

THE JOURNAL
of
HIGHER EDUCATION
MANAGEMENT

VOLUME 22, NUMBER 1 (2007)

THE JOURNAL
of
HIGHER EDUCATION
MANAGEMENT

VOLUME 22, NUMBER 1 (2007)

© Copyright, 2007

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS

Post Office Box 630101
Little Neck, New York 11363

www.aaua.org

CONTENTS

Editorial Board	5
Introduction	7
Higher Education and Teacher Certification Programs: Needed Ethical Changes <i>Rita Dunn, Saint John's University;</i> <i>Karen Burke, Western Connecticut State University</i>	9
Transparent Decision-Making in Higher Education: An Ethical Imperative for Effective Leadership <i>Sheila Taylor-King, Granite State College</i>	18
The College President's Role as Ethical Barometer <i>Ronald A. Williams, Prince George's Community College</i>	22
Ethical Leadership in Higher Education: Are We There Yet? <i>Robert G. Tetreault, Rhode Island College</i>	26
Faculty Impressions of the Charismatic College President <i>Dan L. King, Queensborough Community College of the City University of New York</i>	31
Crossing Economic Borders in the Commodification of Higher Education <i>David Kendrick, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi</i>	39
Review of Enhancing Scholarly Work on Teaching & Learning: Professional Literature That Makes a Difference <i>Anthony DeLuca, Queensborough Community College of the City University of New York</i>	47
The Mission of AAUA	52
Professional Standards of the AAUA	53
Guidelines for Authors	59

JOURNAL
of
HIGHER EDUCATION
MANAGEMENT

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-Chief

Dan L. King

Queensborough Community College
of the City University of New York

- C. Leslie Carpenter, University of South Carolina Sumter — *Senior Editor*
Richard V. Hurley, University of Mary Washington — *Senior Editor*
Wil C. Goodheer, The International University (Austria) — *Editor*
Theresa Madonna, Jewett City, Connecticut — *Editor*
Sheila Taylor-King, Granite State College — *Editor*
Scott M. Boyter, Brigham Young University
Wayne Brumfield, University of Louisiana at Monroe
Charles Cannon, Columbia College Chicago
Abour Cherif, DeVry University
Donna Clevinger, Mississippi State University Meridian
Carolyn C. Collins, Louisiana State University
Kathryn Barrett Duke, University of South Carolina Sumter
Carol Fimmen, Western Illinois University
Raphael Mojica Garcia, University of Meta (Columbia)
Bashar Hanna, Kutztown University
Daniel Julius, University of Alaska
Eileen M. Kolich, Benedictine University
Pedro Martinez, Winston-Salem University
Rilwan Motolani Mustapha, Lagos State University (Nigeria)
Jerome L. Neuner, Canisius College
David Overbye, DeVry University
Christine Z. Somerville, Chicago, Illinois
Heinrich Stremitzer, Vienna University of Economics
and Business Administration (Austria)
Clara Wajngurt, Queensborough Community College
of the City University of New York

INTRODUCTION

Following a several-years hiatus, the American Association of University Administrators has resumed publication of the *Journal of Higher Education Management*. The association's purpose in doing so is to provide opportunities (a) for the discussion of the current issues, problems and challenges facing higher education administration; (b) for the exchange of practical wisdom and techniques in the areas of higher education leadership, policy analysis and development, and institutional management; and (c) for the identification and explication of the principles and standards of college and university administration. Taken as a whole, the articles contained in this issue certainly cover all three of these purposes.

The six articles in this issue sustained a rigorous consideration process and were accepted for publication only after a blind review by three independent members of the editorial board recommended their acceptance.

The Journal of Higher Education Management invites you to read, enjoy, analyze, digest, and react. We encourage you consider contributing a thought-provoking piece for a future issue.

Higher Education and Teacher Certification Programs: Needed Ethical Changes

Rita Dunn

St. John's University

Karen Burke

Western Connecticut State University

Teacher Education has been ongoing through formal and informal experiences in state-certified programs for decades. These programs are periodically evaluated and revised, but their additions and deletions invariably reflect the expertise of current, senior or retired faculty and generally incorporate bits of the most recent fads rather than *research*.

Quality Teacher Education cannot be identified by either the courses in a program or its graduates' test scores or Grade Point Averages. Rather, the quality of Teacher Education Programs is recognizable only by the academic gains of its graduates' pupils—a measure evaluators never previously employed. Instead, teachers often maintain that their students fail to perform well academically because they, their families, their neighborhoods, their culture, their upbringing, or the buildings in and resources with which they teach are inadequate.

Educators are loathe to acknowledge that many students fail because their teachers do not know how to teach them. That teachers do not know how to teach nontraditional students is a direct outcome of being graduated from a Certified Teacher Education program of study that did not prepare them for teaching globally-processing, low auditory but high-tactical and high-kinesthetic, unmotivated and non-conforming students in need of mobility and variety.

How Do Traditional Learners Learn?

Teachers recognize that children learn differently from each other and that many find traditional schooling difficult and intolerable. However, teachers often attribute their students' inability to flourish in our schools to lacking ability, discipline, parental support, or motivation. They seem not to understand that, to perform well with conventional teaching, students need to:

- *Remember* at least 75 percent of what they hear by listening or reading;
- *Understand* what they hear so that they can review it afterward;
- Feel comfortable with authority;
- Sit quietly on a wooden, metal, or plastic seat hours at a time;
- Concentrate in bright light, without snacks, and without benefit of peer interactions;
- Remain *connected* hour after hour each day despite the topic and their personal environmental requirements; and
- Follow other people's rules and regulations (Dunn & Dunn, 1992, 1993).

Because these required behaviors do not come naturally to many children, the National Research Council (1996) established *Standards* requiring that science be taught as an *active process* based on *student engagement* rather than on textbooks or traditional lessons. As an outgrowth of that mandate, two subsequent problems emerged. In their effort to identify engaging instruction, teachers designed strategies based on *their* perceptions of how to involve students in other-than-traditional approaches. They then used those approaches for the entire class at the same time and called that variation, *differentiated instruction*.

How Do Non-Traditional Learners Learn?

Students who learn differently from how many children learn and how most teachers teach are labeled *non-traditional*. Although all non-traditional learners do not learn identically, many of them require:

- Movement while concentrating, interactive discussions, individual, paired, small-group, and/or teacher-directed experiences, active participation, hands-on instruction, and varied self-selected approaches responsive to their individual learning styles;
- tactual and kinesthetic resources because learning-by-listening is the most difficult way for most students to master new and challenging academic material;
- a strong interest in what they are learning, insight into how the topic pertains to them, some emotional involvement, and alternatives for how to master and retain the required information;
- clearly printed-and-illustrated objectives so they know exactly what they are required to learn, but have choices of *how* to do it;
- in a variety of social patterns so that individuals may learn independently, in a pair, in a small group, or with their teacher—some students need a collegial teacher, but others need an authoritative teacher;
- low light, music or background conversation, comfortable seating, and snacks while concentrating; and
- periodic breaks from their tasks (Dunn & Dunn, 1992, 1993; Dunn & Griggs, 1995; 2003).

How Can Teacher Education Programs Teach Future and In-Service Teachers to Address Individual Student Differences?

Teaching to students with different styles of learning is not difficult; but it *is very* different from how most teachers teach. Most of the necessary knowledge and skills can be provided for prospective teachers in four, three-credit Teacher Education courses—one describing the theory, research, and learning-style identification instruments, another demonstrating the development of learning-style responsive instructional resources responsive to individuals' styles, the third including supervised implementation experiences and periodic evaluations, and the fourth requiring research with the practices. Teachers need to know how to:

- Identify individual learning styles and their implications for instruction;
- Explain individual style to students and their parents;
- Provide students with individual prescriptions for studying and doing their homework through their learning-style strengths;
- Develop learning-style responsive instructional materials, teach students how to use them, and then teach students to create their own (Schiering & Dunn, 2001; O'Connell, Dunn, & Denig, 2003);
- Introduce lessons globally for global students and then continue analytically for all, having shown each group how to record beneficial information by capitalizing on their strengths;
- Administer, evaluate, and monitor the process; and
- Conduct experimental research to determine the extent to which each treatment is effective with students with different learning styles (Dunn & Dunn, 1992, 1993).

Does Teaching-to-Learning-Style Really Make a Difference?

Consider the outcomes of teaching to students' individual styles rather than to an entire class.

A meta-analysis of 42 experimental studies conducted at 13 different universities with the Dunn and Dunn Learning-Style Model between 1980 and 1990, revealed that eight variables coded for each study produced 65 individual effect sizes (Dunn, Griggs, Olson, Gorman, & Beasley, 1995). The overall, un-weighted group effect size value (r) was .384 and the weighted effect size value was .353 with a mean difference (d) of .755. Referring to the standard normal curve, this suggests that students whose learning styles were accommodated, could be expected to achieve *75% of a standard deviation higher than students who had not had their learning styles accommodated*. This indicated that matching students' learning-style preferences with educational interventions compatible with those preferences was beneficial to their academic achievement.

