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Nothing endures but change.

–HERACLITUS (540 BC - 480 BC)
Change. If there is one descriptor that fits higher education, it would be a system undergoing substantial and deep change. Apart from the obvious ways in which our institutions are evolving, we are forced to rethink many of our deeply held assumptions about teaching, learning, student development, faculty work, access, equity, and those who lead us through the challenging transitions that are part of becoming a genuine, global knowledge-based society. In this issue of Research Annals, we bring together work in two broad areas of change in postsecondary education: learning and development, and leadership.

Professional learning and development encompasses a broad range of collegiate activity from workforce and human resource development to faculty development. Our graduate programs may also be seen as venues for professional development as we prepare those who represent the future of postsecondary education. We know that the workplace and labor markets are changing; this is true within and outside of universities. How we respond, and the frameworks, models, theories, and pedagogies we use to address learner needs in these complex environments are critical questions across the postsecondary education system.

The transitions through which we are collectively moving also call into question who leads our institutions at any level, how they are prepared to do so, and what cultural factors affect prospective and current leaders. If we want more than 7 steps or 5 levers to facilitate change, we need to be much more willing to examine the ways in which leadership has become problematic as a result of the institutional changes going on in higher education. Old models will not fit dynamic organizations, nor will traditional approaches work for new generations of leaders. Being willing to look in new ways at those who are not always recognized as leaders, is an important step in understanding what the leadership future holds and how we might better prepare to engage that future.
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In a knowledge age, information and learning become indispensable elements of a prosperous society. The knowledge economy, however, brings with it both opportunities and a host of new pressures wrought by the pace of technological change, globalization, and the growth and development of industries new and old. These pressures fall not only on the individual, who must navigate this brave new world, but on the American educational infrastructure from K–12 and vocational schools to community colleges and universities.

Given the new demands, Americans have sought out learning opportunities in larger numbers. Data indicate that in the early 2000s, nearly 70 million Americans were taking formal courses or training that were not part of a traditional degree, certificate, or apprenticeship program for reasons related to their job or career. For postsecondary education, the challenge is clear: prepare students or workers for an ever-more demanding work environment. In this issue of Research Annals, we examine these challenges by focusing on John Dirkx and the nature of continuing education and human resource development, Matthew Wawrzynski and peer education, and Ann Austin and the future of faculty development in age of change.
Change and the Workplace

For Professor John Dirkx, few sectors of American society have been more thoroughly affected by change than the American workplace. The only reliable constant for workers and their organizations, it would seem, is change. Given the ever-increasing knowledge demands on workers, Dirkx and his colleagues, Jerry Gilley and Ann Maycunich Gilley, argue that continuing professional development and human resource development—the two fields charged with fostering education and development in the workplace—need to be grounded in a broader understanding of work-related learning and change.

Dirkx points out that these two fields are essential to the enhancement of workplace learning and development. They are the two fields of practices specifically charged with fostering the necessary change wrought by everything from technological advances to legislative and economic policies. And yet, the two fields seem oddly estranged with continuing professional development, closely attuned to the needs of the individual practitioner and human resource development—the two fields charged with fostering education and development in the workplace—need to move away from their traditional foci and toward each other. For Dirkx, the two fields clearly stress enhancing knowledge, cognitive skills, and workplace performance, but what is often missing is attention to the emotional, relational, and community needs inherent in work-related learning. Given that, Dirkx and his colleagues have suggested a new paradigm that involves a broader context that considers the developmental needs of the practitioner, the evolving nature of the “inner self,” and helping people deepen their understanding of the meaning of work and career.

Dirkx is clear that he is not advocating both fields somehow merge into one. There is a role for both and they will undoubtedly remain related but distinct forms of practice. His point is only that professionals in each field stand to learn much from each other and that would serve them well—as well as the American workers who rely on them.

On the one hand, continuing professional education needs to broaden its perspective beyond the individual learner, Dirkx said, to be more inclusive of how social and cultural factors play a role in lifelong learning and change. Meanwhile, human resource development must start taking into consideration both individual factors and the broader social and community contexts that are inextricably linked to learning and development. Essentially, both fields must move away from their traditional foci and toward each other. For Dirkx, the two fields clearly stress enhancing knowledge, cognitive skills, and workplace performance, but what is often missing is attention to the emotional, relational, and community needs inherent in work-related learning. Given that, Dirkx and his colleagues have suggested a new paradigm that involves a broader context that considers the developmental needs of the practitioner, the evolving nature of the “inner self,” and helping people deepen their understanding of the meaning of work and career.

