Research Annals

A PUBLICATION OF THE PROGRAM IN HIGHER, ADULT & LIFELONG EDUCATION
On behalf of my colleagues in the Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education (or HALE) program, I am pleased to announce the establishment of our new Center for Higher and Adult Education. We are indebted to the Dr. Mildred B. Erickson Distinguished Chair in Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education Endowment, established in 2003 by her son, Dr. Bruce Erickson, for providing us with start-up funds for this endeavor. Before retiring as Assistant Dean for Lifelong Education in 1981, Mildred Erickson spent her career helping non-traditional students, especially women, return to college and attain the self-respect and credibility that comes with an education. We are pleased to honor her legacy with our Center, research and commitment to enhancing lives through higher education.

This issue of Research Annals begins with a brief description of the context and purpose of the new Center, followed by research profiles of my HALE colleagues. The rest of the issue highlights some of their recent work and illustrates some of the ways in which we are helping to define, through research and action, the realities of higher education in the 21st century.

James S. Fairweather, Director
Center for Higher and Adult Education
THE CONTEXT AND PURPOSE
OF THE CENTER FOR HIGHER AND ADULT EDUCATION

Higher education institutions and higher education systems everywhere face more complex environments than ever before. In virtually every country, the challenges facing higher and adult education are daunting: how to attract and retain quality faculty in the face of intense competition for talent and significant changes in career expectations; how to support increased participation in higher education without making the system so expensive that it excludes many of the students it hopes to attract; how to harness complex technology to improve instruction; how to improve the academic and developmental experiences students have as undergraduates and prepare them for an ever-more global world; and how to identify and mitigate the often unintended consequences that result when actions taken to improve higher education in one area create new challenges in another.

As scholars and practitioners, we who work in the field of higher, adult and lifelong education face the exciting prospect of researching these challenges even as we work to meet them. As an important new resource to the field of higher education,
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the Center for Higher and Adult Education at Michigan State University will provide many kinds of support. Most immediately, it will expand the MSU HALE program’s capacity to respond effectively to the many inquiries and invitations its faculty members receive from scholars and institutions, professional and philanthropic organizations and even state and national governments across the country and around the world. The Center will solidify already strong ties between academia, professional associations and other organizations interested in higher education policy.

Sponsorship from the Center will allow MSU to bring together scholars from other institutions and other experts from across the country and around the world for colloquia, conferences and other activities to enrich the intellectual lives of all involved. Currently, HALE faculty at MSU are involved in or exploring research, instructional opportunities and technical assistance activities in China, Finland, Norway, Great Britain, South Africa and Vietnam, with more to come. Each opportunity has its own particular academic focus, but all bring with them significant potential to strengthen the curricular and research components of our program around international issues and experiences. The Center will help maximize that potential in ways that can be shared with the field at large. We envision even more teaching and learning opportunities overseas for our faculty and students, and for faculty and students from other institutions in the U.S. and abroad to come to MSU for the same purpose. We have initiated a Center Fellows Program to host faculty members and policymakers from abroad and from the U.S. both to enrich our research and instructional perspectives domestically, and to benefit our individual and institutional colleagues abroad. A Center intern program will enable us to prepare graduates to enter the field with hands-on experience in international and domestic higher education policy.

The animating spirit of this new HALE Center is a commitment to challenge ourselves and our higher education colleagues everywhere to expand our horizons and our capacity, to engage in new ideas and problems of practice, in order that we might equip both students and citizens to redesign and support systems of higher education in a global society.

The realities of higher education in the 21st century include the need to prepare students and faculty for lives and careers that will be increasingly affected by globalization. For HALE faculty, this means embracing and expanding the international impact of the Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education program at Michigan State University. Several faculty members are already working in this area.

John Dirkx and Kris Renn have worked for a year with Can Tho University (CTU) in the Mekong Delta region of Vietnam. CTU requested help in designing a continuing education and short-term training program to spur individual and regional economic development in the Delta. “CTU had no idea how to develop a program from the ground up,” says Dirkx. He and Renn met with a task force of 20 CTU faculty and administrators, and were subsequently joined by representatives from six other regional universities and community colleges. Together they developed a “train the trainers” model that was project-based professional development, “helping them learn program planning skills by developing a program.”