A second meta-analysis of 76 experimental studies was conducted at multiple universities with the Dunn and Dunn Learning-Style Model between 1980 and 2000 (Lovelace, 2005). The total sample size (N) was 7,196 and the total number of individual effect sizes was 168. Twenty-one dissertations came from 17 universities other than the one at which this meta-analysis was conducted; four dissertations were done at the same university. The overall data reported significantly higher test scores when the Dunns' learning-style strategies were employed and compared with traditional teaching, regardless of the university at which the study was conducted. Most effect sizes were medium to large dependent on the elements tested. Very few effect sizes were small, almost all were medium or large.

According to the United States' government's Center for Research in Education (CRE), the 20-year period of extensive federal funding (1970-1990) produced few programs that resulted in statistically higher standardized achievement-test scores for Special Education (SPED) students (Alberg, Cook, Fiore, Friend, Sano, et al. 1992; Braio, Dunn, Beasley, et al., 1997). Prominent among the very few programs that consistently did increase standardized achievement-test scores for SPED students was the Dunn and Dunn Learning-Style Model.

Practitioners throughout the United States reported statistically higher standardized achievement-and attitude-test scores within one year of implementing the Dunn and Dunn model. Those gains were documented in reading and mathematics for poorly-achieving and SPED students in urban, suburban, and rural schools (Dunn & DeBello, 1999).

How Should Teacher Education Change?

If even a small group of professors in each Teacher Education Program consider the research cited in this manuscript, positive change is possible. However, we must address the following items.

1. In particular, we need to acknowledge that males, particularly African-American and Hispanic males, dominate our Special Education (SPED) and remedial reading classes.

2. Teacher Educators in each institution need to identify the learning styles of all officially classified local SPED and Resource Room students (including African- and Hispanic-American males) to determine the accuracy of our description of their learning styles at particular grade levels (Favre, 2003; Fine, 2003).
3. Those who find credence in what we propose need to speak with their Higher Education colleagues who have experimented with the Dunn and Dunn Learning Style Model to ascertain that they have observed similar academic reversals of failure that Dunn and DeBello (1999) described in K-12 schools and in Higher Education allied-health, engineering, law, nursing, and teacher-training classes (Dunn & Griggs, 2000; 2003).
4. Then, professors of education need to become knowledgeable about this learning-style model and its extensive research base (www.learningstyles.net).
5. They also need to become familiar with the DUNNs' instructional strategies for responding to individuals' diverse learning styles and urge their prospective and in-service teachers to experiment with them.
6. After experimentation with responsive instructional approaches to students' varied learning styles, professors need to report the results in refereed research journals and share their findings with colleagues internationally.
7. As Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, Roth, et al., (1991) urged, we need to stop being suspicious of each other's successes, be open about what we are trying to accomplish, and continue experimenting with teacher training.
8. We need to teach future and current teachers in staff development through *their* learning styles so that they know how to emulate individualized practices.
9. We need to identify the skills and capabilities that are required of teachers who work with non-traditional learners and see whether enough of us are willing to change our present practices—that do not work well with nontraditional learners and cause them unnecessary frustration and failure.
10. We need to begin working with higher education institutions internationally to profit from their experiences with implementing learning-style based instruction.

Teacher Educators must take that risk on behalf of the generations we serve and for our own institutional and professional integrity. Now that extensive research has verified the extent of individual differences, to do less would be unethical and immoral, and *should be* illegal.

Policy makers in states across the country are taking a hard look at prospective teachers and the colleges that train them. In some instances, they're threatening to crack down on programs that don't make the grade. New York's Board of Regents voted to consider closing teacher-training programs if 80% of their graduates cannot pass certification exams.

Former U.S. Secretary of Education Rod Paige issued the call to action during remarks at the first annual Teacher Quality Evaluation Conference in 2002. The charge to states was based on a key finding in the first annual report to Congress released on teacher quality nationwide, Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge. The report's data show that state certification systems allow into the classroom too many teachers who lack solid subject area knowledge of the curriculum they will teach.

REFERENCES:

- Alberg, J., Cook, L., Fiore, T., Friend, M., Sano, S., et al., (1992). *Educational approaches and options for integrating students with disabilities: A decision tool*. Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute, Post Office Box 12194, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27709.
- Braio, A., Dunn, R., Beasley, M, T., Quinn, P., & Buchanan, K. (1997). Incremental implementation of learning-style strategies among urban low achievers. *Journal of Educational Research*, 91, 15-25.
- Dunn, R., & DeBello, T. (1999). *Improved test scores, attitudes, and behaviors in America's schools: Supervisors' success stories*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Dunn, R., & Dunn, K. (1992). *Teaching elementary students through their individual learning styles: Practical approaches for grades 3-6*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Dunn, R., & Dunn, K. (1993). *Teaching secondary students through their individual learning styles: Practical approaches for grades 7-12*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Dunn, R. & Griggs, S. A. (2003). *Synthesis of the Dunn and Dunn learning-style model research: Who, what, when, where, and so what?* NY: St. John's University's Center for the Study of Learning and Teaching Styles.
- Dunn, R., Griggs, S.A. (1995). *Multiculturalism and learning styles: Teaching and counseling adolescents*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Dunn, R., Griggs, S.A., Olson, J., Gorman, B, & Beasley, M. (1995). A meta-analytic validation of the Dunn and Dunn learning styles model. *Journal of Educational Research*, 88(6), 353-361.
- Dunn, R., & Griggs, S. A. (Eds.). (2000). *Practical approaches to using learning styles in Higher education*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Favre, L. (2003b). Impact of learning-style strategies on urban, poverty, minority students: Debunking the big city kid myth. In Rita Dunn & Shirley A. Griggs (Eds.), *Synthesis of the Dunn and Dunn learning-style model Research: Who, What, When, Where, and So What?* (Chapter 18, pp. 81-86). NY: St. John's University's Center for the Study of Learning and Teaching Styles.
- Fine, D. (2003). A sense of learning style. *Principal Leadership*, 4(2), pp. 55-59.
- Lovelace, M. A. K. (2003). In R. Dunn & S. A. G. Griggs (Eds.). *Synthesis of the Dunn and Dunn learning-style model research: Who, what, when, where, and so what?* New York: St. John's University's Center for the Study of Learning and Teaching Styles, (Chapter 47, pp. 217-224.
- O'Connell, D. M., Dunn, R., & Denig, S. (2003). Effects of traditional instruction versus instruction with teacher-constructed and self-teaching resources on the short-

term achievement and attitudes of tenth-grade science students. *The American Biology Teacher*, 65(2), 93-102.

Senge, P., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R., Roth, G., & Smith, B. (1991). Four futures for a change initiative. In *The Dance of Change: The challenge of sustaining momentum in learning organizations* (pp. 187-190). London: Nicholas Brealey Publishers.

Schiering, M. S., & Dunn, K. (2001). Student empowerment: From cognition to Meta-cognition. In R. Dunn (Ed.). *The art of significantly increasing science achievement test scores: Research and practical applications* (pp. 43-66). New York: St. John's University's Center for the Study of Learning and Teaching Styles.

Transparent Decision-Making in Higher Education: An Ethical Imperative for Effective Leadership

Sheila Taylor-King
Granite State College

College and university administrative behaviors are being widely transformed. While our most effective leaders have long practiced the art of transparent decision-making, too many administrators have—for decades—treated information as a power resource and have controlled access to information, frequently for the singular purpose of maintaining power. Fortunately, we are coming to the wide-spread realization that the consequences of closed-process decision-making processes include misunderstood priorities, power-hoarding, and skepticism or outright suspicion.

As both a description of process and an ethical imperative, open decision-making requires the following:

- determining which personnel possess knowledge and skills necessary to advance the quality of decision-making with respect to particular decision-issues;
- inviting these personnel to participate in decision-making, and ensuring that said personnel know they are welcomed and valued in the process;
- ensuring that open dialogue and participation opportunities are appropriate to the level of understanding and previous knowledge of participants; and
- demonstrating the value of discussion and contributions through incorporation of suggestions into decision-making.

Cazares *et al* (2007, p. 3) suggests that “accountability and transparency are at the heart of effective democratic governance.” The question that is then begged is the degree to which

an academic institution that operates within the broadly formed construct of shared governance is a democratic institution. Not entirely, is the obvious answer. The concept of shared governance does not necessarily connote that all decision-making is turned-over to the larger faculty body. It does, however, in the American tradition imply that college and university administrators consult with and solicit the generally held wisdom of the collective faculty. It is this tradition that demands our attention to the ethical imperative of transparency.