Assistant Professor Matthew Wawrzynski seeks to understand growth and development of individuals not from the vantage point of workplace, but from the perspective of the undergraduate. He, like many college and university administrators, has come to recognize the importance of peer interactions in enhancing the growth and development of college students. Peer educators can play important roles in everything, from raising awareness of sexual assault, helping build greater tolerance among diverse groups on campus, and even changing attitudes about such things as alcohol and drugs. Yet, despite the fact that a large percentage of colleges and universities invest a considerable amount of time and energy into recruiting, selecting, training and providing programs and materials to students, there is little empirical data on peer education and peer educators.

Wawrzynski led a team of Michigan State University and Bowling Green State University researchers who interviewed more than 70 undergraduate peer educators from various institutions across the country. Findings reveal that students chose to become peer educators through personal contact and encouragement from current peer educators and also by attending peer education programs. Other value-added outcomes of being a peer educator to emerge from the data include developing lifelong skills such as listening, communication, public speaking, problem-solving, and decision-making skills. In addition, peer educators influenced their own understanding and gained a greater level of self-confidence.

Wawrzynski said that his research provided students an opportunity to reflect on their experiences as peer educators. He believes that when peer educators are given the opportunity to share their experiences, it allows them to reflect on their accomplishments and provides an opportunity to connect their academic and co-curricular lives. According to Wawrzynski, while the focus of his research is to understand better the benefits and effects of peer education, it also creates opportunities to validate the work they do as educators.

As we enter the Age of the Network, faculty developers have identified three areas that are driving change and shaping the future of faculty development. The impact of the changing professoriate is a major factor. How to develop and sustain the vitality of all of our faculty—newcomers, mid-career, senior, and part-timers—is a critical question that will need to be further explored and addressed through faculty development. A second factor is the increasingly diverse student body. It will be more important to invest in faculty development as a means of ensuring that we cultivate teachers, students, and campus environments that value diverse ideas, beliefs, and worldviews, promote community and cultivate more inclusive student learning environments. According to developers, the third shaping influence is the impact of a changing paradigm for teaching, learning, and scholarly pursuits. The cumulative impact of these forces is transforming the field. Faculty development will require a larger investment of imagination and resources in order to strategically plan for and address new developments (e.g., teaching for student-centered learning, retention, learning technologies, assessment, increasing research demands) while not losing sight of core values and priorities.

An Emerging Agenda

(1) Promote professional preparation and development
Over the last 30 years, opportunities for professional development for faculty developers have been growing, and there are now annual conferences, intensive workshops, and summer institutes that feature best practices in the field. Opportunities like these will become even more critical, particularly given the changes in faculty roles, instructional technologies, and other emerging models for learning, teaching, and scholarly pursuits. Our study shows that a surprisingly large cohort of developers, including directors and administrators, are new to the field. This finding raises questions about the professional preparation and continuing development of practitioners in the field. We believe that this issue merits sustained attention so that faculty developers can better support faculty and institutions in their efforts to grow and change.

(2) Inform practice with scholarship
We believe that faculty development is most effective when enlightened by the scholarship concerning faculty careers, professional development, and work experiences, as well as the scholarship of organizational development and change.
For decades, faculty developers have contributed to and based their practices on research literature concerning faculty work and careers. This literature has provided a scholarly and theoretical basis to guide developers as they make choices about where interventions are most useful, how to support faculty professional growth, and what strategies are likely to be most effective.

Our study reveals that developers are most influenced by literature and research in college teaching and learning and faculty development, and less influenced by broader research in higher education, organizational development, adult development, human resources, and personal development. And yet literature and scholarship on organizational change and transformation in higher education and the implications for faculty work and development can expand developers’ knowledge base on how best to prepare aspiring faculty members, how new faculty adjust to diverse and changing work environments, how established faculty learn new roles and adapt to new challenges, the specific needs of faculty in varying types of work appointments, and the implications of an array of organizational changes for faculty careers. Our findings also suggest that developers would welcome more opportunities for scholarly reflection on practice. In sum, building our scholarly acumen and building a defined body of scholarly knowledge for our field are unfinished agendas....

