Higher Education

Service Learning

Summer 2000

Change as a Scholarly Act: Higher Education Research Transfer to Practice

Judith Ramaley
University of Vermont

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slcehighered

Part of the Higher Education Commons, and the Service Learning Commons
Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/
SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

6

Achieving transformational change is a scholarly challenge best dealt with by practicing public scholarship, which is modeled by the leader and encouraged in other members of the campus community. Like all good scholarly work, good decision making by campus leadership begins with a base of scholarly knowledge generated and validated by higher education researchers.

Change as a Scholarly Act: Higher Education Research Transfer to Practice

Judith A. Ramaley

In *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*, Donald Schön (1987) says, "In the varied topography of professional practice, there is a high, hard ground overlooking a swamp. On the hard ground, manageable problems lend themselves to solution through the application of research-based theory and techniques. In the swampy lowlands, messy, confusing problems defy technical solutions" (p. 1). As a president, I spend most of my time in the swampy lowlands. When I ascend to the cooler and breezier heights, I find problems that are easier to define and easier to resolve, but less important.

Identifying Problems

A number of years ago, a group of community activists in the Portland metropolitan area in Oregon developed a simple matrix of three types of problems that present themselves to policymakers and community leaders. Real-world problems can be divided fairly effectively into these three types on the basis of the relative degree of clarity of both the questions posed and the solutions offered.[1]

Type one problems can be articulated clearly, and the solution can be chosen from among one or more already well-researched options or remedies. They represent the high, hard ground.

Type two problems can be articulated clearly, but the solution or resolution is not readily apparent, and there are no well-researched choices to consider. Here the ground is getting slippery, but not yet swampy.

Type three problems are confusing difficult-to-characterize "policy messes" for which there is no agreement on either the most important issues or the most promising remedies. These problems often are made more complex by the conflicting values and perspectives of the various stakeholders. Here we are in the swampy lowlands.

Like the reflective practitioner in Schön's text, I frequently encounter unique cases—type three problems—for which no precedent has prepared me, situations in which several significant and sometimes equally important values clash. These are cases that have too many variables, most of them problematic in several ways at once. Schön (1987, p. 4) calls these issues an "ill-defined melange of topographical, financial, economic, environmental and political factors," often, in my experience, changing shape even as they come into focus.

A Learner Among Learners

A decade ago, when I was preparing a keynote address on the subject of the president-practitioner for the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) meeting in Portland, Oregon, I received a letter from my undergraduate alma mater, Swarthmore College, which was at that time looking for a new president. The college sought a person with these characteristics:

• Strong academic credentials
• Leadership skills
• Strong interest in fostering a culturally and racially diverse community
• High energy tempered with patience, persistence, a sense of humor, and a tolerance for diversity of opinion
• Ability to be visible and accessible and to welcome interaction with other people

What that ambitious portrait and many like it today are missing is a critical point: an administrator today must also be a *learner among learners,* willing to embrace the novel and unexpected and able to be an agent for change. To do this, we presidents must model what it means to have a truly educated mind and then use this mind in public. We must constantly study our environment and test various ideas, let us call them hypotheses, in the living laboratory over which we preside. It would be wise for us to apply to ourselves the same expectations that we have of any well-educated person, whose capacity to think through problems in the swampy lowlands will depend both on the attitudes and knowledge and the skill and experience to employ a rigorous scholarly approach.

There are two interesting and helpful ways to think about scholarship and how we can use a scholarly approach to create a coherent and visionary context for leadership and change. One way to approach being a *public learner* is to practice and model for others what Harry Payne (1996) of Williams College calls the *intellectual virtues,* "the willingness to explore

widely, the ability to test one's ideas against those of others, the capacity to listen thoughtfully, the strength to adduce reasons for assertions" (p. 18). Payne traced the relationship between these intellectual virtues and the character virtues of "honesty, humility, integrity, and independence" (p. 18) and made the case that "all learning is for the sake of something beyond the act of learning itself" (p. 18). In this case, the purpose of learning is to support the kind of decision making that can lead to institutional transformation. I have found that one of the things that helps encourage a more scholarly approach to the management of institutional change is to involve my own senior leadership team in the same kind of intellectual inquiry that I would apply to any other challenging scholarly work. My goal is to "learn our way" into an understanding of institutional change. In my experience, learning is a means for institutional leadership to create a meaningful context for transformational change.

