INTRODUCTION

Context influences postsecondary research in a multitude of ways. This issue of the Center for Higher and Adult Education Report serves to illustrate how the Center faculty examines context and organizational-level research. Educational change provides the backdrop for John Dirkx’s work on the growth and development of university teacher communities. Postcolonialism serves as the theoretical lens for Riyad Shahjahan’s study of the global university rankings system. Professional competencies in student affairs are the framework Christa Porter uses to expand opportunities for students to translate theory into practice. This is just a snapshot of three of the nine scholarship-in-brief narratives contained in this issue. These narrative serve to illumine how Center faculty members understand the role of context in creating new knowledge and deepening our understanding of what is already known.
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Navigating the Complexity of Consortium Work

Sarah Fitzgerald

Professor Marilyn Amey is studying the organizational successes and challenges of the Bio-computational Evolution in Action Consortium (BEACON)—a National Science Foundation (NSF) Science and Technology Center. Since 2010, Amey, alongside Evaluation Specialist Patricia Farrell-Cole and several graduate students, has used various methods to evaluate the center, including surveys, focus groups, individual interviews, and most recently, social network analysis based on co-authorship sites. According to Amey, in addition to creating annual evaluation reports, this study has broader implications for other interdisciplinary and inter-institutional endeavors. She believes communicating across disciplines and trying to create shared understanding necessitates ongoing socialization for those engaged in consortium work. Amey’s work helps BEACON improve, but it also identifies ways in which other higher education consortia can plan for effective communication, motivation, sustainability, leadership, and promotion of diversity. This is helpful because there is a growing demand for interdisciplinary and inter-institutional work in higher education institutions.

Differing contexts
Engaging the work of evaluation within BEACON is a challenging endeavor given the complexity of its organization, which includes five university partners. Much communication between consortium members takes place virtually, and virtual communication does not always have the same impact as in-person communication. When it comes to evaluation, coordinating with people across institutions can be difficult, and observing trends can be an elusive pursuit when individuals are constantly joining or leaving the consortium. Disciplinary differences between the evaluators and the faculty involved in the consortium present challenges to understanding the experiences of consortium members. These disciplinary differences also make conveying the relevance of findings to the BEACON leadership team difficult, which Amey believes can be attributed to the leadership team’s lack of experience focusing on group dynamics and organizational development. Amey explains that she and Farrell-Cole have a difficult time with survey completion, because consortium members become impatient with repeatedly filling out lengthy surveys requested by the leadership team.

Competing demands
One issue Amey faces in her work with BEACON is navigating the convergence of various academic units. She explains that when you create a project like BEACON involving faculty from different units, you must be aware of the demands those faculty members face within their home units. There are five institutions and many departments involved in BEACON, and there are instances in which the demands of those units impact the dynamics of the consortium. For example, each institution’s schedule of classes determines when BEACON classes may be scheduled. An additional issue arises around whether or not faculty members are recognized for BEACON grants, a factor that is determined by the standards of each faculty member’s department. Amey and other members of the BEACON leadership team are seeking ways to incentivize faculty participation with the consortium when grant attribution is not available.

Diversity and sustainability
Another issue Amey has encountered involves promoting diversity. She explains that scientists can be so focused on the content of their work they overlook issues of diversity. BEACON has a director dedicated to promoting diversity work among faculty. Amey explains instilling the value of diversity across sites has not always been easy, and definitions of diversity within the center have changed over time. For example, the consortium now focuses more on creating an inclusive environment for people with disabilities, an issue previously overlooked in their diversity efforts. Amey asserts sustainability is an important issue to consider with groups such as BEACON, which function on soft money. BEACON recently received a one-time, five-year renewal of its initial grant. Given the NSF funds cannot be renewed again, Amey and Farrell-Cole are working to create a plan for sustaining BEACON when the NSF funds run out. Their goal is to maintain BEACON’s vibrancy, but Amey worries there is a danger of complacency once the consortium members believe success has been achieved. With the grant renewal behind them, she believes retaining current members and focusing on succession planning as the older members retire is an important next step.