Of course, expansion of governance participation through transparent decision-making is not an entirely new phenomenon. It was used by many highly effective college and university presidents even before the term *transparency* became widespread. With the past decade, however, there has been a growing awareness of the value of transparent decision making, and there has been a slow but steady expansion of public institutional commitments to transparency. The University of Portsmouth (United Kingdom) is notable for its adoption in 2001 of the Transparency Review of Costing Program (London Times, 2001). Beginning in that year, all financial planning and analysis at the university became public to the community. Faculty, students, staff, and other interested constituents were provided complete information and were also invited to participate in the institution's budgetary planning, allocation processes, and review of expenditures. While Portsmouth adopted in this transparent decision-making process as a response to government influence, personnel at the university noted improvements in overall university climate.

Two widely known and highly respected campus executives—President Mark Emmert at the University of Washington, and President David J. Schmidly at the University of New Mexico—have made public commitments to embrace greater transparency in decision-making at each of their respective institutions. Emmert (2007) wrote to his faculty, “I appreciate the need and am working hard to develop greater transparency in decision-making and to have better communication with the leadership of the institution. I want you to know what we are doing, why we are doing it, and how we make decisions.”

Schmidly (2007) actually engaged a university reorganization process in order to gain efficiencies and transparency of operation. His stated goal was to advance a culture of openness at the university through a commitment to transparent and participative decision-making.

Transparency and open decision-making processes similar to those adopted at New Mexico, Portsmouth, and Washington remain an elusive goal for many institutions of higher education. In 1991, Diamond reported that 70 percent of campus personnel expressed frustration over insufficient opportunities for participation in and insufficient openness in campus decision making. Thirteen years later, Kezar (2004) reported a similar state of unease. Obviously, the state of transparency in higher education decision making had not progressed substantially.

Shared governance is central to the organizational concept of American higher education. It is built on an expectation that all parties—administration, faculty, and students—possess valuable specific interests in and bring valuable specific perspectives to contribute to the development of the college/university. Shared governance depends on the presence of a climate of openness, reliability, and honesty (Pope, 2004). Shared governance—an organizational principle to which virtually all successful college and university leaders subscribe—is substantially advanced through participative and transparent decision making. It's time has come.

REFERENCES:

- Cazares, A.R., & Shirk, D.A., 2007. *Evaluating Transparency and Accountability in Mexico*. San Diego: University Readers Press.
- Diamond, J. (1991). "Faculty Participation in Institutional Budgeting." In R. Birnbaum (Ed.), *New Directions for Higher Education*, no. 75. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Emmert, M. (2007). A communication to the faculty of the University of Washington, posted on the Internet: [HTTP://WWW.WASHINGTON.EDU/PRESIDENT/LCVI/CULTURE/TRANS_PRES.HTML](http://www.washington.edu/president/lcvi/culture/trans_pres.html).

- Kezar, A. (2004). "What is more important to effective governance: Relationships, Trust, and Leadership, or Structures and Formal Processes?" W. Tierney & V. Lechuga (Eds.), *New Directions in Higher Education*, no. 127. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- London Times (16 February 2001). *Analysis: The first rule of business—cover costs*. (Higher Education Supplement p. F-3).
- Pope, M. L. (2004). "A conceptual Framework of Faculty Trust and Participation in Governance." W. Tierney & V. Lechuga (Eds.), *New Directions in Higher Education*, no. 127. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schmidly, D.J. (2007). A communication to the faculty of the University of New Mexico, posted on the Internet: [HTTP://WWW.UNM.EDU/O7-08-14ATHLETICS.HTML](http://www.unm.edu/o7-08-14ATHLETICS.HTML).

The College President's Role as Ethical Barometer

Ronald A. Williams

Prince George's Community College

As institutions of higher education have evolved over the years, so too has the role of college president. It is not longer sufficient merely to be a good academic; college presidents are now expected to possess more political skill than their predecessors. They require deft business negotiating skills and the ability to build and maintain strong relationships with other leaders in the community. These leaders must demonstrate the visionary leadership of corporate CEOs while displaying the tactful diplomacy of government mandarins. This is in part because today's higher education institutions are no longer viewed simply as educational providers, but play a major role in contributing to policymaking, economic development and civic engagement. For college presidents, this means increased engagement with the realms of business and politics, rather than the rarefied existence enjoyed by presidents of yesteryear, when the quasi-ecclesiastical norms of the academy reigned supreme. Defining and maintaining ethical standards of conduct under these changing circumstances demand diligence and care. Ethical issues facing college and university leaders fall into two categories: those that are primarily pragmatic, often involving finances, and those of an academic or intellectual nature.

Complicating the president's role is the significance of institutional fundraising, responsibility for which falls largely on the president's shoulders. Cultivating potential donors and soliciting contributions are time-consuming and delicate activities which involve extended networking with wealthy and powerful individuals. Spending time in such heady company has the potential to exert pressure on college presidents to maintain similar standards of behavior and expenditure. As the

recent case of former American University President Benjamin Ladner illustrates, issues of compensation can become murky. Presidents at public institutions that rely on funding from federal, state and local government often find themselves in situations where they are advocating for increased funding for their institutions. Because they are regularly asking for assistance from politicians, their ability to hold their ground when a favor is asked in return can be compromised.

On intellectual matters, college presidents can also find themselves in the midst of controversy. As academics and leaders, they are expected to contribute to discourse within the academy and to provide commentary, even guidance, on issues of societal importance. However, in a profession where diplomacy is highly valued, it is worth examining the extent to which speech is restrained by established social beliefs. Although higher education claims free speech as a sacred right, there are constituencies that expect alignment with the prevailing philosophy and can institute harsh criticism for any deviation from that philosophy.

This is the situation in which former Harvard University President Lawrence Summers found himself after his highly publicized conference remarks on women in science and engineering caused a furor and sparked a nationwide debate on both the subject of his address and on the role of free speech in academic inquiry. Summers had prefaced his controversial remarks with a disclaimer that he was not speaking officially on behalf of Harvard and that his intent was to be provocative. In a subsequent meeting with faculty, Summers sought to clarify his intentions and reinforce his commitment to the advancement of women in science. In his opening remarks, published on the Harvard University Web site, Summers acknowledged, "I made a serious mistake in speaking in the way I did, especially given my role as president." The wisdom of his attempt to be provocative is debatable, but Summers is correct in his realization that for a college president, it is not possible to speak unofficially in a public setting.

As the public face of his or her institution, a president is never off duty. Anything he or she says, even when couched in unof-

ficial terms or spoken in informal settings, can be construed as reflective of institutional goals or policy. This is simply a reality of higher education administration and must be taken into account whenever a leader chooses to speak or offer opinions on controversial topics.

All this is to say that college and university presidents are held to a high standard. In an age when ethics scandals have become more frequent in politics and the corporate world, there is still a sense of the “purity” of academic life, and educational leaders are expected to serve as moral and ethical examples to the constituencies they serve, both on and off campus. Despite generous presidential remuneration packages, institutional heads are considered to be in their positions not for reasons of financial gain, reward or glory, but for the opportunity to serve the life of the mind, to further the pursuit of knowledge and to improve the prospects of those served by the institution. The contradiction between the lofty academic ideals to which presidents are expected to adhere and the utilitarian, material considerations which are his or her primary responsibility is something which a president must negotiate carefully.

There are some basic guidelines which may serve to steer presidents away from potentially awkward situations. Transparency is important. A president’s activities, compensation and policies should not be a matter of secrecy. Both the campus and external communities should be aware of what a president is doing and what he or she is receiving in return. Secrecy can lead to suspicion of unethical behavior, whether or not it is justified.

When do a president’s activities cross the line from appropriate to inappropriate? What is the ethical benchmark to which he or she can be held? Accountability does not lie with the president alone, but also with the Board of Trustees, with faculty, staff and even students. All have a duty to monitor a president’s behavior and to raise concerns when it deviates from what they perceive as acceptable. This begins with the hiring process. While ethical considerations may have been assumed to be a part of academic hiring practices in the past, they must now be formally incorporated. Ethics, along with other professional credentials, must be a qualifier for the job of college

president. In analyzing candidates for leadership positions, hiring committees must look at and test a prospective president's ethical standards. One way to do this is to ask questions designed to elicit specific responses, including the posing of hypothetical scenarios involving ethical judgments and also to require candidates to offer their own personal philosophies on the role of ethics in the office of president.