In many of the conversations about change in higher education that I have heard in the past several years, the importance of modeling a scholarly approach to leadership was never mentioned. In a world composed primarily of type three (swampy) problems, the act of leadership must become an *act of public learning,* guided by the same expectations that we hold when evaluating any other form of scholarship. Presidents and other administrators must consistently demonstrate a devotion to rigorous inquiry that allows for informed decisions to be made within a *culture of evidence* compatible with the scholarly values that are a defining feature of academic institutions.[2]

The second way to think about the scholarship of change is to use the approach articulated by Ernest Boyer (1990) and then extended by Charles Glassick, Mary Taylor Huber, and Gene Maeroff (1997). For Boyer, scholarship encompassed four kinds of intellectual work—discovery, integration into a body of knowledge, the scholarship of teaching (interpretation), and application. It soon became clear that members of the academy would not accept this broader definition of scholarly work unless the rigor and value of the work could be documented and assessed and its impact properly understood. In the case of a scholarly approach to change, the impact takes shape in large, tangible institutional terms.

Although Boyer died before he could complete this essential phase of the work, Glassick and colleagues (1997) prepared a companion monograph that outlined the features that characterize excellent scholarship, regardless of who conducts the work and where it is performed. These same elements should characterize the work of presidents and senior administrators as well. Rigorous scholarship, as well as good decision making, is characterized by clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, reflective critique, and ethical practice and respect for those involved or potentially affected by the work.[3]

As a scholar, a president must think of each day as a glorious experiment and must constantly encourage others at the institution to view every program or case or problem as a learning opportunity, as a vehicle to test

basic assumptions about the institution, and as a potential avenue for positive institutional change. Only when the presidential role is approached in this manner can the leader be a public learner and properly lead a genuine learning organization (Senge, 1990; Garvin 1995). At the same time, the call to be a public learner and to model the adoption of a habit of experimentation and the acceptance of the associated risk that accompanies the uncertainty of experimentation can make both the leader and his or her associates anxious. After all, in most organizational environments, the leader is supposed to be in charge, and a leader should not need to ask questions or show the uncertainty that a scholarly attitude will reveal. According to Napier and Sanaghan (1999), "Curriculums [sic] and administrative practices alike have suffered from divided loyalties and narrow frames of reference that make coordination and coherence in direction difficult to achieve" (p. 19). In a university, the values, attitudes and behaviors that should be modeled and encouraged are those of a rigorous scholar, but the approach must be multidisciplinary.

It is uncommon for academic leaders to approach their responsibilities in a scholarly mode. One reason for this is that we do not, as faculty members, usually learn "in public." We prefer to conduct our investigations on our own terms, with conditions set by our own protocols and interests. Then we share our best work with our peers using forms of communication adopted to fit the norms and expectations of our particular discipline. As Napier and Sanaghan (1999) have written, "Most leaders arise within the context of their profession with its clear leadership traditions and particular beliefs." To this insight, I would add that we also learn and then share what we know according to particular rules and norms.

A challenge faced by any institutional leader who wishes to view institutional change as a *scholarly act* is that the research base on issues in higher education that might support a scholarly approach to academic leadership is spread across many different fields, built on a variety of different methodologies, and reported in a variety of different communication styles and technical vocabularies—qualitative and quantitative, individual observations as well as comparative studies, theoretical and practical. The interdisciplinarity of the research base that might guide good decision making in a university setting represents a significant barrier to its use. It is difficult for a practitioner to find the relevant studies and reports, to validate their contents, and to assess the degree to which a particular set of findings might be generalized to the administrator's own institution and circumstances.