Marilyn Amey

Professor

Marilyn Amey is a professor of Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education and chairperson of the Department of Educational Administration. She studies educational partnerships, particularly those of community colleges; leadership, including how leaders learn; postsecondary governance and administration; and faculty concerns, including interdisciplinary academic work. Her current work focuses on factors affecting student transfer and degree attainment and educational partnerships, including a multi-year evaluation of a multiple-institutional interdisciplinary consortium.
The Dr. Mildred B. Erickson Distinguished Chair in Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education provides special funding for a faculty member to pursue a research project, one which allows the holder of the Chair to contribute to a scholarly conversation in a visible way. For Professor Roger Baldwin, the current Erickson Chair, the scholarly conversation he is pursuing is about the oft-unspoken topic of faculty retirement.

Baldwin sees a need to help people transition to retirement and to provide people at this stage of life with outlets for service and engagement so they can live longer and better. Through his research, Baldwin seeks to change the bleak vision of retirement that is “walking out of your office one day and never coming back.” In particular, he wants to understand the impact retired faculty organizations can have on their members and institutions.

Studying retired faculty organizations

In the most current stage of the project, Baldwin will survey retirement organization leaders and institutional liaisons for the 200+ organizations that offer services to retiring faculty and staff. This environmental scan will help Baldwin get a sense of the kinds of program models the organizations are using, what the leaders and liaisons see as the impact and benefits of their organizations, and what else the programs would like to offer. From the survey data, he will select institutions and organizations from among the program models and conduct site visits. Through conversations and focus groups with key staff members and members of the organizations themselves, Baldwin hopes to get a richer and deeper sense of what the organizations do to support their members, their institutions, and the larger community.

The aging population is large, in part due to the Baby Boom phenomenon and longer lifespans, and Baldwin feels there are not enough organizations or structures to assist the transition to retirement. He wants to discover what steps should be taken to assist faculty and academic staff in preparing for the next phase of life, a phase where people have more control of their time and can take advantage of opportunities that have long been put off. Ultimately, through his research as the Erickson Chair, Baldwin wants to make the conversation about faculty retirement heard, and in doing so bring this part of academic life “out of the closet.” An overview of Baldwin’s research topic can be found in the Fall 2015 edition of Center for Higher and Adult Education Report.

Roger Baldwin is a professor of Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education and the Mildred B. Erickson Distinguished Chair. 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 in the later stages of academic life, and evolving faculty roles and professional activities.

FACULTY RETIREMENT: MAKING THE SILENT CONVERSATION HEARD

BY ANGIE A. BELIN
DOCTORAL STUDENT
Educational researchers are informed by their experiences and guided by their curiosity. But few experiences are more transformative in shaping the trajectory of an educational researcher than their doctoral training. Assistant Professor Brendan Cantwell’s current research is no exception. Cantwell’s attention to the growth of international postdocs at research universities, particularly in the science disciplines, emerged during his days as a doctoral student.

For Cantwell, what began as an observation of a demographic trend steadily evolved into a growing body of questions, many of which touched upon areas of political economy, academic capitalism, and institutional theory. In his search for answers, he immediately recognized a dearth of higher education literature addressing the changing roles of international postdocs. This glaring gap in the research would provide not only a robust direction for his dissertation, but also a pathway for his future research in higher education, leading to published and forthcoming papers in, among other outlets: *Harvard Educational Review* (Cantwell & Lee, 2010), *Higher Education* (Cantwell & Taylor, 2013), *The Journal of Higher Education* (Cantwell & Taylor, 2015), and *Teachers College Record* (Huang, Cantwell, & Taylor, in press).