Ethical issues will continue to challenge college and university leaders. Particularly in areas related to finances, advocacy and intellectual debate, presidents are expected to serve as exemplars. Creating an atmosphere in which ethical behavior is expected and encouraged requires collaboration between all sectors of the college community. Articulating clear ethical standards within institutional policy will help to clarify what is considered ethical and/or legal, but the nuances of ethical behavior transcend formal expression. Much of the difficulty lies in the gray areas that are not so easily defined. In these cases, institutions must rely on the good judgment of their leaders to make prudent choices and decisions, their own good judgment in choosing those leaders and their willingness to hold those leaders accountable.

REFERENCE:

Summers, L. (2003). A speech to the faculty of Harvard University, posted on the Internet: <http://www.president.harvard.edu/speech>.

Ethical Leadership in Higher Education: Are We There Yet?

Robert G. Tetreault
Rhode Island College

Here we are at the onset of the 21st century. One would think that today's managers would have developed the leadership skills needed to tackle even the most daunting of situations. With each workday, however, supervisors, managers, directors and officers of most organizations deal with situations which challenge their ability to nurture their institutions and to provide them with effective leadership. We are in an era which requires a great deal of knowledge and skill to effectively manage any organization, e. g. functional competency, social responsiveness, business objectives, legal mandates, the ability to satisfy the needs of our stakeholders and technological innovation. Colleges and Universities have a particular responsibility to define and model ethical leadership and we will examine some of the challenges associated with doing so.

Every organization has its own personality, and, like people, each is unique. When we look for people with whom we are comfortable associating, one of the traits we seek out is trust. It is not unusual, then, that we seek the same traits in the organizations we work with and for.

We expect all organizations—public and private companies, all levels of government, religious and secular entities— to conduct themselves in an ethical manner. There has been a major increase in the amount of information that is available and communicated both within organizations and to the public. This has led to some major revelations in recent years about those in leadership positions in both the public and private sector who have not fulfilled their ethical obligations, and the results of their actions have been anywhere from embarrassing to catastrophic. For example, the effects of the Enron and

WorldCom scandals – the loss of jobs, the impact on the stock market, the erosion of public trust in big business—clearly illustrate the impact of such ethical lapses. As a feeder to business and political institutions and as we model much of our practices on business models, it is important that we carefully examine our own ethical practices.

What do people have a right to expect from leaders in higher education? Once again the issue of ethical behavior is our principal yardstick. How do we define what constitutes ethics? We can define ethics as the concept of right and wrong, which provides guidance as to how we should conduct ourselves. Sounds like a simple idea, doesn't it? Conceptually, it is, however the problems occur in its implementation. There are pressures placed upon us by ourselves, our supervisors, our constituents, and society. In order to meet the expectations that are placed on us, it is sometimes more expedient, and more comfortable, to take a shortcut or manipulate our results which allows us to satisfy expectations, but may not be ethical. For example, it may be decided that it is better not to pursue certain changes when renegotiating the labor contract because it is easier to reach an agreement if we acquiesce, even though these changes may be justified and morally correct. The result may be a contract that is settled sooner and without making waves between management and labor, however, the results may not be in the best interests of the stakeholders.

Who are the stakeholders of our colleges and universities? They are students, parents, employees, alumni, taxpayers and the communities in which these educational services are provided. Ethical leadership demands that the expectations of each of these constituency groups are met.

I believe the role that higher education plays in our communities presents an obligation that is greater than that of most other elements of our society. If the administrators of higher education institutions do not lead by example, their employees will not do the jobs that are rightfully expected of them. As employees often follow the example of their leaders, there must be an understanding that how they interact with others will be modeled. By assigning greater priority to the

number of students being admitted rather than the quality of the education being provided by professors, administrators are modeling unethical behavior. This can leave faculty with the impression that they may behave similarly. Imagine professors who are more interested in satisfying their own interests or ego than focusing on the primary job of educating their students. The negative effects of these actions will be felt by students as they make their way through the academic process and will ultimately weaken the fabric of their education. This in turn may have a negative impact on the services they will perform for their employers and others they interact with for the rest of their lives. Other side effects may include jeopardizing the reputation of the institution and a diminished enrollment of students. This domino effect is very real and very dangerous.

Much has been written about how faculty may negatively affect the educational process, often through unethical use of their teaching positions. However, such unethical actions aren't limited to faculty, by any means, which is why I want to spend more time looking at the administrative side of our institutions. This group is populated with employees whose mission is to support the faculty, who in turn are attempting to implement the educational mission of the institution.

The administrative group includes the secretarial, accounting, maintenance, human resource, payroll, office service, communications, information technology and other support staff who often account for fifty per cent of the employees at any given institution. These functional areas are less visible to the students and the public at large, but their impact is significant and their ethical obligations are equally important. These individuals are crucial to our discussion because it is their conduct and their values which are equally responsible for setting the tone of our institutions.

Do students notice the gardener who spends most of the day leaning on his shovel and leaves at the end of his shift with little accomplished or the secretary who doesn't take the time or effort to provide the student with a helpful response to a valid question? While they probably do, these are things that may escape the notice of management. What about employees

who are not held accountable for their actions or lack of acceptable performance because they are a long term employees or they are in favor with those in leadership positions? Management sometimes acts from fear in such situations, accepting the premise that it is better not to incur the wrath of this employee because they don't want to enter a conflict situation or get involved in the repercussions of progressive discipline. Students and employees are not blind to these and many similar practices that smack of inappropriateness. In virtually all cases, the institutions' stakeholders are looking to senior management for leadership to ensure that the organizations' ethical obligations are being met and that, indeed, is a reasonable and correct expectation. As mentioned earlier, each institution has its' own persona which is almost always defined from the top down; this persona is directly affected by management's attitude toward enforcement of institutional mandates.

Managers must stand up to the pressures that these broad institutional demands impose and set the tone for others to model. Conversely, every time leaders take the easy way out or let subjectivity, ego or lack of fortitude dictate their decisions, they run the risk of losing personal and organizational credibility. This inevitably leads to the weakening of our organizations. Is this an easy road to travel? Not by any means. It is far easier to "go along to get along" than it is to take a position, which we believe is morally and ethically correct, but is not in concert with the views of our leaders. The former course of action provides a greater degree of personal safety and indeed may very likely promote an employees own career aspirations, but there is a high price to pay. The basic fiber of the institution and the decision maker becomes weaker every time the easy or more comfortable path is chosen over the correct path. If we are to be truly effective, we need to set the tone for those to whom we are charged with providing direction. If we don't do it right, who will?

The answer to this question lies within each of us who bear the mantle of organizational leadership. We have to be able to distinguish between ruling and leading. Amazingly, some leaders fail to see the distinction. Rulers manage by fiat and care

little about the opinions of subordinates. This often results in subordinates acting out of fear and adopting an attitude of indifference and capitulation. Leaders on the other hand, utilize inclusion and a desire to play to the strengths of their subordinates. This style promotes and fosters dedication, loyalty and honesty and a willingness for employees to go above and beyond what is expected. People will follow us in either case. The success of those who are directly or indirectly subject to our decisions as well as the organizations we serve will be determined by which path we choose.

This may seem to be a rather bleak a picture; however, ethical leadership is not absent in the environs of higher education. Nevertheless, it would be surprising if the reader could not identify with one or more of the examples cited above.

What are some things that we can do to foster the notion of ethical leadership in our institutions? There are many possibilities; we can do all of the following:

- make our ethical principles known to all of our stakeholders
- incorporate an ethics contract in our communications with new students and employees
- provide ongoing, formal training to all employees at all levels including faculty
- weave the element of ethics into our academic programs

Most importantly, we can model our belief in the value of ethical leadership.

Whenever the question “are we there yet?” is raised, the answer will invariably be “No”, since there is no end to the pursuit of continued improvement. We can, however, take comfort in the fact that our individual efforts and examples will make a difference to employees and students as well as to our colleges and universities.

Faculty Perceptions of the Charismatic College President

Dan L. King

Queensborough Community College
of the City University of New York

The management literature is replete with examples supporting the perspectives that leadership is learned; or, that it is earned; or, that it is the confluence of some unique set of innate characteristics that result in a follower-group's willingness to be led. In fact, the effective application of leadership in any complex organization is far too multifaceted to be explained away as the result of a single manifestation—learned, earned, innate. Characterizations of super leadership (Manz & Sims, 1989)—that is leadership that emphasizes teamwork, self-management, and collective responsibility for achieving organizational ends—appear to support the notion that leadership is, in fact, learned, but that the ability to apply the learned techniques are heavily dependent on individual personal characteristics that demonstrate value for self-initiation, openness, and consultation among all organizational members. Oakley and Krug (1994) identify the communication of *intention* as a critical factor in effective organizational leadership. But, they caution, it is not the appearance of intention that is important but rather the actual personal perspective of the leader. They illustrate,

“[As leaders] we can be quiet and act as if we were listening—putting forth the image of the Creative Leader—and really not be listening at all. Yet people tend to sense whether someone is listening or not. They can tell if we are trying to do some Creative Leader things or if we are really coming from the aware, interested, caring, nurturing perspective ...” (p. 241).