The assistance Dirkx and Renn provided represented significant outreach service but it was also an opportunity for scholarly inquiry. Dirkx noted that it surfaces the problem of meaning-making in the professional development process and of working across differences in cultures. “Our work was totally translated,” explains Dirkx, “which we discovered was often a process of negotiation between three constituencies – teacher, learner and translator.” Dirkx and Renn found that translators often take liberties, combining their knowledge of the topic with their knowledge of the culture of the recipients. “To what extent is this an issue? What do translators need to know to do their jobs well?” asks Dirkx. “I could not have predicted this scholarly interest five years ago,” observes Dirkx. “What does it mean for Westerners to work in Eastern cultures, to work with non-Western ways of knowing?”

Researchers and practitioners of 21st century higher education will need to find answers to these and other important questions.
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Marilyn Amey
amey@msu.edu
Ph.D., Pennsylvania State University

Marilyn Amey is a professor of higher, adult, and lifelong education and chairperson of the Department of Educational Administration. She is interested in leadership issues, including how leaders learn, post-secondary governance and administration issues, community college contexts, faculty concerns including interdisciplinary academic work. Her current research involves work on community college leadership development, K-14 partnerships, and a national study of faculty teaching in college student personnel and higher education graduate programs.

Ann E. Austin
austin@msu.edu
Ph.D., University of Michigan

Ann Austin is a professor in higher, adult, and lifelong education, holding the Mildred B. Erickson Distinguished Chair. She is interested in faculty careers, roles, and professional development in higher education, organizational change and transformation in universities and colleges, work and workplaces in academe, and the improvement of teaching and learning processes in post-secondary education. She is co-principal investigator of the Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching, and Learning (CIRTL), a National Science Foundation funded center. Recent work includes her book on changes in faculty work, a book on the preparation of graduate students for the professoriate, and a book on new directions in faculty development.

Roger G. Baldwin
rbaldwin@msu.edu
Ph.D., University of Michigan

Roger Baldwin is a professor of higher, adult, and lifelong education. His professional interests include instructional strategies and curriculum planning, faculty career development, conditions in the academic workplace, and transformation in higher education systems. His current research explores key dimensions of higher education’s response to changing environmental conditions and society’s increased demand for educational services. His most recent work focuses on changing faculty appointment patterns, contingent faculty, faculty at mid-career, and evolving faculty roles and professional activities.

MaryLee Davis
davisml@msu.edu
Ph.D., Michigan State University

MaryLee Davis is a professor of higher, adult, and lifelong education with extensive experience in higher education administration, governance, institutional advancement, and leadership in colleges/universities and not-for-profit organizations. She has interests and expertise in governance, policy analysis, service-learning, executive leadership, technology and learning, and women in higher education. Her current research includes a study on the relationship of diversity and service-learning and a study of Michigan and its higher education institutions in a post-Proposal 2 environment.
John M. Dirkx
dirkx@msu.edu
Ph.D., University of Wisconsin-Madison

John Dirkx is a professor of higher, adult, and lifelong education. His primary research interests focus on teaching and learning in higher and adult education, including education for the professions, education for work, continuing professional development for teachers in higher and adult education, and education for academically underprepared adults. Within these contexts, his research has addressed the psychosocial, transformative, and spiritual dimensions of adult learning, and the role of imagination, feelings, and emotion in these aspects of adult learning. In addition, recent research has focused on teaching and learning in online environments and students experiences of online collaborative group work.

Reitumetse Obakeng Mabokela
mabokela@msu.edu
Ph.D., University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

Reitumetse Mabokela is an associate professor of higher, adult, and lifelong education. Her research examines race, ethnicity and gender issues in post-secondary education; institutional transformation and its impact on the mobility of women to leadership positions; organizational culture and its impact on historically marginalized groups, specifically African American or people of African descent in predominantly white institutions. She also maintains an active research agenda in South Africa where her research explores issues of gender and institutional transformation.