**Broader research**

Nearly a decade later, quite a lot has changed. Cantwell is no longer the sole investigator in this area of higher education research. His work has since attracted the interest of other researchers, each bringing new insights and directions for discovery. Cantwell’s own research questions have grown and changed over time as well. As a doctoral student, his interests in international postdocs concentrated largely on the experiences of the postdoc researchers themselves. Now his research is leading him toward broader issues of higher education policy, academic labor, and the production of science as a university enterprise.

Perhaps most importantly, Cantwell’s introspection has allowed him to appreciate the process of doing educational research. In many ways, his approach has evolved in tandem with his research questions. Through his research experiences—ranging from revelations to wrong-turns—Cantwell has come to understand the importance of uncovering small-scale phenomena in order to inform larger concepts or problems. Providing convincing links from small to large, then, becomes the exciting and creative challenge in his research endeavors.

**References**


Professor John Dirkx and his colleagues at the University of Padova, Penn State University, and Texas State University-San Marcos are examining professional development and teacher communities in the service of fostering organizational transformation within a large Italian university. Together, this team is working to develop and test a model of professional development for teachers within the University of Padova, Italy. For Dirkx, participation in the project represents “an integration of a number of long-standing and emerging interests in research, theory, and practice of the professional development of educators who work with adult learners, and the potentially transformative processes that may be stimulated within them and their organizations.” The overall goal of the project is to stimulate change in teacher practice by fostering change in the culture of teaching within the university. In addition to the Italian and American researchers, faculty participating in this project include 12 volunteer senior faculty and 18 volunteer junior faculty belonging to different departments within the University. This effort represents the first structured attempt at the University of Padova, as well as the whole of Italy, to promote staff development and to enhance academic innovation and educational change within university contexts.

Says Dirkx: “Over the last 15 years, I have become increasingly interested in this work within international contexts. Working within these contexts helps illuminate a number of important dimensions of educational change within higher education, including awareness of diversity and the importance of intercultural awareness and competence; a deep understanding of change as reflecting the dynamic inter-relationship of the individual and the larger social and cultural context; and the critical importance of understanding and learning to work across sectors within any substantive project of educational change.”

Changing the paradigm

Preliminary findings, presented at the 8th annual International Conference of Education, Research, and Innovation in Seville, Spain, demonstrate an increased awareness of key aspects of good teaching, the critical importance of interaction with students, and use of formative and summative assessment in student learning. The majority of participating teachers have piloted some approaches or techniques in their actual classes. Participants gave strong emphasis to peer learning and evaluation. The challenges and sharing within the community constitute for them the most important and innovative element, especially in a university context that privileges individual teaching rather than collective practices. Results show an ongoing change of paradigm. Despite a lack of previous pedagogical knowledge, participation in the project encourages junior faculty members to constantly review their current practices and senior faculty members to move toward development of departmental learning communities and the use of peer coaching activities among colleagues. Institutional support is required by all of them to foster improvement of teaching and change in organizational culture.

A long history

The University of Padova project connects to much of Dirkx’s other international work. He has worked on similar efforts in developing countries such as Vietnam, Pakistan, and Rwanda. Many of the universities Dirkx has worked with in those countries were between 20 to 30 years old. Padova, which was established in 1222, has a much longer history, and Dirkx shares how his current project “generates a new respect for how deeply and historically rooted is much of our theory and practice in higher education.” He explains that his work with Padova highlights the important roles history and tradition play in educational change efforts. Dirkx believes the combination of his work, with newer and older international institutions, provides a more comprehensive lens by which to approach improving university teaching.
EXPLORING THE IMPLICATIONS OF AN HSI DESIGNATION FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS AT A RESEARCH UNIVERSITY