(3) Broaden the scope of faculty development
As a group, American colleges and universities have historically had three missions—teaching, research, and service. The particular emphasis and configuration of missions at any particular college or university depend on institutional type, history, and context, and an institution’s faculty development planning should be matched to the missions the institution seeks to fulfill. Thus, in institutions that are expanding or reframing their missions, adjustments may be necessary to ensure that faculty members have the abilities and support to fulfill the expectations they face. Expectations should be coupled with support. Linking faculty development to institutional missions thus becomes a key element in an institution’s strategic plan.

Our study indicates that many faculty development programs focus primarily on enhancing teaching and learning. This is important because college teaching (and learning) has become increasingly more difficult and complex, requiring new skills from faculty members and faculty developers. But for institutions to succeed in fulfilling their multiple missions, faculty members must be supported in all the roles they are asked to fulfill.... Faculty development that is strategically planned and shared across the institution is likely to be most effective in the current context. Colleges and universities should consider how challenges concerning faculty work can best be addressed through faculty development efforts or through coordination with other units on campus....
(4) Link individual and institutional needs
Our view is that the role and function of faculty development is to foster the growth and development of individual faculty members and of institutions…. While there will always be a creative and dynamic tension between individual and institutional needs, faculty developers will be well served by attending not only to the interests of the individual faculty member or special interest groups (e.g., newly hired tenure-track faculty) but also to larger institutional concerns…. A strategic approach would involve institutional leaders working with faculty members and faculty developers to examine the most important challenges and new pressures confronting each specific institution, given its history, students, and mission. Institutional leaders, faculty developers, and faculty members could then make thoughtful decisions together about how faculty members can be best supported in their work in ways that enhance faculty satisfaction and institutional goals …. 

(5) Context still matters
One of the distinguishing characteristics of American higher education is the diverse array of institutional types available to educate students and to serve the nation’s needs. What this institutional diversity implies is that faculty work is not the same everywhere. What institutions value and faculty members need with regard to faculty development will therefore vary somewhat. Our study validates what developers already knew: faculty development plans cannot be generic, nor is a single vision for faculty development for the coming years appropriate…. 

(6) Redefine faculty diversity
Our study found high interest among developers in mentoring and supporting the most recent and diverse newcomers to faculty. In addition, developers were concerned about the needs of faculty in new appointment types—nontenure-track, part-time, and adjunct roles. There was also recognition of the need for leadership training for faculty who take on department chair positions, and at research universities, in supporting graduate students as they travel on a path to the professoriate. Working with a more sophisticated definition of faculty diversity will be increasingly important for the field of faculty development …. 

(7) Faculty development is everyone’s work
Faculty development programs that support the full range of work in which faculty members are engaged will require institutional commitment and collaboration…. [It is crucial] to recognize faculty development as an institutional responsibility and develop an institutional plan to meet this priority. Faculty development that is “border crossing” may be offered within or among academic departments or various institutional units, such as an institution’s graduate school, research support office, student affairs unit, or assessment office…. Regardless of the specific organizational structure selected, institutions that will be most effective in meeting both individual and institutional needs will be those that approach faculty development as collaborative, community work—within and beyond the institution.

Concluding Thoughts
The findings of this study validate our belief that faculty development is a critically important lever for ensuring institutional excellence. As the context for higher education changes and faculty members assume new roles and responsibilities, faculty development professionals and senior institutional leaders must grapple with the question of the place of faculty development within the institutional landscape. 


The leading edge of the baby boom is now within 10 years of retirement, marking the start of a remarkable generational turnover that will have far-reaching implications for the academy. The numbers speak for themselves. An analysis at the University of Wisconsin found that based on past retirement patterns and the age of its faculty, the university should expect that nearly a third of its professors will retire by 2011. More than half of the tenure and tenure-track faculty members at the University of North Carolina system were 50 or older in the early 2000s. That's up from a third in 1984.

On and on it goes. Look at any age-distribution chart of a given college or university and you'll find a large number of the faculty clustered in their 50s and 60s. It is no coincidence that retirement issues appear most pronounced at state universities, for they, along with community colleges, were the engines of growth during higher education's last great period of expansion. So what does this mean for postsecondary education? Where will the next generation of institutional leaders come from, and will they need to lead in different ways? Does the changing face of the professoriate portend a different experience for women and minorities in the academy in the United States and around the world?

