

The Steinhardt Institute

FOR HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY

**Clark Kerr's World of Higher Education Reaches the Twenty-first Century:
A Symposium on Kerr's Life, Work and Legacy
October 25-26, 2012
New York University**

On October 25th and 26th, 2012, the NYU Steinhardt Institute of Higher Education Policy convened a symposium of higher education scholars and leaders to discuss Clark Kerr's life, work and legacy. The symposium's purpose was twofold:

1. To celebrate the recent publication of Sheldon Rothblatt's edited volume "Clark Kerr's World of Higher Education Reaches the 21st Century".
2. To convene a discussion among scholars and policy leaders who bring different perspectives to their interest in Kerr and his accomplishments.

The agenda was programmed to address the arc of Kerr's long career, using as focal points the major landmarks in his work and thought:

- Kerr's leadership in the context of the chancellorship at U.C. Berkeley and the presidency of the University of California, as well as his own writings and thoughts on academic leadership.
- Kerr's contributions to the development and enactment of the famed California Master Plan for Higher Education, which he skillfully shepherded through a precarious political landscape.
- The publication of "The Uses of the University", in which Kerr described with acute insight the ever-expanding scope of the modern research university and its multiple goals and constituencies.
- Kerr's assumption of the leadership of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and its successor the Carnegie Council, which under his guidance over thirteen years issued a prodigious number of influential reports and studies addressing critical issues in higher education.
- The personality and character of the man himself and how they contributed to his many successes and occasional disappointments.

At an opening dinner on October 25th, symposium participants were each asked to offer their own personal reflections on their interest in Clark Kerr. Some participants knew Kerr personally and drew from their experiences working with him, while others had never met him and knew Kerr only through his writing or by reputation. The discussion considered both the personal and the public qualities with which Kerr invested his work:

- Kerr had a deep moral and civic core that informed every position he took and which undergirded his analytical qualities.
- He was a deeply reflective man who made a deliberate effort to understand the implications of change, both in terms of his own thinking and in the evolving sociocultural milieu in which he lived and worked.
- His complex personality could easily be perceived as dour or stiff, and he remained a private man his entire life.
- Kerr grew to become disenchanted both with what he perceived as particular personal failings in his own career and with the direction American higher education had taken.
- Kerr was a contradictory figure who remained deeply ambivalent about his own works and accomplishments. Not all of his ideas throughout his life can be retrospectively assembled into a coherent whole, and he often struggled to reconcile his own competing and evolving views about higher education.

At the symposium's opening dinner, Sheldon Rothblatt delivered brief remarks highlighting the complexity of Clark Kerr as a man, scholar, leader and towering figure in higher education. The ensuing discussion focused on Kerr's work in the context of challenges faced today, including his leadership of system design, his role in the creation of policy and his leadership of policy development on the part of others, his institutional leadership, and his influence on higher education as an author and thinker.

- Kerr's thinking can be situated not only within the history of American higher education, but also within a broader continuum of social scientific thought in the twentieth century.
- His accomplishments in the policy arena offer a working model of the application of analytical, empirically driven planning to significant policy problems and provide a solid starting point for any new policy research in higher education.
- Kerr was adept at framing issues for his time, providing a theoretical and practical foundation that was both scholarly and oriented toward the public interest. His analytical talents assembled in incisive ways the disparate lines of thought supplied by other scholars and practitioners working in higher education.

- Kerr's great strength as a leader was in seeking to situate decisions in a grounded understanding of the context of state and public demands.
- Perhaps most importantly, for most of his career Kerr was someone who reliably understood the times he lived in, as well as the forces that worked continually to shape them.

The participants emphasized that the importance of what might be called Kerr's "context-consciousness" resonates today. As one symposium participant noted, "we would do a lot better in our own time" if scholars and policymakers could properly understand the last great transformation of higher education after World War II. The discussion closed with the invocation of a central question the symposium seeks to address: in today's complex and evolving context, what do the works of Clark Kerr now communicate to us?

Clark Kerr's Multiversity

Discussion led by Thomas Bender

Thomas Bender opened the discussion of Kerr's "multiversity" by describing the transformation of the university's role in American society during the postwar period. During this era, the availability of federal money fueled both increased public demand and the pursuit of scientific knowledge on an immense scale. As development of science and technology became increasingly important institutional priorities, research universities were firmly established as engines of economic development. As the academy expanded to include students more representative of the nation's complex demography, diversity and access became pressing issues and institutions wrestled with longstanding social problems in a new way. By the 1960s, higher education had developed into an important and influential sector and the university had become a fundamental institution in American life.