BY MICHELLE ALLMENDINGER & GRAHAM F. HUNTER

DOCTORAL STUDENTS

The number and type of Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSI) has been increasing over time as a result of the increasing enrollment of Latino/a students in colleges and universities. Assistant Professor Patricia Marin’s interest in HSIs includes a small but growing phenomenon — research universities with very high research activity (formerly known as Research I institutions) — adding the HSI designation to their list of classifications. Marin says that as a Latina researcher, her pursuit of this research includes an interest not only in HSIs but also in the uniqueness of research institutions becoming HSIs and the potential this offers within higher education and for the pipeline of Latino/a students. Because of her background in student affairs work, she is also interested in the roles and responsibilities HSIs professionals and their institutions have to serve all students. In a forthcoming paper, currently titled “Hispanic-Serving Research Institutions: Engaging Graduate Students for Campus Success,” she focuses on graduate students at a research institution that is also an emerging HSI. In the paper, Marin and her co-investigator Priscilla Pereschica ask, “What are the implications of an HSI designation for graduate students at a research university?”

Existing HSI research has focused on the impact of the designation on areas such as undergraduate college choice, experience, and success. Additional research highlights HSI characteristics and development and attempts to dispel negative perceptions about them. However, because research institutions are not the typical HSI, those institutions have not been included in HSI literature. Marin suggests the purpose of the study is “to address existing literature gaps by focusing on two intersecting areas that have been understudied in the HSI literature: a research institution with very high research activity (formerly known as Research I institutions) and the experience of its graduate students.”

Focus group insights

In this qualitative case study, master’s and doctoral students at the institution of inquiry were invited to discuss their awareness of the institution’s HSI status and their related experience. The 45 volunteer participants, who were diverse across race/ethnicity, gender, and academic discipline, were interviewed in focus groups. Focus group questions included: “What would becoming an HSI mean for this institution? What are the responsibilities of and opportunities for the institution? How does/might HSI status impact the graduate experience?” Marin reports, “less than 1% of participants heard their institution referred to within the HSI context,” but they were quickly able to “consider the impact of the designation and related institutional issues, discussing both positive and negative potential effects.”

Several themes emerged as a result of Marin and Pereschica’s analysis: (1) opportunities and responsibilities for the institution; (2) challenges to address, and (3) the experiences of and roles for graduate students. In discussing the opportunities and responsibilities for the institution, participants indicated the institution should be public, positive, and proud of its new HSI label and communicate that to all stakeholders. Participants also indicated they felt the HSI designation (and the increase in the Latino/a undergraduate population that led to the designation) would have educational benefits for the student body as a whole. Participants stressed, though, access and admission for Latino/a undergraduate students is not enough. Institutions need to focus on retention and communicating that to all stakeholders. Participants also recognized the institution should be public, positive, and proud of its new HSI status:

- providing clear communication regarding HSI status, objectives, and commitment;
- increasing graduate student involvement;
- addressing the campus climate; and
- supporting the Latino/a educational pipeline through graduate school.

Additionally, Marin asserts institutions should “engage and incorporate more members from their campus into the HSI process, especially graduate students.”

Undergraduate spillover

Although graduate students are not included in the population that defines an institution as an HSI, participants in the study recognized ways in which they, as graduate students, could be affected by the HSI designation. First, they indicated the diversification of the undergraduate student body could have a spillover effect and lead to increased diversity in the graduate student body. Also, while they acknowledged the possibility that graduate students might need training in issues regarding HSIs, Latino/a students, and cultural competency, the participants were excited about the opportunities they might have to mentor and encourage Latino/a undergraduate students and to engage those students in research (as both participants and assistants). Participants also recognized such interactions could be beneficial to their future careers, providing them with marketable skills and experiences working with Latino/a students.

In addition to expanding the HSI literature to include research institutions and graduate students, this study reveals how an institution’s HSI designation has an impact beyond undergraduate students and into the greater campus community. Marin suggests campus administrators should focus on the following goals in addressing their new HSI status:

- providing clear communication regarding HSI status, objectives, and commitment;
- increasing graduate student involvement;
- addressing the campus climate; and
- supporting the Latino/a educational pipeline through graduate school.