James S. Fairweather
fairwea4@msu.edu
Ph.D., Stanford University

James Fairweather is a professor of higher, adult, and lifelong education, co-principal investigator of the Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching, and Learning (CIRTL), and director of the Center for Higher and Adult Education. His interests lie in research design and policy analysis, faculty roles and rewards, industry-university partnerships, assessing the quality of academic programs, reforming undergraduate education, and access to post-secondary education for students with disabilities. His latest research focuses on finding ways to improve the quality of college-level teaching in science, engineering, mathematics, and technology in work supported by the National Science Foundation, and on evaluating the impact of philanthropic contributions to higher education policy funded by the Ford Foundation.

James T. Minor
jtminor@msu.edu
Ph.D., University of Wisconsin-Madison

James Minor is an assistant professor of higher, adult, and lifelong education. His research focuses on organizational theory; governance and decision making in higher education; higher education policy; and how governance patterns influence the performance of historically Black colleges and universities, and African higher education systems. His research currently involves an examination of how selection/appointment processes affect the performance of public governing boards.
Kristen A. Renn
renn@msu.edu
Ph.D., Boston College

Kristen Renn is an associate professor in higher, adult, and lifelong education. Her research centers on identity in higher education, with current projects focusing on bi/multiracial college students and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender college students. Other interests include college student learning and development, student affairs administration, and qualitative research in education. She coordinates the ASHE/Lumina Foundation Fellows, a national program providing support and mentoring for doctoral students studying policies related to higher education access and success.

Matthew R. Wawrzynski
mwawrzyn@msu.edu
Ph.D., University of Maryland

Matthew Wawrzynski is an assistant professor in higher, adult, and lifelong education. His research focuses on transitional experiences of college students, student access to higher education, retention, and student learning. Other interests include student affairs, higher education law, college teaching, and quantitative research.

Steven Weiland
weiland@msu.edu
Ph.D., University of Chicago

Steven Weiland is a professor of higher, adult, and lifelong education. His primary research interests are in the fields of academic careers and disciplinary cultures, adult development and aging, and life history methods in the behavioral and social sciences and the humanities. He addresses the nature of disciplinary specializations and their place in intellectual history and the history of higher education, aging in academic life, the rhetoric of scholarly inquiry, and the development of new forms of study and writing in adult development and learning, including educational biography.
Rethinking Faculty Work

To maintain the quality of their primary asset – the faculty – it is imperative that institutions of higher education rethink the work and workplaces of faculty

For Ann Austin, professor of higher, adult and lifelong education who holds the Mildred B. Erickson Distinguished Chair in the College of Education, recognizing and responding to the realities of the 21st century is “higher education’s strategic imperative.” In fact, this is the subtitle she and her co-authors Judith Gappa and Andrea Trice have given their new book, Rethinking Faculty Work: Higher Education’s Strategic Imperative (2007).

The book asks three compelling and timely questions: What enhances the ability of academic institutions to recruit and retain highly capable faculty members? What are the essential elements of academic work and workplaces that will help ensure that faculty find their work satisfying and meaningful? How can colleges and universities fully recognize and build on the intellectual capital that faculty represent, and on the talents and abilities of each member of the faculty?

The first part of the book focuses on changes in the context of faculty work related to societal factors affecting higher education institutions, changes in the characteristics of the faculty, and the emergence of various types of academic appointments (including a shift in many institutions away from tenure-track to other kinds of appointments). Moreover, Austin and her colleagues point out, institutions are dealing with these forces within a larger context of general shifts in American society in employment practices and employee preferences concerning work. These shifts are creating new expectations among current and potential faculty, particularly interest in balancing professional and personal fulfillment. Given the significant changes affecting institutions of higher education, Austin et al. argue, faculty are not engaged in business as usual. To maintain the quality of their primary asset – the faculty – it is imperative that institutions of higher education rethink the work and workplaces of faculty.