While postwar progress was formidable, Bender argued that today the standing of higher education as a vital public resource has considerably eroded. He locates the stalled progress of higher education within a profound cultural shift that took place between two eras. In the 1940s and 1950s, "society" and "the social" were central analytic concepts, but since then individual choice has become paramount and investment in collective, public goods has contracted. In this context, higher education is increasingly thought of as a private good. As a result, Bender suggested, communally held perceptions of higher education have devolved and now exhibit little public implication.

Bender referred broadly to this problem as the "thinning of public culture" and commented that without a strong sense of higher education as a public good, the world of higher education Kerr helped build could never have happened. The prevailing sense of higher education as an essentially private good undermines the values of liberal learning and results in the "economization" of higher education - a phenomenon Kerr himself predicted. Bender concluded by noting that growing economic inequality has led to a

divide between rich, private forms of higher education and increasingly impoverished public higher education. This growing divergence has diminished the public character of higher education and offers reason to worry for its future.

In the subsequent discussion, most of the discussants agreed with Bender's general assessment of higher education as a "stalled" social institution. The discussion centered on whether this problem is reversible and what might be the most appropriate correctives:

- Participants discussed whether current conditions are the product of a cyclical swing between recognition of the public role of higher education and a narrow emphasis on individual benefits. Some agreed that such changes are cyclical. Others argued that a fundamentally broken political system will not continue to accommodate higher education in its current form and that what is required is an entirely new model.
- The public needs that higher education ought to be responding to should be identified. Higher education is driven by waves of public demand, but it is not clear what the next wave of that demand will resemble. We are in the midst of a transformation from an industrial age to a digital information economy. Kerr was a product of an "analog" industrial economy and created appropriate institutions for that era; the challenge now is to identify and design the appropriate institutions to meet the needs of this new era.
- What will the next model of higher education look like? Some participants discussed online or digital forms of education, as well as recent attention to "global" education, but it seems unlikely that any of these models offer a simple solution. Higher education will clearly look very different as we move into a new era, but what remains unclear is what the future model should look like.

These issues were considered in the context of Kerr's intellectual approach to change:

- Kerr thought of sociocultural and economic structures as essentially evolutionary, and recognized that conditions in any given period make possible certain courses of action (as long as those conditions are appropriately understood by those in a position to act).
- Kerr today would try to recognize the ways in which higher education plays by a different set of rules and understand how to effectively wield the new political, economic and cultural forces shaping the sector.
- Kerr would not accept a reductive dichotomy in which "good" conditions dictate success and "poor" conditions generate failure.

Clark Kerr's Leadership

Discussion led by Richard Freeland

Richard Freeland led a discussion of Clark Kerr's view of academic leadership in the context of Kerr's career as Chancellor of the Berkeley campus and President of the University of California system. Freeland noted that Kerr's view of leadership evolved and incorporated different definitions over time, including the leader as mediator; as manager; as 'mediator-leader'; as mayor or governor, essentially political; or as clerk of a Quaker meeting, simply keeping business moving and getting a "sense of the meeting". The central theme that appears to consistently emerge from Kerr's many working definitions is the role of the leader as problem-solver, skillfully managing conflict and arriving at practical solutions.

- The success of the academic leader is contingent upon understanding the social structures in which the institution operates as well as the boundary conditions governing the behavior of each party in a bargaining situation. When Kerr confronted a new world in which those conditions were not entirely understood by him (such as the emergence of student unrest at Berkeley), he was unmoored and his leadership less effective.
- It is enormously difficult to make generalizations about academic leadership. Kerr well understood broader, macro-level issues but at times perhaps failed to appreciate the often significant differences in challenges faced by different kinds of institutions. In some of his most influential writing on leadership (and particularly in *The Uses of the University*), Kerr tended to invoke a particular type of institution, but only that type, and a type that was not the majority.
- Kerr's vision of leadership overlooked an understanding of the 'intangibles' that motivate constituents. Most people do not know or understand what is motivating them; the task of campus leadership is thus to consider the emotions of the campus community as well as their intellects. The affective component of leadership was not part of Kerr's intellectual or personal approaches to problem solving.
- Leadership invariably depends at least in part upon a kind of "mystique" that goes beyond mind and reason to make an emotional appeal in establishing connections and winning approval. Kerr was temperamentally unsuited to this kind of leadership, and his evolving views unvaryingly omitted any analysis of how personality or personal traits might play a part in effective leadership.