Clearly, they recognize and value the worth of innate perspectives and behaviors as they apply to effective organizational leadership.

Of course, there is a technology to leadership. Effective leaders are organized and decisive. They demonstrate excellent problem analysis skills and good judgment. They are able to manage their time, and to organize the work of others. They demonstrate high ethical standards as well as advanced political skills (Soder, 2001). Wheatley suggests that there is a new science of leadership—one that is dependent on (a) leader knowledge/skill, (b) leader personality, and (c) leader integration with followers. It was this integrated perspective that first led to the question that guided the original conceptualization of this study: “Given a demonstrated adequate level of knowledge/skill for a particular collegiate leadership role, to what degree does the interchange of personality and commitment to integration with followers influence success in the college presidency?”

Of course, college and university leadership does not occur in a vacuum. Gappa et al (2005) point out that external pressures and influences can and do have significant impacts on the workplace environment for college faculty. However, recognizing that even the most volatile external pressures must be attended to in an organized fashion, we depend on the steady and controlled management of the college president to guide the institution through difficult situations.

An assumption underlying this study is that identified charismatic college and university leaders are characteristically so because of their nature. One does not usually set out to be charismatic, nor does one typically begin a day with the thought, “Today I’m going to behave especially charismatically.” So, the identification and study of charismatic presidents is a means of studying innate managerial and leadership characteristics.

This study began with a survey of presidents in three geographic regions of the United States—the Midwest (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin), the Mountain West (Colorado, Idaho, Nevada, Utah, Wyoming), and the Southeast (Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia). One-half of the presidents of all regionally accredited institutions in each of those regions were randomly selected for inclusion in the original survey group (Table 1). As

the first step in establishing a pool of charismatic presidents from among whom to populate the study group, each president in the total population was asked to identify (by name and institution) the one or two most charismatic presidents who were personally known to him/her. A total of 456 surveys were distributed. After a first mailing and two follow-up requests, 171 usable responses (37.5 percent of the total surveys) were received. By state, responses ranged from a high of 50 percent to a low of 27.4 percent.

This study utilized a nominal group identification technique in the selection of charismatic presidents to populate the study group. It was determined to select every president who was named by at least one-half of all respondents as a charismatic leader. However, if no candidate in any state satisfied the pre-determined nomination threshold, it was decided to include the one individual in each state who received the greatest number of nominations.

Table 1 – Initial Survey Response Rate

	Number of Surveys	Number of responses	Response Rate
MIDWEST REGION			
Illinois	73	20	27.4%
Indiana	27	11	40.7%
Michigan	40	15	37.5%
Ohio	55	22	40.0%
Wisconsin	30	14	46.7%

SOUTHEAST REGION			
Alabama	26	12	46.2%
Georgia	44	14	31.8%
North Carolina	57	19	33.3%
South Carolina	26	10	38.5%
Virginia	36	15	41.7%
MOUNTAIN WEST REGION			
Colorado	22	10	45.5%
Idaho	5	2	40.0%
Nevada	4	2	50.0%
Utah	7	3	42.9%
Wyoming	4	2	50.0%

Each of the nominated presidents was invited to participate in the study. The extent of their participation was to allow the distribution of a survey regarding faculty impressions of the president's leadership. Each potential study participant was assured that survey responses would be kept confidential and that responses would not be disaggregated by either the individual president, or the institution, or even the geographic region of the college or university. The distribution of nominees and their rate of agreement to participate in the study is summarized in Table 2.

Once the study subjects had been identified, the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System of the National Center for Education Statistics was used to identify a matched-pair institution that characteristically and geographically closely resembled the institution of the study subject. The president of each of these institutions was then solicited for his/her agreement to allow a survey solicitation of a limited number of faculty for the purposes of providing contrasting data. Again, presidents were assured of confidentiality and non-disaggregation of data. In those instances where a control-group president was reluctant to participate, another similar matched-pair institution was selected. (It is an interesting aside that these presidents—although not told whether they were in the char-

Table 2 – Number of Presidents Nominated/Participating in Study

	Number of Nominated Presidents	Number of Participating Presidents
MIDWEST REGION		
Illinois	1	1
Indiana	2	2
Michigan	2	1
Ohio	2	2
Wisconsin	2	2
SOUTHEAST REGION		
Alabama	3	3
Georgia	2	2
North Carolina	3	2
South Carolina	1	1
Virginia	2	1
MOUNTAIN WEST REGION		
Colorado	1	1
Idaho	1	1
Nevada	1	1
Utah	1	1
Wyoming	1	1

ismatic group or the control group—declined to participate at a substantially higher rate than did those who had been nominated as charismatic president.)

Using the faculty directory from each participating president's institution, 20 percent of the full-time faculty were randomly selected to receive a survey instrument that asked respondents to rate their impressions of their president's behavior and their reactions to his/her behavior. By institution, the number of surveys distributed ranged from 17 to 108. A to-

tal of 1632 surveys (829 at study institutions and 803 at control institutions) were distributed. After a first and two subsequent follow-up mailings, 504 usable survey responses were received; this represented an overall response rate of 30.9 percent.

The faculty survey contained 20 items and asked respondents to rate each item on a Likert-type scale (5 = greatest agreement / 1 = greatest disagreement). Responses of faculty from institutions of the charismatic presidents were compared with those from the matched-pair control group institutions, and differences were noted. These are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3 – Survey Response Summary

ITEM	Mean Score of Faculty From Institutions of Charismatic President	Mean Score of Faculty From Control Group Institutions
1. The president . . . values my teaching contributions to the institution.*	4.1	3.2
2. . . . values my scholarly/creative work.*	4.3	3.6
3. . . . values my service contributions to the institution.*	4.1	3.0
4. . . . demonstrates an upbeat and positive attitude about the institution.*	4.4	3.2
5. . . . demonstrates an enthusiasm for his/her work.	3.9	3.6
6. . . . shares important information with the college/university community.	3.7	3.3
7. . . . relates well with students.*	4.3	3.3
8. . . . relates well with faculty.	3.9	3.2

9. . . . relates well with board members or external policy-makers.	4.2	4.1
10. . . . relates well with non-professional staff.*	3.9	2.9
11. . . . relates well with administrative and other professional staff.	3.7	3.3
12. . . . relates well with alumni.	4.0	4.1
13. . . . relates well with members of the community.*	4.1	3.7
14. . . . effectively communicates with all members of the college/university community.	3.5	2.9
15. . . . effectively communicates the institution's needs to external constituents.	3.9	3.1
16. . . . effectively balances competing demands for institutional resources.	3.1	3.3
17. . . . motivates me to do good overall work.*	4.3	3.0
18. . . . demonstrates good judgment.	3.6	3.2
19. . . . works hard at being an effective leader.*	4.3	3.0
20. . . . is an effective leader.*	4.3	3.1

* Statistically significant at the .05 level.

The overall differences in scores between the charismatic president group and the control group are striking, as is the fact that a statistically significant difference was found for ten of the twenty survey items. Clearly, faculty at the institutions where presidents had been identified by their peers as highly charismatic leaders view those presidents as more appreciative, more motivational and overall more effective in their leadership roles.

The educational leadership literature supports the notion that leader skills can be learned, and that the full opportuni-

ties to lead are earned only after establishing one's self in an organization. The results of this survey demonstrate that some innate leadership qualities—in this case personal charisma—can make a difference.

REFERENCES:

- Covey, S. R. (2004). *The 8th habit: From effectiveness to greatness*. New York: The Free Press.
- Drucker, P. F. (2003). *The new realities* (Rev. Ed.). Somerset, NJ: Transaction.
- Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2005). Rethinking academic work and workplaces. *Change*, 37(6), 32-39.
- Higgerson, M. L., & Joyce, T. A. (2007). *Effective leadership communication*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Manz, V. V., & Sims, H. P. (1989). *Super leadership: Leading others to lead themselves*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Oakley, E., & Krug, D. (1994). *Enlightened leadership*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (2003). *Shared leadership: Reframing the how's and why's of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Soder, R. (2001). *The language of leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wheatley, M. J. (2006). *Leadership and the new science*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Crossing Economic Borders in the Commodification of Higher Education

David Kendrick

Texas A&M University–Corpus Christi

We may disregard the long held belief that education's principle duty is to instill a values set that one might cultivate into a contributing citizen or that lofty notion that education is for the common good. Education is becoming an internationally traded commodity to be purchased by consumers to develop their own marketable skills sets. Such is the issue in the World Trade Organization (WTO) regarding the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). The commodification of education has major implications for the university, the ownership and transmission of knowledge, and even citizenship in American and world societies (Altbach, 2002). Even courses, the essential learning unit, have become "commoditized" and sought as commercial products by online distance learning companies, for-profit universities, and publishers (Twigg, 2005). Nevertheless, education in the United States and Western countries has traditionally been considered a public good and guaranteed by the state, certainly not as a for-profit enterprise or a tradable commodity (Sedgwick, 2002). Regardless of one's leaning on "globalization," for better or for worse, it has arrived, is here to stay, was inevitable, and is unstoppable (Altbach, 2002).