Ways to Encourage Public Learning in Others

A university is a special form of democracy that seeks to provide an environment where all persons can do their best work and develop as educated human beings, whatever role they play within the organization—student, faculty, staff, administrator, trustee, or advisory board member. To accom-

plish these goals, everyone must continue to learn, and change itself must be both an intentional and a scholarly act. To accomplish this consistency of behavior, the president must model and encourage public learning. Although many strategies might support the infusion of the experimental mode into the governance and administration of a university, four approaches, taken together, have proven very effective.

First, it is important for a leader to instill a discipline of reflection and a culture of evidence, insisting that everyone back up their opinions and observations with real information, not just perceptions. I frequently ask, "How do you know that?" when faced with a critic who claims to be in possession of the truth. To my delight, the self-appointed critic rarely has any objective evidence for his or her criticisms or alarming observations.

Second, it is essential to create new patterns of conversation that encourage and support the involvement of everyone in defining the issues that will be important in building the organization. There are many ways to do this. As I prepare this chapter, my own institution is engaged in a strategic change initiative. In the first stage, the senior campus leadership learned new approaches to problem solving. We also experimented with new ways to involve a broad-based segment of the campus community in defining questions critical to our future and in identifying and then evaluating strategies that we might employ to address our critical issues.

As the process unfolds, a record is being kept on the University of Vermont home page for anyone to examine and follow over time. There you can see the schedule of activities, the results from each stage, and the logic behind the process as a whole. Reports will also appear in our campus faculty-staff newspaper. In this model, three new forms of conversation and communication are being used to ensure campuswide accessibility to the process—carefully designed interactions that promote careful listening and thoughtful, informed input to the process; use of a Web site to provide a map to the overall change process and a record of the results obtained at each stage; and regular open forums and interactions to allow people to ask questions and satisfy their concerns about what is happening and what it might mean.

A third component of an experimental or scholarly mode is to adopt a philosophy of experimentation and the active management of reasonable risks. Several universities have begun to replace the more traditional concepts of risk and risk management with a broader domain of risk bounded by legal, financial, public relations, and institutional integrity considerations. This new philosophy, which actively promotes the management of known risks and a more experimental approach to the generation of campus strategies, results in the establishment of some of the features of a learning organization.

Presidents, like everyone else, operate within the norms and methodologies of their home disciplines. As a scientist, for example, I have explicit assumptions about how to frame a question, how to test the validity of

hypotheses I have about the issue, and how to communicate my results or findings to others. Given my own scholarly background, I react more quickly and favorably when someone else communicates their concerns or findings in a "scientific mode." My provost, who is a social scientist, has quite different intellectual habits from my own. This complementarity of disciplinary perspectives is helpful on a senior leadership team, especially during a time of intense change. As Peter Senge (1990) has written, "The organizations that will truly excel in the future will be the organizations that discover how to tap people's commitment and capacity to learn" (p. 4). Transformational change itself also depends on superior learning (Eckel, Green, and Mallon, 1999).

The final and fourth strategy needed to establish a successful learning enterprise is to create new ways to facilitate access to information, so that everyone can make informed choices.[4] In many institutions, essential information such as budget details appear mysterious. A number of institutions, including my own, are moving to the use of benchmarking and *dashboard indicators* to measure critically important aspects of institutional performance. These measures are readily available and are frequently posted on a Web site.

In a college or university undergoing meaningful and intentional change, a leader can serve as the facilitator of a research team by building a shared vision for the future, challenging unexamined assumptions and bringing to the surface mental frameworks or models that inappropriately shape everyone's thinking about the issues, fostering more connected learning (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule, 1997) and a consideration of the context of individual decisions and choices, and modeling the intellectual virtues and adopting a scholarly approach to change (modified from Senge, 1990).