In response to this imperative, Rethinking Faculty Work then presents a theoretical framework to guide institutions in this important work. The authors identify five essential elements that all faculty members, regardless of their appointment types, should experience in their work: employment equity, academic freedom, flexibility, professional growth and collegiality. These five essential elements build upon and surround a sixth element that serves as a foundation or core element: respect.

Successive chapters elaborate upon the essential elements and make recommendations to institutional leaders and higher education policymakers for addressing and embedding these elements into faculty work and workplaces. These recommendations are highlighted by specific examples from current institutional practice around the country.

Another facet of the realities of higher education in the 21st century is the increasing frequency of collaboration between institutions, even across sectors of education. This growing trend is often a function of state mandates to provide more seamless transitions for students between education levels and to promote a more educated state citizenry. And while K-12, community college and four-year institutions all share the broad mission of educating students, their distinct cultures can make working together successfully a challenge.
year institutions all share the broad mission of educating students, their distinct cultures can make working together successfully a challenge. Advocates of Pre-K-20 initiatives, including state legislatures, federal policymakers and even the public, often over-simplify the challenges in meeting these calls for collaboration and do not often provide appropriate financial, structural, and leadership support to accomplish the task.

Professor Marilyn Amey, who chairs the Department of Educational Administration at Michigan State University, has studied collaborations throughout Michigan and in other states to understand what brings them together, what makes them work, and what keeps them going or causes them to end. She is joined in this work by MSU alumna Pamela Eddy, now associate professor of education at Central Michigan University, and two HALE graduate students, C. Casey Ozaki and Jesse S. Watson. In their forthcoming book, Collaboration Across Educational Borders: New Directions for Community Colleges (2008), Amey and her colleagues develop a model of educational collaboration based on a mixed method study of more than three dozen institutions that have engaged in collaborations beyond the typical articulation agreements that are more like business contracts than partnerships.

Amey et al. present and elaborate upon their model, which begins with the antecedents to partnership development, including the contexts and motivations that give rise to it. External policies or regulations, prior relationships, resource needs or a challenging issue can all serve as impetuses for forming partnerships. The fact that partners have different motivations for participating is not inherently a problem as long as the partnership is mutually beneficial. Once the partnership is established, it enters the second stage of the model, which describes the longer term projections for the collaboration. Amey and her colleagues consider the density of the relationship, which refers to the amount of power one or more partners brings to the partnership, whether institutional (in the form of organizational capacity and resources) or personal (in the form of social capital). Partnership success can also depend on who champions the cause of the partnership, as well as the kinds of social and organizational capital partners are willing to bring to bear in order to create and sustain the partnership. “Key to the model and partnership success,” they write, “is how the institution and its members frame the partnership and how this changes as the partnership continues.”

Amey and colleagues further identify and describe important components of partnership sustainability, including feedback mechanisms and the proper role of champions. The authors also analyze why partnerships end, whether from dissolution, failure or simply the completion of the initial purpose. “Ultimately, it becomes a question of organization – how do you organize and foster collaboration in ways that allow it to survive and thrive?” Amey notes that partnerships raise other questions about how to organize faculty and provide student services more efficiently.

Examining the Consequences of Change

The South African system of education has undergone significant changes over the last decade, changes that have occurred within a broader context of change in the social, political and economic arenas.

The new realities of higher education in the 21st century are not limited to the United States. Associate professor Reitumetsé Obakeng Mabokela has studied institutional transformation in the higher education system in South Africa. Her recent research examines some of the consequences of the reconfiguration of higher education in the post-apartheid era. The South African system of education has undergone significant changes over the last decade, changes that have occurred within a broader context of change in the social, political and economic arenas. The primary challenge within the higher education sector has been to rid the system of inequities created by divisive policies of apartheid, including the fragmentation of universities and educational resources along racial, ethnic and linguistic lines, the disjointed relationship between universities and other postsecondary institutions, pervasive disparities along gender lines, and the imbalance in the size of the higher education sector relative to the further education institutions, among others.