In a subsequent discussion, participants reflected on Kerr's understanding of academic leadership in the context of the present day:

- The role of the president has changed dramatically since Kerr's time; now a president's primary expected function is to raise money.

- Today, the notion that “leaders don’t matter” is occasionally expressed. Leaders are critically important to the success of any institution, and Kerr understood that.
- It is possible to read too much into the temperamental differences between Kerr and his larger-than-life predecessor Sproul. Kerr was caught up in a fundamental change in Californian politics, and that structural change had as much to do with his fate as any differences he might have had from Sproul.

The California Master Plan

Discussion led by Patrick Callan and David Breneman

Patrick Callan led a discussion of Clark Kerr’s role as principal architect of the Master Plan for Higher Education in California (CMP), a mid-twentieth century public policy blueprint for the development of California higher education. Callan framed the development of the CMP by putting it in the context of a central question arising in any instance of system design:

- What values are going to drive a system, and how do any proposed systemic policies support or express those values?
- In the context of California, the CMP reflected civic values that were both egalitarian and meritocratic, striking a unique balance between competitive excellence and equality of opportunity, selectivity and universality, and growth and efficiency.

Callan went on to note that the CMP was unique in a few key ways:

- It made California the first state to commit to universal educational opportunity through planned and coordinated growth.
- It imposed the most rigid mission differentiation ever implemented in a higher education system.
- It represented a very particular approach to policy that is empirically driven and analytical, reflecting Kerr’s core belief that planning and policy were the most effective ways of solving problems.

Callan noted that the development and implementation of the CMP took place in a unique context of looming demographic pressures and an amenable political environment. Later, the political context in California would change so quickly that it was highly unlikely that the academic community could ever take leadership in developing a plan like the CMP given the political attitudes that developed.

Given the changing political climate, Kerr may have recognized the moment as the last opportunity to put something as ambitious as the CMP in place. He certainly believed that in enacting the CMP he was addressing California's higher education needs for the long-term. In the end, Kerr did not foresee the need for a dynamic mechanism allowing for periodic adjustments to the plan. This would prove to be a critical oversight. As California's political, economic and cultural characteristics shifted over time, the CMP remained in stasis, permanently responding to a largely outdated set of past conditions. Although most structural elements of the CMP have been retained, some of its most important principles have been compromised due to its inflexibility in the face of changing conditions.

David Breneman discussed the impact of the CMP on other states, noting that in his many interviews with state leaders and policymakers virtually none of them explicitly admitted that the CMP had any appreciable effect on their planning. Indeed, some actually thought that certain tenets of the CMP were regressive and consequently modeled their systems in direct opposition to those parts of the CMP's structure. This led Breneman to conclude that the influence of the CMP is found not necessarily in its structure - which has not been widely copied - but rather in its fundamental principles.

Breneman noted that a major influence of the CMP was in highlighting the importance of rational empirical models of planning. In that respect, the enactment of the CMP served as an impetus to the creation of coordinating boards across states. Perhaps ironically, in California these entities were relatively powerless, but in other states they were much more powerful.

The ensuing discussion emphasized the limitations of the CMP and the constraints in achieving systemic change on a similar scale in the present day context. In their discussion, the participants framed the problem in two primary ways:

1. There is a "lack of models" from which to draw on when seeking solutions to systemic, statewide problems.
2. The capacity of the states to address systemic problems in higher education has been severely curtailed.

Participants noted that these issues are essentially political problems, exacerbated by the following conditions:

- Systemic change depends on the involvement of a person or entity that can effectively represent the view that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Current conditions do not easily allow for any one entity to assume that role or take that view.

- State coordinating boards are now less effective than ever. They were created to govern growth, but in the absence of growth their role is less clear.
- Effective leadership is made enormously difficult in a time of scarce resources. During these tumultuous periods decisions are often governed by emotions as well as reason, which increases the likelihood that they may be less effective in the longer term.
- The time horizon for state governments has been shortened because of term limits, and increased partisanship makes it hard to operate in this environment. Higher education used to be excluded from political gamesmanship, but this is no longer the case.
- Current political conditions encourage the continual application of stopgap measures, putting something in place that solves one problem at a given point in time, instead of seeking long-term, sustainable solutions that are adaptable to change.
- There has been a continual decline in confidence in the public mission of higher education as well as an erosion of public trust, making it difficult to make the case for investment in significant measures that would address longstanding problems.