The State of the Research

Having laid upon the shoulders of presidents and other academic leaders a mantle of scholarship, we are faced with two key questions: What body of knowledge might we consult in order to perform the necessary step of adequate preparation? How can a president acquire sufficient knowledge of the relevant literature and the scholarly work that might illuminate our swampy problems? In 1990, I asked a member of the Institutional Research and Planning Office at Portland State University to tally the topics and themes covered in six national journals and the programs of three national meetings. The journals were the *Journal of Higher Education,* the *Review of Higher Education*, *Research in Higher Education*, the ASHE-ERIC *Research Report Series*, *New Directions for Higher Education*, and *New Directions for Institutional Research*. The meetings were the Association for Institutional Research, the Association for the Study of Higher Education, and the Society of College and University Planning—all for the years 1988, 1989, and 1990. The ten

most frequently mentioned topics across all nine outlets for higher education research were (1) institutional governance-management-organization, (2) planning, (3) assessment-outcomes, (4) technology issues and applications, (5a) facilities management, (5b) institutional finances, (6a) faculty salaries-personnel issues, (6b) the role of institutional research, (7) student success-achievement, (8) admissions and enrollment, (9) community colleges, and (10) student issues-conduct.[5]

In a second study, the University of Kansas Office of Institutional Research and Planning studied the tables of contents of *Change,* the *Journal of Higher Education, Research in Higher Education,* and the *Review of Higher Education* over the period from January 1988 through June 1990. The themes were sorted out by using the ERIC search descriptions for each article. The results were interesting. The most popular topic in all four journals was college faculty. After that, the themes diverged. The list of topics included minority and gender issues on campus, college students, educational change, the conduct of research, leadership issues, and the presidency.

Although many of these topics sounded interesting, they were not of particular use to me in 1990 as I struggled with a steep learning curve as a new president. I dragged home a foot high stack of "homework" every night, consisting of correspondence, copies of other people's letters, materials from various higher education associations, articles that someone had copied and thought I should read, and reports from campus groups. In the case of the campus reports, the authors had taken months to prepare the documents and were nonetheless expecting an answer from me within a day or two. As a scientist unfamiliar with qualitative research methods and the scholarly approaches used by social scientists, I did not know how to assess the validity of most of these studies and reports, nor could I determine their usefulness to me as a practitioner. In addition, they did not match up very well with the list of the top ten issues that I was thinking about in those days as a new president. At that time, in the fall of my first year, I had the following issues on my mind:

1. *Women and minorities.* There were only five articles on diversity, thirteen on minority students, and twelve on women in academia, a total of less than 10 percent of the articles on planning and institutional governance.
2. *University-industry partnerships and technology transfer.* These were not on the list at all.
3. *Fundraising.* There were only eleven articles or speeches on this topic.
4. *Team building and professional growth of staff.* These issues were not visible as such but possibly contained as a section within some of the many leadership articles, most of which I did not have time to read.
5. *Community college and high school articulation.* There were only thirty-one articles and presentations on these topics (in sharp contrast to the interest that at least K–12 articulation elicits today).

6. *College athletics.* There were only six articles and presentations.
7. *Research centers and institutes and interdisciplinary work.* There were eight articles on these topics.
8. *Conflict resolution and good decision making.* There were none.
9. *Enrollment management and fostering student success.* There were thirty-three articles.
10. *Effective on-campus and off-campus communication methods.* There probably were none unless they were buried inside another topic.

As I write this chapter in 1999, I am two years into my second presidency at the University of Vermont. Perhaps partly as a factor of my greater presidential experience and partly because I now serve a different kind of institution in changing circumstances, my list is actually now much longer than the one I constructed in 1990. I had some difficulty deciding which items to put in the top ten. In addition, my problem list now appears in the form of questions rather than themes. Unable to confine myself to a simple ten items, I expanded the list to a baker's dozen. Even so, many of my key questions did not make it onto the list:

