) is the leading national association devoted to advancing and strengthening liberal education for all students, regardless of academic specialization or intended career. AAC&U's mission is to reinforce the collective commitment to liberal education at both the national and local levels and to help individual institutions keep the quality of student learning at the core of their work as they evolve to meet new economic and social challenges. These are a few examples of AAC&U's programs and events designed to meet these goals:

[Changing Students in a Changing World--Culturally Diverse, Economically Divided, Globally Interdependent](#)

Annual Meeting January 23-26, 2002.

The conference will explore how higher education is nurturing students' capacities to become global citizens prepared to live and work creatively across cultural and economic borders. A pre-conference symposium will focus on Liberal Learning and the Challenge of Uncommon Values.

Liberal Education and Global Citizenship: The Arts of Democracy

This project will be designed to work with colleges and universities to develop societal, civic, and global knowledge in their graduates by linking liberal education and democracy in the context of our interdependent but unequal world. Colleges and universities in the project will develop new levels of intercultural competency as part of the core educational goal of undergraduate majors.

Greater Expectations: The Commitment to Quality as a Nation Goes to College

This multi-year, multi-project initiative will articulate the aims of a 21st century liberal education and identify comprehensive, innovative models that improve learning for all undergraduate students. Among its several projects is the Forum on Twenty-first Century Liberal Arts Education Practice. The Forum will research and share powerful methods that lead to better student performance from high school through college. To launch the Forum, four working groups of educators will recommend best practices in the key areas of 1) reasoned inquiry, 2) civic, global, and social responsibility, 3) integrative learning, and 4) integration of the liberal arts with pre-professional programs.

Science Education for New Civic Engagements and Responsibilities

Planned as a five-year initiative, SENCER connects science education and civic engagement by teaching basic science through the study of complex, capacious, and unsolved public issues. The project is developing and disseminating models for teaching science in social context that can be implemented at a wide array of institutions. It is designed to both improve science education especially for students who will never major in a scientific field and stimulate informed civic engagement with scientific questions on the part of today's students.

For information about these and AAC&U membership or other projects and resources, see www.aacu.edu or call 202/387-3760.

Graduate Student Seminar: Notes From the Ranks

Pamela Eddy, Michigan State University

Each year Division J sponsors a graduate student seminar prior to the beginning of the regular sessions of the AERA conference. University graduate programs nominate students to participate in this event, which

generally has a cap on the number of student participants. The topics covered in the day and a half sessions vary from year to year, but the common element is an opportunity for students to network with their peers from other institutions and to meet senior scholars on a more personal basis.

As a graduate student participant last year, I felt the seminar was one of the best kept secrets of Division J. The opportunity for graduate students to discuss their own research, share their hopes and fears for their future career aspirations, and to meet senior scholars whose work we read in classes was a highlight of my first AERA experience. The seminar resulted in exchanges of e-mail addresses and the beginning of many new friendships. Graduate students also learned how to become more involved in service for AERA Division J.

I would encourage program coordinators to promote this seminar on their campuses and for graduate students to inquire about the nomination procedures in their programs. At last year's conference there were many students who were unaware of this professional development opportunity, but who would have benefited from attending. Even though the annual conference is still months away, it is not too early to start promoting attendance to the graduate student seminar. The size of the annual AERA conference can seem overwhelming, but Division J does a great job of promoting opportunities for graduate students and making us feel welcome. Take advantage of all the hard work of the planning committee and come to New Orleans next year!

New appointments

- Adrianna Kezar and John B. Williams III have joined the Department of Education Policy and Leadership at the University of Maryland.
- Chris Golde is now Senior Scholar at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, working on the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate. New email is golde@carnegiefoundation.org.

ASHE Executive Office and Director

The Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) invites proposals from interested parties to manage and provide leadership for the ASHE Office, effective January 1, 2004. ASHE is a scholarly society with approximately 1300 members dedicated to higher education as a field of study. The Association promotes collaboration among its members and others engaged in the study of higher education through research, conferences, and publications, including its highly regarded The Review of Higher Education. ASHE values rigorous scholarly approaches to the study of postsecondary education and practical applications of systematic inquiry. The Association's members are committed to diversity in our programs and membership; we also have enjoyed significant success in involving doctoral students in the Association's activities.