The participants concluded the discussion by noting that leadership in higher education is essential to the future of the United States. Given formidable political constraints, it is more important than ever to identify the correct model for the future as well as the leaders who can shepherd necessary changes through a highly contentious political environment.

Clark Kerr and the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education

Discussion led by Arthur Levine

Arthur Levine led a discussion on Clark Kerr's role as leader of both the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and its successor, the Carnegie Council on Higher Education. Prior to his tenure with Carnegie, Kerr's unique career had afforded him the opportunity to both modernize the contemporary public research university and essentially remake the higher education system in California. In the context of Kerr's career, his time with Carnegie also represented a unique opportunity for a retrospective review of the world of higher education he had helped create.

Levine noted that three key factors contributed to the success of Kerr's tenure at Carnegie:

1. Kerr's stature – Kerr was viewed as a giant in the world of higher education, credited with establishing the prototype of the modern American higher education

system in California.

2. Kerr's personality –Kerr had the appropriate temperament and self-confidence to pursue the work of the Commission. He had a unique talent for assembling and managing different and sometimes conflicting viewpoints, ultimately achieving consensus.
3. The nature and design of the Commission and the Council, which had support from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as well as ample funding from the Carnegie Foundation.

Levine commented on some of Kerr's key accomplishments in his leadership of the Carnegie Commission and Council:

- Assembly of the largest and most distinguished collegium of academics ever to study higher education, including the recruitment of major researchers from other disciplines who had never previously studied it.
- Commissioning of a significant number of influential books and reports on critical issues in higher education.
- Creation of advisory boards and committees composed of the most celebrated scholars in their respective fields.
- Development of a research base for higher education where relatively little had previously existed.
- Modeling of an approach for how to study a field, focusing on specific topics, concrete recommendations, targeted audiences, and emphasis on adoption.
- Cultivation of three generations of talent who would continue to study the pressing issues confronting higher education leadership.

Levine and the participants also discussed some of the drawbacks and limitations of the Council and Commission's work:

- The sheer volume of materials produced was daunting and sometimes prevented any one release from receiving the amount of consideration necessary to facilitate adoption.
- The research did not have clearly identifiable foci or themes guiding its work, except for those retrospectively applied by Kerr.

- Some recommendations proved more attractive in the short-term than they would in the long-term.
- The Council and Commission were based on the west coast, rather far removed from the centers of governmental and financial power in the east.

The participants then discussed the need for and prospects of a new Carnegie-like commission to address the challenges confronting higher education today:

- There has never been an endeavor quite like the Commission and Council, which looked so broadly and so deeply for such a long time at the aspects and context of higher education. Such a broad view would benefit scholars and policymakers today who are grappling with questions and issues that are increasingly complex.
- There is far less of an opening for any endeavor like this now; fewer people are willing to listen to commissions; there is hardly a demand for policy analysis now such as there was in Kerr's day.
- The Carnegie work legitimized a great deal of scholarship in higher education. The responsibility of carrying on that work has since fallen to institutions, but the scholarship produced at institutions tends to be inward looking and focuses more narrowly on institutional issues rather than broader policy or systemic questions.
- There is no single history of higher education policy development in literature, at just a time when the United States needs to be thinking about this.

Clark Kerr: Legacies

Group discussion

To close the symposium and provide an opportunity to review themes and ideas that developed throughout, participants discussed how Kerr's work and thought resonate today for those seeking to understand and improve higher education.

- Of chief importance in moving higher education forward is "getting the paradigm right." Kerr was able to succeed when he did because he fundamentally understood the forces operating in his time and was able to move tactically within that framework. Today, we're no longer certain of the paradigm guiding changes in higher education, and as a result our course is not clear. Using Kerr's approach as an instructive example, it would be more useful to evaluate how the underlying structure of our situation is problematic instead of simply addressing symptomatic difficulties as they arise.