How did commodification come about? We must look beyond GATS, beyond WTO, and even beyond education as an enterprise which, incidentally, is not a twenty-first century phenomenon. We must look to the development of the "knowledge society." Knowledge is, of course, the society's key resource and knowledge workers will drive the workforce and its economy. It is devoid of borders, mobile, available to all

through easily acquired formal education, and with high potential for failure or success (Drucker, 2001). It has winners and losers. Losers may include low-income countries falling behind in the knowledge economy and in desperate need of higher-level skills (Sedgwick, 2002).

The knowledge society is highly competitive for individuals, organizations, and nation states. Information technology is allowing knowledge to spread rapidly and making it accessible globally. Businesses and universities must be globally competitive as the Internet keeps potential customers informed on availability and price (Drucker, 2001). Actually, globalization should keep service prices in check, just as it did with clothes, appliances, and home tools when manufacturing went offshore (Higher Education Union, 2005). However, the benefits of such price checks are felt mainly by large consumers of the industries who outsource; thus, corporations and their share-holders will reap the largest benefits. This may lead to the "share-holder class," those Americans (and foreigners) who own stock and experience economic buoyancy through the rise and fall of corporations. Those who enjoy such significant are among an elite group (2005). Are we in the grips of another form of neocolonialism.

Are we in the grips of another form of neocolonialism? Certainly it is a new era of power and influence. Who are the new neocolonialists? They are the multinational corporations, media conglomerates, and even a few major universities. They seek not to dominate for ideological or political reasons, but rather for commercial gain. GATS establishes open markets for knowledge products of all kinds so that the new neocolonialists may gain access to world markets. Developing countries, like in the era of the cold war, become pawns or are left on the fringe among feuding superpowers (Altbach, 2002).

Higher education has already made the global entrepreneurial leap. Witness two prominent cases. UNext.com offered a group of elite universities a chance at Wall Street riches in exchange for the right to use their names and their faculty expertise for developing courses in business, engineering, and writing. UNext.com aimed at the major U.S. growth areas

— corporate training, continuing education, distance learning, and the international-student market and has developed business-oriented courses, selling them to multinational and overseas corporations (Blumenstyk, 2002). At issue is the ways in which colleges and universities deploy their academic resources and reputations for financial gain. Are for-profit educational organizations cannibalizing traditional institutions to the organizations' benefit and to the institutions' detriment?

In another case, The University of Virginia (UV) offered a package of case-based courses, "CaseNET," sold over and delivered by the Internet to colleges, universities, and school districts in North America and overseas. Higher education institutions who bought the courses could repackage them using their own course titles and charge their own tuition rates. Students earned credit by registering with their home institutions any place in the world or they could register and earn credit directly with UV, again, from anyplace, globally (Wooten, 1997).

The ultimate question at hand is just what conduit of international law makes possible the transactions and commodification? The international education market, spawning a wave of protectionism, impelled the World Trade Organization (WTO), through the General Agreement on Trade in Services, to include education in its list of services to be liberalized. Specifically, GATS has demanded the creation of common educational standards for quality control and the eradication of barriers that inhibit or prevent cross-border exchanges in educational services (Sedgwick, 2002).

What exactly is the General Agreement on Trade in Services? It is the first international trade agreement to cover trade in services as opposed to products and negotiated under the auspices of the World Trade Organization. It was inspired by the same objectives as its counterpart in merchandise trade, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (WTO, 2005). Its purpose is to establish a multilateral framework of principles and rules aimed at progressively opening up trade in services worldwide. Education proposals have called for the implementation of universal educational standards, mutual recognition of academic credentials, and liberalization of professional ac-

creditation. Most developing nations have not committed themselves to liberalization in higher education. In fact, only four countries — the United States, New Zealand, Australia and Japan — have actually submitted their negotiating proposals for liberalizing trade in educational services (World Education News and Reviews, 2002).

The World Trade Organisation, 144 member states strong, is the international body dealing with the rules of trade between nations. Its tasks include increasing trade liberalization internationally, the assurance of transparency in trade, and serving as a forum for trade negotiations. At the heart of the WTO are their agreements, negotiated and signed by the majority of the world's trading nations and ratified in their parliaments (GATS, 2005).

The laws for transparency and free trade are at odds with the laws protecting the values of a nation and social common good. Protecting culture, intellectual independence, and social values are viewed by protectionists as not on the same level as free trade and equal access in commodities as those posed in the GATS agenda (Altbach, 2002). The debate is on. Opponents of trade believe in limited access because trade will not only commercialize education, but escalate the cost of education and perhaps lead to a two-tiered system. Furthermore, some governments with limited budget capacity or lack of political will to allocate funds will not deal effectively with the escalating costs of higher education. (Knight, 2002).

There are those who believe that the heavy hand of GATS and the WTO is not needed in the educational sphere (Altbach, 2002). The debate is divisive, pitting students and universities against big business interests. Supporters of globalized free trade argue that trade in educational services creates more providers and delivery modes, increases access and facilitates socio-economic growth through higher education. Opening up markets to foreign education providers brings people more choices and greater freedom. Coursework, lectures, and academic resources are freely accessed and exchanged on the Web much in the same way that the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has recently made available its entire curriculum (Sedgwick, 2002).

Those opposed to GATS say the commodification of higher education places profits above the public good and can actually impede student access. GATS could erode university autonomy and drastically reduce government subsidies. Students and teachers unions have opposed the GATS agreement, claiming it would force countries to dismantle their own systems and adopt one based on U.S. education. Students are concerned that the GATS measures could hike tuition costs, placing a college education beyond the reach of most, particularly those in the developing nations (2002).

There are four modes of supply in terms of education (Canadian Higher Education, 2001):

1. Cross-border supply: Distance education is an example of cross-border supply. An institution in one Member country exports its services to another member country.
2. Consumption abroad: Student mobility is an example of consumption abroad. Citizens of one member country consume services on the territory of another member country.
3. Commercial presence: Educational facilities set up abroad are an example of commercial presence. A service supplier from a member country supplies a service on the territory of another member country.
4. Presence of natural persons: Faculty lecturing abroad is an example of the presence of natural persons. People from one member country supply a service in another member country.

There are many on the anti-commodity side of the debate: The Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), representing Canada's 92 public and private not-for-profit universities and degree-level colleges, the American Council on Education (ACE), representing 1,800 accredited degree granting colleges and universities in the United States, the European University Association (EUA), representing 30 national Rectors' Conferences and 537 individual universities across the European continent, the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), representing 3,000 accredited,

degree-granting colleges and universities and 60 recognized institutional and programmatic accreditors in the United States who have stated that "Higher education exists to serve the public interest and is not a 'commodity', a fact which WTO Member States have recognized through UNESCO and other international or multilateral bodies, conventions, and declarations" (AUCC, 2002).

Perhaps, in light of all these international entities pitching their perspectives, it is best to consider how GATS might affect those of us serving or utilizing the public institution of higher education at the state level. GATS considers government monopolies as a barrier to service trade. Another barrier is subsidization of local (state) institutions; however, all nations, particularly the United States, engage in substantial subsidization of their local institutions. State budgets compensate the taxpayers who provide the funding for these state universities by providing reduced tuition to their residents (NEA Report, 2005). Adoption and compliance with complete service liberalization could ask domestic governments to choose to extend subsidization to foreign affiliates or cut off these subsidies for native institutions (2005). Is this drastic leap toward trade liberalization one that we are willing to take so close to home?

REFERENCES:

- Blumenstyk G. (1999). A company pays top universities to use their names and their professors. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 18, 1999.
- Altbach, P. (2002). Knowledge and Education as International Commodities: The Collapse of the Common Good. *International Higher Education, Summer, 2002*
- Canadian Higher Education and the GATS: AUCC Background Paper. (2001). Retrieved from the Internet Mar. 2005 at [HTTP://WWW.AUCC.CA/_PDF/ENGLISH/REPORTS/2001/GATS_07_E.PDF](http://www.aucc.ca/_PDF/ENGLISH/REPORTS/2001/GATS_07_E.PDF).
- Drucker, P. (2001). The next society. *The Economist*, Nov. 1, 2001.