In this section of Research Annals, we examine some of those issues by focusing on the ideas put forth by Marilyn Amey about the nature of leadership as a learning endeavor; Kristen Renn and the different dynamics for women at mid-career in the academy; Roger Baldwin and the overlooked faculty, and Reitumetse Mabokela and the specter of racism and sexism in South African higher education.
Leadership as Learning

If you ask Professor Marilyn Amey about leadership as it relates to America’s community colleges, she will tell you that the top-down, “great man” approach has held forth for too long. This view conceives of leadership as a series of career stages, a kind of presidential pipeline: chair, dean, provost and, finally, president. It captures the process accurately enough, and for Amey that’s the problem. Leadership development at community colleges is untenable. The community college has been rocked by major shifts in everything from funding to technology and more changes are in the offing: some four-fifths of incumbent community college presidents say they intend to retire within 10 years. “Trusting that the pipeline will produce the next generation of great men or women isn’t good enough,” Amey says. Instead, she has developed a different model, known as leadership as learning.

Amey’s conception of leadership as learning is not complicated. Traditional leadership at a community college—as is the case in most of postsecondary education—is top-down, bureaucratic and enacted by a single administrator (e.g., president, provost). This model creates a system of leaders and followers. Leadership as learning flattens the hierarchy. Amey argues that what will be important in the future is a leader’s ability to facilitate the learning of others so that they develop as professionals and can assume more responsibility for decision-making. Under Amey’s cognitive approach, presidents would focus on helping faculty and administrators become active inquirers of their and others’ practices, and would encourage risk taking, innovation, and critical thinking. The payoff is clear: a more capable organization dexterous enough to adapt quickly to internal or external change. Moreover, the system would create a broader talent pool of faculty and administrators who could assume leadership roles.

Amey published her ideas about this new kind of institutional leadership in a special issue of the Community College Journal of Research and Practice. It was a shot across the bow. She has no illusions about the hard work that will be required to bring about such a change in the thinking about leadership—let alone preparing future leaders to assume such roles. But there is little choice in the matter.

Women Leaders at Mid-Career

The leadership profile in higher education has begun to change, and is most clearly discernable in relation to gender. Women in the academy have steadily, albeit slowly, moved up the ranks over the past few decades to the most senior posts at institutions throughout the country. Their presence among top administrators—and even the presidency—is no longer the rarity it once was. This reality has spawned increased research attention on the female experience within the academy.

Some scholars believe that there is already a leadership crisis in community colleges, something an impending generational turnover will only exacerbate. For Amey, the time for change is now—or face the consequences later.

Associate Professor Kristen Renn has delved into these issues as they relate to the field of student affairs administration, which has long been staffed predominately by women. She co-edited with Carole Hughes, *Roads Taken: Women in Student Affairs at Mid-Career*, which features a number of personal stories by women in the field about the decisions they have made to balance their careers and family life. For Renn, focusing on such personal stories—one of the authors writes about her divorce while another postpartum depression and the struggles of raising young children and working fulltime—was a way to provide insight into the unique set of pressures faced by women in higher education.

Renn argues that given the traditional responsibilities ascribed to women in contemporary American society, there exists a set of conditions that pose particular challenges for women in the academy—and there has been precious little discussion about them. For Renn, these conditions, which range from child rearing to caring for elderly parents, have implications for leadership development. She points out that research has shown that women more often than men make career decisions in order to accommodate the needs of a spouse or partner, thereby affecting their own professional development in a field that depends in part on flexibility and mobility for career success. These are the kinds of issues, Renn believes, that higher education will have to be more careful to consider as increasing numbers of women join the ranks of faculty and academic staff.


**The Overlooked Faculty**

Whereas Renn has focused on women in student affairs in those challenging middle years, Professor Roger Baldwin has applied a wider lens. His research examines what he and other scholars consider the single most overlooked component of the academic profession: faculty in the middle of their careers.