Patricia Marin is an assistant professor of Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education. Her research interests focus on higher education policy and issues of inclusion and equity for underrepresented students. In particular, her work examines issues of diversity, affirmative action and college access. In her current work, Marin is studying the changing nature of Hispanic-Serving Institutions and research use within the law.
Professor Christa Porter is leading the way students and site supervisors envision, develop, and implement practical experiences on and off campus. She is using the joint American College Personnel Association (ACPA) and National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) professional competencies (2015). She believes these competencies provide a framework for students and supervisors to track students’ professional development, help to intentionally create space for placement supervisors to articulate their opportunities, and provide students more opportunity to align their core and elective coursework with their assistantship, practicum, internship, and/or other professional development experiences while in the program. The restructured practicum process serves to maximize students’ experiences translating theory to practice and using practice to inform theory. It also aids students in articulating how their professional preparation equips them for high-quality work in the field.

As Porter explains, the SAA program’s partnerships within MSU and throughout the state of Michigan are strong and wide. This provides opportunity to offer students experiences in a multitude of functional areas and institutional types. In previous years, students selected sites through a database housed within the program or identified their own experiences. While many students enjoyed rich opportunities in their practica, not all experiences lent themselves to enhancing students’ professional competencies. Consequently, Porter is working to restructure the process in order to:

• ensure quality across practica experiences,
• align assessment of tasks with the ACPA and NASPA professional competencies, and
• create an intentional plan for students to progress through their M.A. degree—ascertaining skills, knowledge, and abilities across their experiences.

Recruiting sites
Phase One of the restructuring process involved changing the way practica sites were recruited to participate in the selection process. First, Porter gathered feedback for program improvement from past placement sites and students. She then communicated program updates and changes to the practica process, namely alignment with the ACPA and NASPA (2013) professional competencies, to placement sites. Next, Porter narrowed the list of potential placements to those who could provide the most robust experiences in theory-to-practice and competency development to SAA students. She then sent out a Call for Practica form in order to add to and/or reframe outcomes and projects based on the students’ prior and desired competencies. Revised forms were signed by the student and site supervisor to indicate a shared agreement on the structure of the experience.

Spring semester 2016 marked the initial implementation of the new process. Porter has received positive feedback from both site supervisors and students. She also plans to track the outcomes of this new process after the semester has concluded. The revision of this process is part of a larger effort on Porter’s part to ensure students have a seamless experience of theory-to-practice across their coursework and experiential placements.

Matching students
Phase Two involved matching practica sites and students. Porter provided students a list of practicum opportunities and created a timeline for both students and site supervisors that included when students could contact sites, when sites could hold interviews, and when sites could offer placements. Once a match was made, the student and site supervisor reviewed the site’s completed Call for Practica form in order to add to and/or reframe outcomes and projects based on the students’ prior and desired competencies. Revised forms were signed by the student and site supervisor to indicate a shared agreement on the structure of the experience. Porter has received positive feedback from both site supervisors and students. She also plans to track the outcomes of this new process after the semester has concluded. The revision of this process is part of a larger effort on Porter’s part to ensure students have a seamless experience of theory-to-practice across their coursework and experiential placements.
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Christa Porter is an assistant professor in Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education and coordinator of the Student Affairs Administration program. Her administrative service and academic work are grounded in higher education and student affairs administration. Porter has served in multiple functional areas; her educational training, graduate, and professional experiences include four predominately White large research institutions, a single-sex college, a small private institution, and a small public college. Her research examines the success, intersectionality of identity development, and socialization processes of Black girls and women along the P-16 educational pipeline, and the administrative structures and policies that facilitate or hinder their success.
T

through his work on equity and knowledge production, Assistant Professor Riyad Shahjahan asks questions that push the boundaries of current knowledge, often utilizing theories that challenge dominant ways of thinking. A recent Call for Proposals (CFP) from the journal Comparative Education Review, seeking work that explores the rethinking of social science from postcolonial and decolonial perspectives was the impetus for one of his most recent projects. The CFP was aimed at deeper inquiry around how the global north dominates the comparative education field. This domination, Shahjahan would argue, hinders our ability to imagine alternatives outside of mainstream modernity discourses.