- GATS Fact and fiction: Misunderstandings and scare stories. *World Trade Organization*. Retrieved from the Internet April, 2005 at [HTTP://WWW.WTO.ORG/ ENGLISH/ TRATOP_E/SERV_E/GATS_FACTFICTIONFALSE_E.HTM](http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/serv_e/gats_factfictionfalse_e.htm).
- GATS in a Nutshell. (2002). *World Education News and Reviews*. Retrieved from the Internet April, 2005 at [HTTP://WWW.WES.ORG/EWENR/02SEPT/ FEATURE.HTM](http://www.wes.org/ewenr/02sept/feature.htm).
- The General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS): objectives, coverage and disciplines. *World Trade Organization*. Retrieved from the Internet April, 2005 at [HTTP://WWW.WTO.ORG/ENGLISH/TRATOP_E/SERV_E/GATSQA_E.HTM](http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/serv_e/gatsqa_e.htm).
- Globalization and the Knowledge Economy. *The Higher Education Union*. Retrieved from the Internet April, 2005 at [HTTP://WWW.AUT.ORG.UK /INDEX.CFM?ARTICLEID=116](http://www.aut.org.uk/index.cfm?articleid=116).
- Higher education and international trade agreements: An examination of the threats and promise of globalization. *NEA Report*. Retrieved from the Internet Apr. 2005 at [HTTP://WWW2.NEA.ORG/HE/GLOBAL/INDEX.HTML](http://www2.nea.org/he/global/index.html).
- Impacts of GATS on Higher Education. GATS overview document. Retrieved from the Internet April, 2005 at [HTTP://WWW.AIC.LV/ REC/ENG/NEW_D_EN /GATS/GATS_OVW.HTML#IMPACTS%20OF%20GATS](http://www.aic.lv/rec/eng/new_d_en /gats/gats_ovw.html#impacts%20of%20gats)
- Joint Declaration on Higher Education and the General Agreement on Trade in Services. (2001). Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. Retrieved from the Internet March. 2005 at [HTTP://WWW.AUCC.CA/_PDF/ENGLISH /STATEMENTS/2001/GATS_IO_25_E.PDF](http://www.aucc.ca/_pdf/english /statements/2001/gats_io_25_e.pdf).
- Knight, J. (2002). Trade creep: Implication of GATS for higher education policy. *International Higher Education*, Summer, 2002.
- The National Unions of Students in Europe. Retrieved from the Internet March. 2005 at [HTTP://WWW.AIC.LV/ACE/ACE_DISK/GATS/COMMO_STATEMESIB.PDF](http://www.aic.lv/ace/ace_disk/gats/commo_statemesib.pdf).
- The Prospects for U.S. Higher Education in Trade Agreements National Committee for International Trade in Education*. 2002. Retrieved from the Internet March. 2005 at [HTTP://WWW.TRADEINEDUCATION.ORG /GENERAL_INFO/FRAMES.HTML](http://www.tradeineducation.org/general_info/frames.html).

- Sedgwick, R. (2002). The Trade Debate in International Higher Education. *World Education Services*, 15, 5, 2002. Retrieved from the Internet April, 2005 at [HTTP://WWW.WES.ORG/EWENR/02SEPT/FEATURE.HTM](http://www.wes.org/EWENR/02SEPT/FEATURE.HTM).
- Trade in higher education. (2001). *United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization*. Retrieved from the Internet Mar. 2005 at [HTTP://WWW.UNESCO.ORG/EDUCATION/STUDYING-ABROAD/HIGHLIGHTS/GLOBAL_FORUM/GATS_HE/BASICS_LINKS.SHTML#ED](http://www.unesco.org/education/studying-abroad/highlights/global_forum/gats_he/basics_links.shtml#ed).
- Twigg, C. (2000). Who owns online courses and course materials? *Intellectual Property Policies for a New Learning Environment*. Retrieved from the Internet Apr. 2005 at [HTTP://WWW.CENTER.RPI.EDU/PEWSYM/MONO2.HTML#ANCHOR-PREFAC-40794](http://www.center.rpi.edu/pewsym/mono2.html#anchor-prefac-40794).
- Wootten, L. (1997). Teacher training gets a new twist with online case study. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 12, 1997.

Book Review

Anthony DeLuca

Queensborough Community College
of the City University of New York

Review of: Weimer, M. (2006). *Enhancing Scholarly Work on Teaching & Learning: Professional Literature That Makes a Difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

In *Enhancing Scholarly Work on Teaching & Learning: Professional Literature That Makes a Difference* (2006), Maryellen Weimer seeks to inspire a greater use of scholarly work on teaching and learning by increasing an understanding of what it is. She also wants to help bring about a “more positive future in which scholarly work on teaching and learning is accepted and valued.” She inspires us to engage in pedagogical research by showing its value and offering practical advice on how to recognize and practice it. She also provides a framework for interpreting past pedagogical research, and discusses how it can be used to create more effective teaching, teacher training, and professional advancement. In addition, she considers “promising possibilities” for future research and applications of pedagogical research, as well as unconventional formats in which it appears outside of the realm of conventional journal articles. Recognizing that research on teaching and learning involves the academic community beyond faculty researchers, Weimer writes this book for deans, provosts, and college presidents, who identify themselves as “teaching-learning advocates,” for “faculty developers,” and for “editors, reviewers, authors and potential authors” of pedagogical research.

In the first two chapters of *Enhancing Scholarly Work*, Weimer defines pedagogical research by asking fundamental questions such as, “How is this kind of scholarly work alike and different

from discipline-base scholarship?” She discusses where one can find this kind of research, and questions why more faculty do not avail themselves of it. She argues that the “cost of not having a viable literature associated with instructional practice is high.” She also cautions that we avoid a field-specific approach to pedagogical literature to see, for example, that methods used to teach science and math more effectively can also be applied to the teaching of literature or psychology.

In Chapter 3, Weimer examines what would make pedagogical scholarship more “credible.” She identifies and analyzes several characteristics of scholarly pedagogical research that indicate rigor and intellectual integrity and identifies some of the editorial policies of journals and periodicals that publish solid pedagogical scholarship. This material is helpful to the novice as well as the experienced researcher. In this same chapter, Weimer also offers helpful ways to categorize past scholarship on teaching and learning scholarship. She divides it into “Wisdom-of-Practice” and “Research Scholarship.” She offers four experiential approaches under the rubric of “Wisdom-of-Practice Scholarship,” which includes “personal accounts of change,” and “personal narratives.” Under “Research Scholarship” she describes the most common approaches to pedagogical research: quantitative investigations, qualitative studies, and descriptive research. It is in Chapters 4 and 5, which she defines as the “heart” of her book, that we see Weimer examine the scholarship according to the categories and approaches she has identified and explicated in chapter 3. Here she provides exemplars of pedagogical research and then analyzes them in depth. It is these chapters, Weimer states, that are crucial to help readers new to this field see for themselves the breadth of previously published research, the lessons that the scholarship reveals, and the “real and potential quality of scholarship on teaching and learning.”

Weimer goes beyond her own and traditional approaches to scholarship on teaching and learning in chapter 6 when she discusses non-traditional research approaches. She considers “promising possibilities” in articles that combine some of the approaches (“hybrids”) she has discussed and pedagogical re-

search presented in “unusual formats,” for example, the letters exchanged between two faculty members who team-teach a course to explore the benefits of collegial collaboration within and across disciplines. She also provides information about valuable research in the form of newsletters and online course materials. In Chapter 7 Weimer discusses what we can learn from past scholarship and how to use what we have learned to “improve instruction and advance the profession.” She looks for “defining characteristics” observing, for example, that in the past the emphasis in pedagogical research was on “how to teach” but that has given way to “how to promote learning.” She advocates that pedagogical scholarship that is “more credible, more recognized and rewarded, will make the literature more viable.”

In the concluding two chapters, Weimer turns her attention to the practice of actually “doing and using pedagogical scholarship.” Chapter 8 offers practical advice on how faculty can start doing research on teaching and learning, from formulating goals to joining a pedagogical writing support group to handling rejection constructively. She urges readers to “explore the questions that interest you,” and debunks the reasons people usually give for not attempting to do pedagogical research. She lists its benefits to help motivate the hesitant, such as, developing “instructional awareness,” thinking “more deeply about teaching,” and keeping “your teaching fresh over the long haul,” among others. In the final chapter, Weimer offers advice on providing the academic leadership necessary to “enhance scholarly work on teaching and learning,” from creating an agenda that is broad enough to allow for a wide range of creative scholarship, to rewarding and supporting interested faculty who have never engaged in pedagogical research or practice. She proposes that administrators begin a dialogue with faculty and create an agenda for pedagogical scholarship “by bringing pedagogical literature to faculty” through the library, the Internet, and through text in the form of journal and periodical articles and books. This can be followed up by creating venues for discussion of issues relevant to teaching and learning research, and by creating standards for assessing the

research performed and the recognition credible research will receive. Weimer concludes that, “Because pedagogical scholarship is different, it merits unique standards”—certainly an institutional challenge for any college or university.