1. Does investment in research really lead to the creation of jobs and to economic development? How can I make the case that investing in my university is truly an investment in the state's future? What are the best ways for universities to participate in economic and community development?
2. How can my institution best participate in the rapidly growing information age and the increasingly complex knowledge marketplace? What is intellectual property now? How will the knowledge media develop and who will prepare materials for these media?
3. Is there a path toward a sustainable fiscal future? How can I reconcile the competing demands of affordability and access on the one hand with the demands to spend ever increasing amounts for academic excellence, increasing health care costs, technology, and competitive compensation for faculty and staff on the other?
4. Are there meaningful differences in the way students learn, what they learn, and how much they learn in classroom and community settings where they have direct contact with one another and with faculty when compared with distance learning and various forms of *virtual* experiences? How much should we invest in the capacity to do distance learning, and what form should our participation take?
5. What strategies can I use to promote more effective communication within the campus community, with the trustees, and with our external constituencies? What can I do to get across important messages and information in the flood of information that crosses everyone's desk and computer screen every day?
6. What does academic quality really mean, and how can I measure it?

7. How can I truly involve members of the campus community meaningfully in setting the direction of the institution and obtain buy-in for the agenda we are developing? What does it really take to initiate and sustain meaningful institutional change?

8. What are the best ways to contain and then decrease problem drinking among our students? How can we best collaborate with the community to deal with the shared consequences of drinking among high school and college age youth?

9. How can we create truly multicultural competency and a climate that supports diversity on campus, and by the way, how would I know that we had done so? How can we detect and then effectively deal with bias incidents and promote harmony on campus?

10. What can we do to ensure a successful and meaningful student experience and live up to our aspiration to prepare our students to live creative, productive, and responsible lives?

11. How will work be done in the university of the future, and how should we classify jobs to reflect the changing nature of work?

12. What forms will effective governance (decision making) take in the university of the future, and how can we ensure meaningful participation of trustees, faculty, staff, alumni, and students in defining and addressing the institution-shaping issues that we will face over the next decade?

13. By what means can we learn together fast enough to keep up with all of these issues? What does it take to produce a true learning organization?

With the assistance of a doctoral student, Mika Nash-Gibney, I reviewed the major topics contained in the same set of journals in 1998–1999. This review yielded a long list of topics, here presented as a baker's dozen. The topics were as follows—(1) approaches to K–16 reform and the importance of school-university partnerships; (2) the use of technology and distance learning; (3) governance; (4) curricular design and the meaning and purpose of an undergraduate education; (5) university-industry collaborations; (6) national educational policy issues; (7) multiculturalism, affirmative action, and admissions standards; (8) service learning; (9) nontraditional students and adult learners; (10) workforce preparation, competency-based testing, and needs of employers; (11) reform of the lending process-regulatory burdens and direct lending; (12) national ranking schemes and higher education quality and standards; and (13) tuition discounting, cost containment, and institutionally based aid. Although many of these topics would be helpful to policymakers, they do not appear on the list of many of the presidents I know. I would hope in the future for more overlap between institutional concerns like mine and the research interests of higher education researchers.

In 1990, most of the things I was worrying about did not show up in the higher education literature at all. I did find my concerns in other publications

aimed at presidents or trustees or administrators, but these articles were not based on any scholarly research. They were usually in the form of essays and opinion pieces, sometimes supported by methodologies and observations that I might apply to my own circumstances but usually based on broad assumptions and assertions that were not held up to close scrutiny or tested.

In 1999, the list of research topics in the higher education literature looks very different from the pattern a mere decade ago, indicating that researchers are paying much closer attention to the major issues faced by higher education. Some of my issues and questions still do not show up in the scholarly literature, although they are regularly addressed in publications such as *Change* or monographs issued by associations such as the American Council on Education, the Association of Governing Boards, and the American Association for Higher Education. Most of these reports are reflections on experience, but they frequently lack the rigor of scholarly analysis and assessment, leaving me unsure what validity to assign to these pieces. A few of my concerns have not shown up very often, if at all, in the typical parade of publications that comes across my desk (for example, issues 6, 11, and 13 from my 1999 baker's dozen list of issues that concern me), except in the forms of *calls to action* and recommendations for how I should exercise my duty as a president to respond to a particular challenge, such as college drinking or the lack of civility and civic responsibility on college campuses today.