For Baldwin, it is a rather odd oversight in the research on faculty roles and careers, for professors and administrators at mid-career make up the single largest cohort in the academy. Perhaps one reason for this is because the middle part of a faculty career has no clear hallmarks, such as tenure or retirement. Baldwin has sought to understand whether faculty members in the middle of academic life differ from their colleagues at other stages in terms of work activities, scholarly productivity, and professional satisfaction. In a recent study, Baldwin and two doctoral students at the time, Christina Lunceford and Kim VanDerLinden, analyzed data from the National Study of Postsecondary Education, which surveyed a sample of 19,213 faculty and instructional staff at 960 degree-granting postsecondary institutions. What Baldwin and his colleagues found was that although differences among faculty at various career stages were not large, professors in the middle years did approach their work “somewhat differently from their colleagues at other stages.” For example, the percentage of time faculty devoted to administration was highest in the middle years. Moreover, the hours worked decreased with age and experience, as did the proportion of time spent on research and service. The time devoted to teaching was greatest late in a career.

The findings offer a tantalizing glimpse into the nature of life-stage transitions in an academic career—but only a glimpse. The findings, he says, raise more questions than they answer. It makes sense that faculty in mid-career begin to take on administrative responsibilities and become more engaged professionally. But does movement into leadership and administrative roles and external professional activities trigger reduced involvement in other roles that are important parts of academic life? Moreover, why does the focus of faculty work appear to shift and in some cases (such as research) narrow at higher ages? And what roles does an institution or the disciplinary field play in the experiences and perceptions of the middle years of the academic life cycle? For Baldwin, these are just a few of the questions that should be pursued in an effort to gain a better understanding of an aspect of academic life that has been overlooked for too long.

the legacy of apartheid in South African higher education

By Reitumetse Obakeng Mabokela and Liliana Mina
Issues of racism and sexism are ubiquitous in South African society as in many parts of the world. These problems stem from the beliefs of colonizing Europeans that women, black people and other people of colour are inherently inferior to white men. The enactment of apartheid laws in 1948 institutionalized racial separation by relegating the black population, people of mixed race and Indian and Pakistani immigrants, among others, to segregated communities and separate educational systems. In the apartheid era, black people were treated as second-class citizens and black women endured the additional burden of existing only for domestic service in the eyes of many white South Africans.

Even though a number of policies and government initiatives have been developed in recent years to ‘redress’ the legacy of apartheid, especially at institutions of higher education, the burdens of gender and racial oppression experienced by black women scholars in this collection of essays, elucidate that structural and cultural organizational practices are deeply embedded in racism and sexism. South African colleges and universities cannot gloss over the history of apartheid; neither can they deny that the legacy of racial segregation still affords white South Africans a secure and privileged position in the academy.

On the surface, South African higher education institutions appear to be making rapid changes related to equitable treatment in access and hiring practices. For South African higher education to progress in the
years ahead, however, today’s institutions need to scrutinize closely how the injustices of the past are influencing the culture and ethos of organizations that for the most part have had no representation or limited numbers of black people in faculty positions. Clearly, other strategies besides recruitment are necessary to ensure that black women acquire the support they need to do well in the academy.

In reviewing the situation many black South African women scholars face in higher education institutions, a number of overarching themes emerge, which can serve as a foundation for further research: institutional culture and practice, academic marginalization and professional identity. The voices of black women scholars in this edited text present additional empirical justification that South African policymakers and institutional planners can employ to direct their actions and decision-making processes as they apply transformation in higher education.

Institutional Culture and Practice

The nature of the educational system already in existence may hamper attempts to transform the system. Because colonizers originally set up South Africa’s educational systems, changes in institutional culture and practice also involve ideological questions. In considering the institutional context is necessary, from the beginning, to pay particular attention to what is deemed valuable intellectual inquiry and exceptional research. For instance, Potgieter and Moleko state, ‘academic knowledge produced by and about people of colour is not seen in the same light, or regarded with the same amount of respect, as that produced by and about white people’. The authors also note that many historically white universities are still not including African literature as part of the curriculum. This omission not only reinforces the assumption that materials written, created and interpreted by Westerners are superior, but also discourages the systematic exploration of African modes of inquiry and analysis. Thus, disdain for academic knowledge produced by black scholars and benign acceptance of Western ideology continues to perpetuate glaring inequalities in the academy ….

Academic Marginalisation

Women often find it difficult to establish themselves in the academy. First, obtaining a faculty position is often difficult because few institutions have comprehensive programmes that encourage women’s involvement in the professoriate. Although a small representation of women in the professoriate is not unique, affirmative action initiatives in South African higher education tend to redress race under-representation rather than gender. Furthermore, the few black women in top academic and leadership positions are either overextended in their commitments or have yet to reach a
status where they impact policy decisions and changes.