The ASHE Office has previously been located at Texas A&M University and most recently at the University of Missouri-Columbia. We currently seek proposals for a five-year contract that will support the following five major activities:

1. The handling of all ASHE business, management, and promotional services, including member records, correspondence, financial management and accountability, and other corporate and operational services;
2. The planning, coordination, and logistical on-site support for the Association's annual meeting and other sponsored programs and events;
3. The infrastructural support for the Board of Directors, other Association officers, and committee chairs;
4. The development, maintenance and advancement of communications strategies that will enable ASHE to increase its outreach, including its impact on policies affecting higher education; and,
5. The development, maintenance, and advancement of fiscal strategies, including fund-raising, to enable ASHE to increase its outreach and impact.

We seek creative proposals from interested parties who desire to be involved in a premier postsecondary research association at a critical time in American higher education. We encourage innovative proposals that utilize new technologies and we are willing to consider managerial formats that may differ from previous arrangements. The proposal may identify a specific individual or individuals for managerial roles for the ASHE Office. If so, letters of application or nominations, as well as vitae, should be included in the proposal. If specific individual(s) are not identified, then the proposal should include the proposed process by which they will be determined. Applications from historically underrepresented groups are especially welcome. Please check the ASHE website at: www.ashe.missouri.edu for how the office is currently configured and how it will be configured from January 1, 2002 until December 31, 2003.

Proposals should be sent to Dr. Michael B. Paulsen, Professor of Education, Graduate Studies in Higher Education, Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling and Foundations, 348 Bicentennial Education Center, University of New Orleans, Lakefront, New Orleans, LA 70148. We intend to begin the review as soon as possible after January 1, 2002, so applications and supporting materials should be received by **December 15, 2001**. The search and review will continue until a new institutional arrangement is settled. However, we intend to announce the award no later than May 1, 2002 to ensure that the new office will have proper lead-time for a leadership transition.

Publication Outlet

The RoutledgeFalmer Dissertation Series in Higher Education

General editor: Philip G. Altbach

Published in cooperation with the Program in Higher Education, Boston College

The RoutledgeFalmer Dissertation Series in Higher Education publishes the best research-based dissertations. Our intention is to provide a source for the best research on higher education in a timely

way. The series is multidisciplinary and publishes dissertations from all methodological and substantive perspectives. The series is open to research in all fields of higher education, including policy-related studies, historical research, student affairs and development, among others. Our criteria for publication is relevance to scholars, administrators, and policy makers in higher education and the quality of the research and presentation of the dissertation.

The RoutledgeFalmer Dissertation Series in Higher Education is able to bring the best scholarship to relevant audiences and is able to publish relatively specialized studies. Books in the series are published in hardcover editions and made available to relevant audiences in higher education as well as to university and other libraries in the United States and abroad. Our aim is to advance the field of higher education by highlighting the best research.

The Series anticipates publishing 8 to 10 volumes annually.

How the Series Works

Ideas for books in the series may be submitted directly to Garland Publishing, Inc., or to the series editor. An abstract of the dissertation should be provided initially. If a dissertation is selected for inclusion in the series, a contract will be issued by Garland Publishing, Inc. The author will be able to revise the dissertation for publication. After revision, the manuscript will be submitted to Garland Publishing, Inc. along with an unformatted disk. Garland Publishing will not provide copyediting but will design the book, and publish it. The entire publication process from the submission of the final manuscript and disk to bound books typically takes 7 to 9 months, not including time for preparing the index. All books are published in hardcover to library standards. A royalty of 4% on net receipts is paid to the author.

For More Information or to Submit a Proposal, Please contact:

Dr. Philip G. Altbach
Monan Professor of Higher Education
207 Campion Hall
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu Fax: (617) 552-8422

Dr. Farideh Koohi-Kalmail
RoutledgeFalmer Publishing, Inc.
29 W. 35th St.
New York NY 10001-2299. E-mail: fkamali@routledge-ny.com.