The Mission of AAUA

The mission of the American Association of University Administrators is to develop and advance superior standards for the profession of higher education administration. Through its policy statements, programs, and services the association emphasizes the responsibility of administrators, at all levels, to demonstrate moral and ethical leadership in the exercise of their duties.

To achieve these ends the association provides, through programs and services, opportunities for the professional development of its members, whether they be employed by colleges, universities, specialized institutions, or professional associations.

Professional Standards of the AAUA

In 1975, the AAUA developed a set of professional standards, which embody the principles of moral and ethical leadership and which define the rights and responsibilities of administrators in higher education. These professional standards were revised in 1994. This revision process began in October, 1992. The Association's Professional Standards Committee developed a series of draft revisions that were reviewed and amended by the Board of Directors at its regular meetings, and by the AAUA membership at the 22nd National Assembly in June 1993. In November 1993, Draft IV of the revised standards was mailed to all members of the AAUA with a questionnaire, the responses to which were included in Draft V. Draft V of the revised standards was approved, with amendments, by the Board of Directors at the 23rd National Assembly in June 1994.

Standard 1 – Non-discrimination

(a) An applicant for employment or promotion as an Administrator has the right to consideration without being discriminated against on the grounds of race, gender, sexual orientation, religion (except where exempt by Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, or other statute), national origin, age, or disability.

(b) An Administrator has the responsibility to perform the duties of his or her office in such a way as to not discriminate on the grounds of race, gender, sexual orientation, religion (except where exempt by Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, or other statute), national origin, age, or disability.

Standard 2 – Written Terms of Employment

(a) An Administrator has the right to a written statement of the terms of his or her employment, including, but not limited to, statements on salary and fringe benefits, term of office, process of review, and responsibilities of the position.

(b) An Administrator has the responsibility to perform the duties of his or her office as defined in the written statement of the terms of employment or as defined in an official handbook of the institution.

Standard 3 – Institutional Authority and Support

(a) An Administrator has the right to the authority necessary to fulfill the responsibilities of his or her office and to a supportive institutional environment.

(b) An Administrator has the responsibility to use the authority of his or her office and the support provided by the institution to fulfill the responsibilities of his or her office.

Standard 4 – Availability and Use of Resources

(a) An Administrator has the right to the financial, physical, and human resources necessary to fulfill the responsibilities of his or her office.

(b) An Administrator has the responsibility to use the financial, physical, and human resources of his or her office in a way that is consistent with the policies and priorities set by the institution's governing board; and has the responsibility to develop, allocate, and preserve the resources of the institution that are within the limits of his or her office.

Standard 5 – Policy Development and Implementation

(a) An Administrator has the right to participate in the development and implementation of those institutional policies that relate to the authority and responsibilities of his or her office.

(b) An Administrator has the responsibility to participate in the development and implementation of those institutional policies that relate to the authority and responsibilities of his or her office.

Standard 6 – Speaking for the Institution

(a) An Administrator has the right to act as a spokesperson of the institution within the limits of his or her office and subject to the policies of the institution.

(b) An Administrator has the responsibility to act as a spokesperson for the institution within the limits of his or her office, insofar as that function is a requirement of the office.

Standard 7 – Professional Growth and Development

(a) An Administrator has the right to support for his or her professional growth and development by means such as participation in professional activities and attendance at professional meetings and by sharing in sabbaticals, leaves of absence, and other developmental programs of the institution.

(b) An Administrator has the responsibility to improve his or her professional skills, abilities, and performance by means such as participation in professional activities and attendance at professional meetings and by sharing in sabbaticals, leaves of absence, and other developmental programs of the institution.

Standard 8 – Job Performance Evaluation

(a) An Administrator has the right to regular formal evaluation of his or her job performance, to participate in the evaluation process, and to the timely receipt of the results of those evaluations.

(b) An Administrator has the responsibility for ensuring that his or her subordinates receive regular formal job performance evaluations, that they participate in the evaluation process, and that they receive in a timely manner the results of those evaluations.

Standard 9 – Advancement Within the Institution

(a) An Administrator has the right to be considered for career advancement opportunities within the institution.

(b) An Administrator has the responsibility when positions become available that are within the limits of his or her office to post those positions within the institution and to give consideration to candidates from within the institution.

Standard 10 – Academic Freedom

(a) An Administrator has the right to enjoy the benefits of academic freedom insofar as the concept of academic freedom (as defined by the institution) is applicable to his or her duties.

(b) An Administrator has the responsibility to perform the duties of

his or her office in a way that maintains and secures the academic freedom of faculty, students, and administrators, and that maintains and secures the academic freedom of the institution.

Standard 11 – Expression of Personal Opinions

(a) An Administrator has the right to enjoy the benefits of academic freedom insofar as the concept of academic freedom (as defined by the institution) is applicable to his or her duties.

(b) An Administrator has the responsibility when expressing personal opinions on issues that are related to the institution to make clear that he or she is speaking as a private person and not as a representative of the institution.

Standard 12 – Harassment-Free Environment

(a) An Administrator has the right to perform the responsibilities of his or her office without being harassed.

(b) An Administrator has the responsibility to perform the duties of his or her office in a way that creates and maintains an environment in which each person is able to perform his or her responsibilities without being harassed.

Standard 13 – Personal Privacy

(a) An Administrator has the right to privacy in all personal matters, including, but not limited to financial information, religious beliefs, and political views and affiliations, unless this right is specifically limited by statute or the conditions of the particular office.

(b) An Administrator has the responsibility to respect the right of privacy of others, in all personal matters including, but not limited to, financial information, religious beliefs, and political views and affiliations, except where this right of others is specifically limited by statute or the conditions of their office.

Standard 14 – Participation in Associations and Support of Causes

(a) An Administrator has the right to participate in associations and to support causes of his or her choice, subject only to the constraints

imposed by institutional responsibilities or conflict of interest considerations.

(b) An Administrator has the responsibility to respect the right of his or her subordinates to participate in associations and to support causes, subject to the constraints imposed by institutional responsibilities or conflict of interest considerations.

Standard 15 – Fair and Equitable Treatment

(a) An Administrator has the right to fair and equitable treatment by his or her superiors and by the institution's administrators and governing board and to receive treatment that is free from arbitrary or capricious action.

(b) An Administrator has the responsibility to treat subordinates fairly and equitably and to avoid arbitrary or capricious actions especially in situations relating to performance evaluations, promotions, demotions and, or, the termination of employment.

Standard 16 – Reappointment and Termination

(a) An Administrator has the right to receive a copy of the institution's policies and procedures relating to the timely notification of reappointment and termination actions, prior to his or her appointment. When these policies and procedures are amended, an administrator has the right to receive the amended policies and procedures.

(b) An Administrator has the responsibility to respect his or her subordinates' rights contained in the institution's policies and procedures relating to the timely notification of reappointment and termination actions.

Standard 17 – Post Employment Support

(a) An Administrator has the right, when his or her termination of employment is for reasons other than for cause, to receive professional and technical support from the institution in seeking new employment.

(b) An Administrator has the responsibility, within the limits of his or her office, to provide professional and technical support to subor-

dinates whose employment is terminated for reasons other than for cause.

Standard 18 – Post Employment References

(a) An Administrator has the right, when ending his or her employment or subsequent to ending his or her employment, to receive a written statement from the institution that reflects clearly and accurately his or her job performance evaluation and the reason for his or her termination of employment.

(b) An Administrator has the responsibility, when requested by a subordinate or former subordinate, for providing a written statement from the institution that reflects clearly and accurately the performance evaluation and the reason for termination of employment of that subordinate or former subordinate.

Guidelines for Authors

The purpose of the *Journal of Higher Education Management* is to promote and strengthen the profession of college and university administration the *Journal* provides a forum for:

- (a) a discussion of the current issues, problems and challenges facing higher education administration;
- (b) an exchange of practical wisdom and techniques in the areas of higher education leadership, policy analysis and development, and institutional management; and
- (c) the identification and explication of the principles and standards of college and university administration.

Manuscripts should be written for the college or university administrator who has the general responsibilities of educational leadership, policy analysis, staff development, and/or institutional management. Practical as well as scholarly-oriented submissions are welcome.

All manuscripts should be submitted electronically to the Editor-in-Chief at DKING@QCC.CUNY.EDU. They must be submitted as MSWord documents. One page should be headed with the title of the article and should contain only the complete identification and contact information for all authors. The actual manuscript should contain no identifiable information other than the title of the article. Manuscripts must conform to the latest standards of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*.

Manuscripts are blind reviewed and are publishable only upon the favorable recommendation of at least three reviewers. The *Journal* charges no publishing or page-cost fees.