Second, the level and representation of women in senior academic positions—particularly black women—is minuscule, thus there is a lack of role models and mentors for students and junior academics. The low level of representation of black women faculty and lack of opportunities for mentoring relationships also has serious consequences for research and academic advancement. For instance, many women in Mabokela’s chapter reported receiving no mentoring or guidance in conducting research, publishing and presenting at conferences, which are measures for promotion and tenure. Therefore, opportunities for junior academics to improve their research and writing skills and to publicize there are greatly diminished. Without discussing further what seems to be obvious, white people end up publishing 80 per cent of the articles in highly selective journals (Magubane 2002).*

Sadly, for many black women junior scholars and graduate students, working with others is virtually nonexistent. Accordingly, the low percentage of black candidates to the professoriate is maintained since many of these women often look to black faculty for guidance and support. Needless to say, like many of their North American counterparts, the structure and culture of several South African institutions of higher education do not reward mentoring and other service activities. Although, undoubtedly there has been progress in recruiting black faculty and students, developing and supporting the talents of these individuals have not been addressed adequately.

Unfortunately, for many black women faculty, their academic lives become so intolerable that rather than staying, they leave to fight the legacies of colonial oppression by becoming policy-makers, administrators and high-ranking executives in business and key figures in government agencies. Others choose to remain silent because of the perceived ramifications of lodging formal complaints. Yet others boldly reveal discriminatory events in their day-to-day academic existence by publicly connecting these events to the legacies of apartheid in research publications. Regardless of their professional decisions, understanding the conditions in which black women scholars fight for the attainment of race and gender equity not only raises public awareness and increases our understanding of complex issues, but also provides a foundation for putting into practice effective processes.

The hesitance of many white academics to recognize and acknowledge that the legacy of apartheid continues to subjugate many black South African women scholars is deeply embedded in institutional culture and practice. The institutional milieu makes it possible to maintain the burdens of gender and racial oppression. In essence, the organizational culture requires that black women, to be successful academics, mask their racial and ethnic selves and assume a role imposed by white academics.
To achieve a sense of reconciliation with their personal and professional identities, black women scholars such as Yvette Abrahams often turn to self-reflection as an attempt to cope with the residue of colonization. For instance, the sheer act of acknowledging a desire to search for the truth about Sara Bartmann is empowering in and of itself. Abraham's search to place her existence and history in proper context not only served to expose the shortcomings and biases of previous research but to reconcile her with her personal anger and sense of inner betrayal for allowing this truth to be silenced by cultural texts through obscurity. Abrahams' self-reflective process allowed her to become one with her past. More significantly, self-reflection helped Abrahams to learn more about the multiple identities she occupies. ‘I found out that I would remain a brown woman, no matter how many strings of degrees I trailed around behind my name. My race and my gender follow me, even into my academic work.’

To effect change, black women faculty in South Africa must constantly assess and relive the past history in order to reconcile their personal and professional spheres. While complete eradication of racism and sexism in the academy is unlikely to occur, self-reflection is one way that these women are reclaiming knowledge and thus reclaiming themselves.

Within the current context of South African higher education, black women's experiences, policy recommendations must attend to concrete issues and practical applications. One way to provide needed support for black women faculty and graduate students is through formalized mentoring programmes. Enacting such a collaboration mechanism would help black women scholars and graduate students grow professionally and personally.

There is no doubt that the voices of these black women scholars crystallize the underlying processes that occur in their academic lives. Although these processes occur in varied contexts and in many forms, their experiences are shaped and defined by the broader political and social setting. In order for South Africa’s tertiary institutions to become more inclusive and effective, a vision of a university environment where black women have the opportunity, support and resources to aspire to and plan a vital role in promoting greater social justice and equity in society requires intentional, measurable outcomes.

The Michigan State University College of Education’s graduate program in Higher, Adult and Lifelong Education (HALE) is among the finest in the nation. *U.S. News & World Report* magazine consistently has ranked the program as one of the five best in the country. Deeply committed to research, teaching and service, the faculty is widely published in academic journals and engages in projects that span postsecondary education. The program offers master’s degrees in student affairs administration and higher, adult and lifelong education. The Ph.D. program is in higher, adult and lifelong education. More information about the program can be obtained by logging onto its Web site (http://ed-web3.educ.msu.edu/ead/HALE/HALE.htm).
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