I asked myself in 1990, and I continue to ask myself now, why higher education researchers are not analyzing issues that are most meaningful to people who are faced with the challenge of leading institutions out of the swamp. Where is the base of scholarly knowledge that I could draw on to guide my institution onto higher ground? Why are my colleagues writing personal pieces about issues that I care about but that lack the rigor of scholarly work? Why is it so hard to apply the results of many of the more scholarly pieces to my own circumstances? Above all, why is the field of higher education research so out of sync with the needs of people like me, who are trying to exemplify in our practice of the presidency the same rigorous standards that apply to any other form of scholarly work? Even if higher education researchers *were* publishing exactly what I need, how would I find time or develop the expertise to read the studies and interpret them?

My educated, but untested, answer to all but the last of these questions is that as in most other fields, the faculty who work in higher education are seeking legitimacy within the intellectual hierarchy of the contemporary disciplines. The more that faculty in higher education programs seek status, the more they are likely to pull away from contact with the real world from which they originally drew their questions and in which their findings might be tested in the context of practice. This seems especially paradoxical in the field of higher education because the object of the research in this discipline is the actual world of the institution that lies just beyond the researcher's office door.

When I submitted my manuscript to the editors of this volume, they offered another explanation for the gap between my interests as a chief executive and the content of the scholarly literature on higher education. They pointed out that researchers write for many audiences, including legislatures, students, and parents. I must admit that I doubt that much of this work actually gets into the hands of legislators, students, or parents unless it is translated from the scholarly literature by someone else. However, I would be interested to know more about how researchers who are interested in higher education select their topics for research and who they think the audiences will be for their findings and interpretations.

By trying to dress up any field that derives directly from the practical necessities of a profession, we risk losing the vitality that makes the life of a scholar-practitioner so interesting. My scholarly interests as a president are very much shaped by the realities of the institution I serve and by my external constituencies. In addition, I must be aware of the larger, more general realities of the academic community as a whole, as well as the particular experiences of the community of educational institutions of which we are a part—in our case, the cohort of public research and land-grant universities. The interests of a generalist like me must inherently be interdisciplinary, and I am forced, by the nature of my work, to keep the big picture in mind and to concentrate on the things that matter the most. I cannot worry only about the issues I wish to define, because the world presents me with issues on its own terms, not mine, and with its own urgencies. I cannot use exclusively the language or jargon of any one field lest my faculty and administrative colleagues give me up for lost.

Improving the Scholarly Base

What can be done to create the scholarly base to support the intellectual and knowledge needs of a learner among learners, a scholar-president? As higher education researchers plan their agenda for the future, I hope they will keep in mind some of the needs of presidents and other academic leaders and approach their work with the swampy questions of higher education in mind. It would help if, in selecting topics for investigation, researchers would emphasize issues of interest to policymakers, focus on the big picture, avoid studying small questions, encompass more comparative studies so that a particular institutional experience could be studied in a larger context, and provide a clear interpretation that would allow practitioners to see how broadly the results might be applied to other similar circumstances.

What about my last question? Even if higher education researchers *were* publishing exactly what I need, how would I find time or develop the expertise to read the studies, interpret them, and apply them to the issues facing my own institution?[6] I propose changing the role of the institutional research office, so that it can support leadership and change as an act of

scholarship. In most cases, these offices evolved to collect data and provide statistical reports for various compliance reviews. These tasks require the services of data managers rather than scholars (Barbara Holland, personal correspondence with author, June 17, 1999). Institutional research offices should evolve into *institutional studies offices.* These new offices would be staffed by higher education researchers who would help presidents and other academic leaders find and properly interpret the base of existing literature that could be applied to practice. They could also conduct research designed to support transformational change as well as contribute to a shared body of literature on higher education.