One of the most significant changes to occur is the mandate from the Minister of Education for institutions of higher education to merge from 36 universities and technikons to 21 institutions, in an attempt to eradicate the race, ethnic, and language-based fragmentation of the past. The majority of institutions involved in mergers have experienced cross-sector (universities merging with technikons) or cross-race (historically White institutions merging with historically Black institutions) interaction. Most of the mergers have been implemented within the past three years, so their full impact on the higher education sector has yet to be realized. As may be expected, the magnitude and pace of change have been met with enthusiasm in some areas, and with uncertainty and resistance in others. For example, race and gender continue to play a significant role in the segmentation of labor. The more prestigious professorial and administrative ranks continue to be occupied predominantly by White males, while Blacks and women tend to be relegated to lower academic ranks (Mabokela & Mawila, 2005). The majority of the formerly White universities have appointed Blacks to senior administrative positions as vice-chancellors or rectors, but beyond this visible display of diversity, critical elements of the South African academy are still White and male. Data from the Department of Education (DOE) indicate that in 2001, Blacks comprised 68% of the teaching and research staff, 85% of the administrative staff, and 100% of the service staff at historically Black universities. At the historically White universities, Blacks made up 30% of the teaching and research staff, 49% of the administrative staff, and 98% of the service staff. Historically Black and White technikons revealed similar employment patterns.

An interesting development has been noted at some of the historically White universities where the representation of Black faculty and administrators has historically been very low. With increasing pressure from the Minister of Education to create equitable and accessible institutions, some of these universities employ Black faculty on short-term contracts of about three years, some renewable based on performance; others employ Black faculty at their satellite/off-campus sites where they rarely have interaction with students or colleagues on the main campus or influence critical decisions and policies there (Mabokela, 2007). This pattern of employment has the potential to undermine the race and gender equity objectives articulated by department of education.
Another challenge to the higher education system in South Africa is the persistence of segmentation in the knowledge production arena. There is increased pressure among South African universities to increase their research and publication output. Given historical structural barriers still pervasive in the current system, the knowledge production arena is still dominated by scholars at historically White universities, the majority of whom are White and male. Subotzky (2003) affirms this disturbing trend by noting that 65% of research publications output and 61% of research and development funding allocations to higher education are concentrated in the five historically White universities. The ten historically Black universities combined produce about 10% of the research. The primary challenge of ridding the higher education system of the inequities created by the divisive policies of apartheid remains very real.


Another reality for higher education in the 21st century is continued pressure for accountability in providing a quality experience for undergraduate students. Assistant professor Matthew Wawrzynski investigates how the college environment impacts student experiences and outcomes. College administrators have long believed that peers play a uniquely effective role in encouraging their peers to develop responsible attitudes and lifestyles. However, while a large percentage of colleges and universities in the U. S. have invested in peer educator programs, little is known, for example, about the outcomes that peer education has on the students who are peer educators.

At the 2007 Joint Meeting of the American College Personnel Association and National Association of Student Personnel Administrators conference, Wawrzynski and colleague Janet Cox of The BACCHUS Network (2007) presented findings from the National Peer Educator Study project that includes peer educators at 96 institutions across the United States. Besides gathering demographic data, the Wawrzynski and Cox survey focused on student learning and changes in the behavior of peer educators. The researchers found statistically significant changes in the growth and development of students over the course of their participation as peer educators. In general, they found that respondents reported improved higher order thinking skills and increased educational gains, such as greater appreciation and awareness of diversity, stronger communication and presentation skills, improved helping skills, a stronger sense of purpose and career clarification. Wawrzynski and Cox also found peer educators making positive changes in decision-making related to alcohol behavior.