Inspired by this opportunity, he undertook a project with colleagues Vanessa de Oliveira Andreete from the University of British Columbia and Gerardo Blanco-Ramirez from the University of Massachusetts Boston. Specifically, their interests converged on the hotly debated topic of global university rankings (GURs), a phenomenon widely critiqued but not through postcolonial or decolonial lenses. Their paper, “Imagining the unimaginable: Decolonizing global university rankings (GURs) from Southern/Decolonial perspectives,” interrogated the naturalized ways of theorizing higher education and argued the process of rankings imposes boundaries on the imaginary ways we conceptualize universities. In their review of the literature, they found the emergence of GURs coincides with the alignment of forces in higher education, such as the quantification of faculty effort, increased calls for accountability, and positioning of academics into hierarchical, competitive environments. Mainstream critiques of GURs fell into two general categories: (1) methodological critiques, and (2) critiques of the general hegemonic global politics of knowledge production. Within some critiques, alternative ranking systems were proposed. However, Shahjahan and his colleagues found these alternative rankings failed to challenge the underlying logic of rankings, which promote the naturalization of standardization and competition. Rather than seeking to provide “solutions” to a problem, they asked themselves:

• What would be possible to imagine using decolonial and Southern epistemologies?
• What would universities and education look like; and
• Would GURs still exist?

Looking through different lenses

For their writing, Shahjahan and his colleagues drew upon Some’s Teshugung (1994), Anzaldúa’s Nopantla (2002), and da Silva’s po-ethics perspectives (2014), and posed several questions: What kind of human beings are imagined through GURs? What forms and political economies of knowledge production are reproduced through GURs? How can we imagine higher education beyond the confines of modernity? In answering these questions, all authors brought different insights into the phenomena, which led to a more nuanced analysis of global rankings. Their analysis foregrounded their own lived experiences as transnational scholars of Color whose academic work is impacted by GURs.

Shahjahan explored indigenous Dagara philosophy in relation to GURs. Some, a shaman healer from the Dagara nation, introduced the notion of Yielbongura—the idea of “the thing to GURs. Somé, a shaman healer from the Dagara nation, explored indigenous Dagara philosophy in relation to GURs. Shahjahan and his colleagues drew upon Somé’s work. Looking through different lenses, Shahjahan asks questions that push the boundaries of current knowledge, often utilizing theories that challenge dominant ways of thinking. A recent Call for Proposals (CFP) from the journal Comparative Education Review, seeking work that explores the rethinking of social science from postcolonial and decolonial perspectives was the impetus for one of his most recent projects. The CFP was aimed at deeper inquiry around how the global north dominates the comparative education field. This domination, Shahjahan would argue, hinders our ability to imagine alternatives outside of mainstream modernity discourses.

Inspired by this opportunity, he undertook a project with colleagues Vanessa de Oliveira Andreete from the University of British Columbia and Gerardo Blanco-Ramirez from the University of Massachusetts Boston. Specifically, their interests converged on the hotly debated topic of global university rankings (GURs), a phenomenon widely critiqued but not through postcolonial or decolonial lenses. Their paper, “Imagining the unimaginable: Decolonizing global university rankings (GURs) from Southern/Decolonial perspectives,” interrogated the naturalized ways of theorizing higher education and argued the process of rankings imposes boundaries on the imaginary ways we conceptualize universities. In their review of the literature, they found the emergence of GURs coincides with the alignment of forces in higher education, such as the quantification of faculty effort, increased calls for accountability, and positioning of academics into hierarchical, competitive environments. Mainstream critiques of GURs fell into two general categories: (1) methodological critiques, and (2) critiques of the general hegemonic global politics of knowledge production. Within some critiques, alternative ranking systems were proposed. However, Shahjahan and his colleagues found these alternative rankings failed to challenge the underlying logic of rankings, which promote the naturalization of standardization and competition. Rather than seeking to provide “solutions” to a problem, they asked themselves:

• What would be possible to imagine using decolonial and Southern epistemologies?
• What would universities and education look like; and
• Would GURs still exist?