- Kerr always strove to find meaning in what was happening and to put change in a broader historical context. Today, partially because of Kerr's work with the Carnegie Council and Commission, there are more people than ever studying higher education as an academic discipline. This has not necessarily led to a surplus of constructive knowledge about our current conditions or how to best address them, however, as too few are examining higher education in its broader social and economic contexts.
- Kerr's work at Carnegie stands as a significant counter-example to the kind of foundation-driven reform we see today, which is often bereft of analysis or empirical grounding. The philanthropic sector does not seem inclined to engage the most critical questions and all too often steers clear of issues with broader implications.
- When describing the cultural and political conditions that contribute to prevailing problems in higher education today, we need to reflect on how we (as participants in the system) are not merely victims of them but also contribute to them in the way we do our work and promote our enterprise. Ultimately, we are not going to be able to sustain a vibrant higher education system if these conditions persist.
- Kerr always had the courage to ask the large questions and had confidence in the malleability of the political system to find solutions. In that spirit, those working in higher education need to address a set of fundamental questions whose answers will help inform which direction we take in pursuing solutions. For example, what sort of values will we employ to drive change? What will we protect, what are we willing to sacrifice, and who will we serve?

Prepared by
Zachary Maggio, Rapporteur
Ph.D. Candidate in Higher Education
New York University
zm10@nyu.edu

Participant Biographies

Thomas Bender is Professor of History, and University Professor of Humanities at New York University. He is an intellectual and cultural historian whose work focuses on the United States, which in the past decade or more has increasingly focused on transnational connections and the global framing of the history of North America, beginning with earliest European ventures out onto the Atlantic to the present. He has written extensively on the academic disciplines and the history of universities, ranging from *The University and the City: From Medieval Origins to the present*; *American Academic Culture in Transformation*; *American Higher Education Transformed, 1945-2000* and *The Education of Historians for the Twenty-first Century*.

David Breneman is University Professor and Newton and Rita Meyers Professor in Economics of Education and Public Policy at the University of Virginia. He has served as Senior Fellow in Economics Studies at The Brookings Institution, as President of Kalamazoo College in Michigan, as Professor at Harvard Graduate School of Education, and as Dean, Curry School of Education, University of Virginia. His research has concentrated on the finance and governance of higher education, and on federal and state policy toward higher education.

Patrick M. Callan is President of the Higher Education Policy Institute in San Jose, CA. He was president of the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education from 1998 to 2011 and of The California Higher Education Policy Center from 1992 to 1997. He has served as executive director of state higher education boards and commissions in Montana, Washington and California. He is currently a Senior Fellow at NYU's Steinhardt Institute for Higher Education Policy.

Robert Cohen is a professor of history and social studies in NYU's Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development. He is an affiliated member of NYU's History Department. His historical scholarship focuses on politics, higher education, and social protest in twentieth century America. His social studies work links middle and high school teachers with the recent advances in historical scholarship and develops curriculum aimed at teaching their students to explore history as a critical discipline.

Joni Finney is Director of the Institute for Research in Higher Education (IRHE) at the University of Pennsylvania. She is currently directing a five-state study, sponsored by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, to understand the relationship between a state's policies for higher education and a state's performance. She served as vice president of the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education for the past ten years. Prior to that, Dr. Finney was with the California Higher Education Policy Center and the Education Commission of the States.

Richard Freeland is Commissioner of Higher Education for Massachusetts, appointed to this position in January 2009. Working with the Board of Higher Education, he is responsible for providing overall direction to public higher education in Massachusetts and helping shape state-level policies that maximize the benefits of higher education to the Commonwealth and its citizens. Previously, Freeland was President of Northeastern

University for ten years, from 1996 to 2006. Freeland has spent his entire academic career in urban higher education. He is the author of *Academia's Golden Age: Universities in Massachusetts, 1945-1970*.

James Furman is former Executive Vice President and emeritus member of the Board of Directors of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. He is also a former Executive Director of Washington's first coordinating board, the Council on Higher Education, former Executive Director of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, and former Executive Vice-President of the Ohio Board of Regents.

Roger Geiger is Distinguished Professor of Higher Education at The Pennsylvania State University and former Head of the Higher Education Program (1997-2000; 2003-2007). His research has focused on the history of American higher education and its research universities. He is also an editor of *The Future of the American Public Research University* (2007) and author of *Knowledge and Money: Research Universities and the Paradox of the Marketplace* (2004). He has edited *Perspectives on the History of Higher Education* since 1993, and is Senior Associate Editor of *The American Journal of Education*.