Along with a research team of graduate students and student affairs professionals (Jody Jessup-Anger, Cindy Helman, Katie Stolz and Jacque Beaulieu), Wawrzynski (2007) presented research findings from two studies of living-learning communities and their effect on student outcomes. These two studies were unique in that they specifically looked at living-learning communities that are academically based. The living-learning communities in the studies consisted of students who live together on campus, take part in a shared academic endeavor, use resources in their residence environment designed specifically for them, and have structured social activities in their residential environment that stress academics. Although there is a growing body of evidence demonstrating the positive learning outcomes associated with living-learning communities, less attention has been paid to understanding what it is about these environments that makes them work. In the first, quantitative study, Wawrzynski and his team investigated issues of anticipated value, opportunities for learning, student engagement in the living-learning community, academic behaviors, and connections with peers. Researchers found that collaborative living-learning communities – programs characterized by strong connections between an academic program or department and the residential environment – produced the greatest gains in learning outcomes.
and the residential environment, in which faculty teach and can be found in the dining hall or in offices in the residential environment – produced the greatest gains in learning outcomes.

In the second, qualitative study, Wawrzynski’s team conducted focus group discussions to tease out some of the subtle aspects of participation in living-learning communities that might be overlooked by quantitative studies. Themes that emerged from the data suggest that these communities work by promoting a culture of learning, community, and relatedness among students and faculty. Wawrzynski et al. note that the different levels of culture present in living-learning communities illustrate an important feature of the communities that is not captured in the existing literature. Instead of isolating different variables to explain the outcomes observed, such as hours of informal contact with faculty or amount of time spent studying with peers, Wawrzynski et al. argue that it is important to consider the interconnectedness of the variables and how these might influence student outcomes.

WHAT HAPPENS TO THE UNDER-PREPARED STUDENT?

In a world that increasingly rewards and expects post-secondary education, what happens to the under-prepared student? Professor John Dirkx researches the challenges facing under-prepared adult learners who want or need to continue to renew their education after years away from formal schooling. “There are between 3 and 4 million adults in the United States who currently do not have the academic preparation they need to access some kind of postsecondary education to help themselves and their families. Traditional adult education designed to provide them with this preparation reach only about 5 percent of these individuals,” explains Dirkx, “and most of them do not successfully complete these programs.” The majority of under-prepared learners enroll in occupational programs, but their lack of academic competency in reading, writing, and mathematics often hinders their progress. Building on his prior work and interest in contextual learning and integrated approaches to curriculum development (Brockman & Dirkx, 2006; Dirkx, Kielbaso, & Smith, 2004), Dirkx’s research has turned up promising programs, such as those highlighted in national projects such as Breaking Through, Opening Doors, and Bridges to Careers for Low Skilled Adults. These projects integrate academics and occupational training and “allow people to learn in the context of what they need to know to get ahead.” Together with a colleague from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Dirkx is preparing a critical review of this research that will be presented at the 2008 Annual Meeting of the Academy of Human Resource Development in Panama City, Florida. Dirkx is concerned about the ability of these innovative programs to “go to scale and become sustainable and institutionalized,” but he has found potential partners in both academia and Michigan’s Department of Labor and Economic Growth with whom to pursue the concept.


ExPLORING THE EXPERIENCES OF NEW STUDENT AFFAIRS PROFESSIONALS

A look at the experiences of new professionals in student affairs and the preparation and supervision these professionals receive prior to and during their early years on the job.

Associate Professor Kristen Renn is one of two lead faculty in the master of arts program in student affairs administration. Her research interests include the experiences of new professionals in student affairs and how they can inform the preparation and supervision these professionals receive prior to and during their early years on the job. In their National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) Journal article, “The First Year on the Job: Experiences of New Professionals in Student Affairs,” (2007) Renn and recent doctoral graduate Jennifer Hodges report on a year-long pilot study of a cohort of recent masters graduates. They identify three overlapping issues with which new student affairs professionals must contend: relationships with students and colleagues; fit, or how well they are matched with the institutions that employ them; and whether they bring the correct and sufficient competencies to their positions. Renn and Hodges found that how new professionals perceive each of these issues evolves over time, from a pre-employment and orientation phase, through a transition phase and into a “settling in” phase. The pre-employment and orientation phase lasted about a month and was characterized by a sense among the study participants of anticipation and special status that cut across relationships, fit and competencies. The transition phase lasted 2-4 months and was marked by concerns about finding a mentor, seeking approval and support from the outside, and beginning to question fit and competence. The settling-in phase brought renewed self-confidence in the new professionals’ ability to get the job done and to adjust to the new location. At this point in the year, which was typically after the start of the second semester, new professionals were establishing relationship networks and beginning to get their feet on the ground. Renn and Hodges suggest that their study has implications for how graduate students are prepared, what new professionals can do to enhance their experiences as new professionals, and how supervisors can help assist new professionals in adjusting to their new environment. The study also raises questions about whose responsibility it is to ensure a smooth transition from graduate school to the workplace. The authors note that, statistically, only half of the new professionals who participated in the study will still be in the field five years later; those that remain will likely be supervising new professionals themselves. Will they remember their own experiences as new professionals?