The institutional studies office could also be developed as a research center that would support and extend the scholarly work of faculty whose primary appointments are in the academic units, and it could identify and support promising lines of scholarly inquiry that could benefit professional practice and the exercise of leadership. It is common practice for some faculty to hold administrative appointments as directors and chairs of departments and programs. Why not consider an institutional studies appointment or fellowship that would be comparable? A true institutional studies office could help presidents and other academic leaders by serving an R&D function for the institution and its leaders, while at the same time providing technical assistance to faculty members and advanced students who wish to conduct research on issues in higher education. The following are some of the tasks it could perform:

- Evaluate the effectiveness of the new programs we are trying to put in place and assist in creating a base of evidence to support regular program review of continuing programs
- Interpret national data and research by relating them to our own institution, pointing out where the national trends fit our situation and where they do not, and why
- Sort through the case studies, project reports, and monographs that cross my desk in waves and tell me which have application to us, which address issues that we are also facing, and what conclusions the authors have drawn
- Identify people who are doing interesting research on higher education to bring to our campus as consultant-evaluators and to give us an opportunity to reflect on our mission, our progress, and our aspirations
- Do studies that could help us address our own issues more thoughtfully and with a richer base of knowledge about ourselves, our experience, and the relevance of the work of others to our own efforts
- Provide technical assistance to other units on campus that wished to conduct studies of performance or to assess and address issues specific to that part of the institution
- Conduct research that would support the development of new measures of performance to address those elements of our mission that are not

commonly assessed, such as the impact of our community involvement and professional service on quality of life in the community

There is much to be gained from good communication among researchers, managers and administrators, and campus leadership. Good contact can keep all three groups honest. An appropriate bridge builder is the scholar-president, the learner among learners who must slog back and forth between the swamp and the dry highlands. Over the years, I have learned that a frequent shift of perspective between inductive and deductive reasoning, theory and practice, and formal inquiry and application can enrich our scholarship. It is also a useful route to making informed choices that have institution-wide consequences. If researchers always take the high road and presidents and others mostly have to take the low road, "We'll ne'er meet again," to quote the old Scots ballad. If we travel together, we can spin out some fine tales and like the Canterbury pilgrims can entertain one another along the way, while keeping our aspirations and our spirits high.

Notes

1. As far as I know, the ideas were never published, so I use them here without being able to provide a citation.
2. The term *culture of evidence* was used regularly by Steve Weiner, formerly the executive director of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, to describe the growing importance of assessment and accountability in the design of quality assurance in the institutional review process conducted by regional accrediting bodies.
3. This last element was not presented in Glassick and others as a feature of excellent scholarship, but integrity is mentioned as one of the qualities of a scholar.
4. The four strategies suggested here are based in part on a list found on a large piece of newsprint in the St. Johnsbury Extension Office of the University of Vermont. I was told that it first appeared in someone's church bulletin.
5. 5a and 5b and 6a and 6b indicate that these items were tied for that position on the list.
6. In a few instances, I know that what I want simply is not available, even if I had time to look for it. We really know very little, for example, about adolescent drinking and how best to treat or manage drinking at that age. This knowledge is needed if we are to address the growing problem of binge drinking on college campuses.

References

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, R. M., Goldberger, N. R., and Tarule, J. M. *Women's Ways of Knowing.* (10th anniversary ed.). New York: Basic Books, 1997.

Boyer, E. L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.* Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.

Eckel, P., Hill B., Green, M., and Mallon, R. *On Change: Reports from the Road: Insights on Institutional Change.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1999.

Garvin, D. A. "Barriers and Gateways to Learning." In C. R. Christensen, D. A. Garvin, and A. Sweet. (eds.), *Education for Judgment: The Artistry of Discussion Leadership.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1995.

Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., and Maeroff, G. I. *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997.

Napier, R., and Sanaghan, P. "The Changing Nature of Leadership: Implications for Business Officers." *NACUBO Business Officer*, 1999, *33*(1), 48–60.

Payne, H. C. "Can Or Should a College Teach Virtue?" *Liberal Education*, 1996, *82*(4), 18–25.

Schön, D. A. *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Senge, P. M. *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday, 1990.

JUDITH A. RAMALEY is president of the University of Vermont.