Ted Hollander served as Chancellor of the New Jersey Department of Higher Education. He assumed the position in August 1977. Early in his career he joined the faculty of the City University of New York as a university professor and associate professor of accounting, and served as CUNY Vice Chancellor in the late 1960's. He left CUNY to accept an appointment at the New York State Education Department as deputy commissioner for higher and professional education until coming to New Jersey as head of the Department of Higher Education.

Arthur Levine is the sixth President of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation. Before his appointment at Woodrow Wilson, he was president and professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University. He also previously served as chair of the higher education program, chair of the Institute for Educational Management, and senior lecturer at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. He has written widely on such subjects as the preparation of school leaders, teachers, and education researchers; education inequity; school reform; higher education innovation; and trends among college students.

Ann Marcus is professor of higher education and director of NYU's Steinhardt Institute for Higher Education Policy after serving as Dean of the Steinhardt School of Education for 14 years. Her career has included a variety of senior leadership positions in both the public and private sectors of higher education. At the City University of New York, she served as Director of Planning for Community Colleges (1969-71) and joined LaGuardia Community College as its first Dean of Continuing Education in 1972. She joined NYU in 1976 as Dean of the School of Continuing Education, and in the 1980's served as Vice President for Student Affairs for ten years.

Aims McGuinness is a senior associate with the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), a private nonprofit policy center in Boulder,

Colorado. At NCHEMS, he specializes in state governance and coordination of higher education; strategic planning and restructuring higher education systems; roles and responsibilities of public institutional and multi-campus system governing boards; and international comparison of education reform. Prior to joining NCHEMS in 1993, he was director of higher education policy at the Education Commission of the States (ECS). Before joining ECS in 1975, he served as a congressional staff member and was executive assistant to the Chancellor of the University of Maine System.

Richard Richardson is professor emeritus of higher education at NYU. His recent studies have examined policy and higher education performance, structural designs, and systemic change for state higher education systems. He recently completed a Ford Foundation funded research project that was designed to improve understanding of the linkages between federal and state policies and college and university performance in the US, Mexico and Canada. His most recent book with co-author Mario Martinez is *Policy and Performance in American Higher Education: An Examination of Cases Across State Systems* (2009).

Sheldon Rothblatt is Professor Emeritus of History and Former Director of the Center for Studies in Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley. He is a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society of Britain, a Foreign Member of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences and a Member of the National Academy of Education. He was knighted by the King of Sweden in 2010 as Knight Commander of the Royal Order of the Polar Star (1748). He is an historian of ideas and culture writing on the comparative history of universities in the modern period.

Ethan Schrum studies the intellectual, cultural, and political history of the United States and its role in the world from the late nineteenth through the twentieth century, with a primary research focus on the role of universities and academic knowledge in American life. He earned his Ph.D. in history at the University of Pennsylvania in 2009 and subsequently served as a lecturer in history. He has published several articles, including “Clark Kerr’s Early Career, Social Science, and the American University” (*Perspectives on the History of Higher Education*, 2011).

Catharine Stimpson is University Professor and Dean Emerita of the Graduate School of Arts and Science at New York University. From 1994 to 1997 she served as Director of the Fellows Program at the MacArthur Foundation in Chicago. She has also served as University Professor and dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost for Graduate Education at Rutgers from 1986 to 1992. Before going to Rutgers, she taught at Barnard College, where she was also the first director of its Women's Center.

Zehev Tadmor is distinguished Research Professor at the Chemical Engineering Department of The Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, and serves as Chairman of the S. Neaman Institute for Advanced Studies in Science and Technology. He served as Dean of the Chemical Engineering Faculty, Director of the S. Neaman Institute, and President of The Technion from 1990 to 1998. At the Neaman Institute, Professor Tadmor leads its Higher Education Forum.

Harold Wechsler co-directs NYU's Ph.D. program in Education and Jewish Studies. He has published widely on higher education access, governance, and the formation of curriculum and disciplines in American higher education. Wechsler formerly chaired the higher education programs at the University of Chicago and Northwestern University. Sponsored by a major Spencer Foundation grant, Wechsler currently studies the history of minority access to American higher education. He edits the NEA annual *Almanac of Higher Education* and co-edits the *ASHE Reader on the History of Higher Education*.