Examining Issues in Higher Education Finance

Where the money goes, where the money comes from, the differences between college costs and student prices, the factors affecting affordability, and the important role that perceptions play in student and family decisions about going to college.

No discussion of the realities of higher education in the 21st century is complete without a consideration of higher education finance. In his commissioned report for the Education Policy Center at Michigan State University, *Higher Education and the New Economy*, professor James Fairweather uses the recommendations of a blue-ribbon panel, the State of Michigan’s Commission on Higher Education and Economic Growth, to illuminate higher education finance policy from the institutional, state and federal perspectives. Fairweather begins with a review of the evidence on the economic and social benefits of higher education to the individual as well as to the state in which he or she resides. He concludes that the evidence of the benefits to the individual are overwhelming: the so-called education premium as measured by average total personal income ranges from about 60 percent for a bachelor’s degree compared to a high school diploma to 300 percent for an advanced degree. Fairweather notes that U.S. Census data shows that the education premium holds across racial and ethnic groups, regardless of gender, and that it persists over a lifetime. Going to college increases the likelihood that an individual will grow up emotionally, prepare for a successful career, find happiness and make positive contributions to society, from voting to volunteering.

The benefits to a state of higher rates of higher education participation, although not easy to itemize or measure in full, are evidenced by many indicators, from lower public health costs and crime rates to higher college-going rates among the children of college graduates. The College Board estimates that the government spends between $800 and $2,700 less per year on social programs for individual 30-year old college graduates than for high school graduates of the same age, gender and race/ethnicity. Traditional economic benefits of higher
participation in higher education include higher tax revenues from college graduates and institutional employees – the average college graduate working full-time pays more than twice as much in federal income taxes and about 78 percent more in total federal, state and local taxes than the average high school graduate – and the additional local business volume generated by college campuses.

The evidence about the likelihood that increased public and private investment in higher education, especially in degree production, will stimulate economic development and revitalize a state’s economy is intriguing but much less conclusive than the evidence on individual benefits or traditional economic benefits to the state. The challenge for policymakers, therefore, is to weigh the benefits to the state against the cost to the state, and so Fairweather draws upon state and federal data to explain, from an operational perspective, where the money goes, where the money comes from, the differences between college costs and student prices, the factors affecting affordability, and the important role that perceptions play in student and family decisions about going to college. On the one hand, college participation is voluntary, so students and families weigh the perceived benefits against the perceived costs of college attendance. Of course, the benefits of college completion are irrelevant if a student cannot afford the price of attending, and the past three decades have seen a fundamental shift from public to private funding for higher education. At the same time, much of the policy debate about costs and prices in higher education is driven by legislative response to concerns raised by parents and their children.

Complicating the policy debate on higher education finance is the possible effect of increased participation upon the quality, capacity and missions of the institutions themselves. Fairweather points out that increasing college participation by decreasing the quality of the college experience is not an acceptable option, and that institutions play other valuable roles besides degree production, some of which could be compromised by a shift in focus to increasing college participation and completion. The difficult task facing policymakers, concludes Fairweather, is finding the right balance between cost, access and quality. Their decisions will be crucial to the state’s economic future.

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.

There is only one admirable form of the imagination: the imagination that is so intense that it creates a new reality, that it makes things happen.

Sean O’Faolain (1900 - 1991)
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