Looking through different lenses

For their writing, Shahjahan and his colleagues drew upon Some’s Teshugung (1994), Anzaldúa’s Nopantla (2002), and da Silva’s po-ethics perspectives (2014), and posed several questions: What kind of human beings are imagined through GURs? What forms and political economies of knowledge production are reproduced through GURs? How can we imagine higher education beyond the confines of modernity? In answering these questions, all authors brought different insights into the phenomena, which led to a more nuanced analysis of global rankings. Their analysis foregrounded their own lived experiences as transnational scholars of Color whose academic work is impacted by GURs.

Shahjahan explored indigenous Dagara philosophy in relation to GURs. Some, a shaman healer from the Dagara nation, introduced the notion of Yielbongura—the idea of “the thing to GURs. Somé, a shaman healer from the Dagara nation, explored indigenous Dagara philosophy in relation to GURs. Shahjahan and his colleagues drew upon Somé’s work. Looking through different lenses, Shahjahan asks questions that push the boundaries of current knowledge, often utilizing theories that challenge dominant ways of thinking. A recent Call for Proposals (CFP) from the journal Comparative Education Review, seeking work that explores the rethinking of social science from postcolonial and decolonial perspectives was the impetus for one of his most recent projects. The CFP was aimed at deeper inquiry around how the global north dominates the comparative education field. This domination, Shahjahan would argue, hinders our ability to imagine alternatives outside of mainstream modernity discourses.

Inspired by this opportunity, he undertook a project with colleagues Vanessa de Oliveira Andreete from the University of British Columbia and Gerardo Blanco-Ramirez from the University of Massachusetts Boston. Specifically, their interests converged on the hotly debated topic of global university rankings (GURs), a phenomenon widely critiqued but not through postcolonial or decolonial lenses. Their paper, “Imagining the unimaginable: Decolonizing global university rankings (GURs) from Southern/Decolonial perspectives,” interrogated the naturalized ways of theorizing higher education and argued the process of rankings imposes boundaries on the imaginary ways we conceptualize universities. In their review of the literature, they found the emergence of GURs coincides with the alignment of forces in higher education, such as the quantification of faculty effort, increased calls for accountability, and positioning of academics into hierarchical, competitive environments. Mainstream critiques of GURs fell into two general categories: (1) methodological critiques, and (2) critiques of the general hegemonic global politics of knowledge production. Within some critiques, alternative ranking systems were proposed. However, Shahjahan and his colleagues found these alternative rankings failed to challenge the underlying logic of rankings, which promote the naturalization of standardization and competition. Rather than seeking to provide “solutions” to a problem, they asked themselves:

• What would be possible to imagine using decolonial and Southern epistemologies?
• What would universities and education look like; and
• Would GURs still exist?

Looking through different lenses

For their writing, Shahjahan and his colleagues drew upon Some’s Teshugung (1994), Anzaldúa’s Nopantla (2002), and da Silva’s po-ethics perspectives (2014), and posed several questions: What kind of human beings are imagined through GURs? What forms and political economies of knowledge production are reproduced through GURs? How can we imagine higher education beyond the confines of modernity? In answering these questions, all authors brought different insights into the phenomena, which led to a more nuanced analysis of global rankings. Their analysis foregrounded their own lived experiences as transnational scholars of Color whose academic work is impacted by GURs.

Shahjahan explored indigenous Dagara philosophy in relation to GURs. Some, a shaman healer from the Dagara nation, introduced the notion of Yielbongura—the idea of “the thing that knowledge can’t eat.” What follows from this idea, Shahjahan argued, is that knowledge production, the concept of learning, cannot be categorized. Rather, knowledge production would resist categorization, being stripped of its “spiritual nature” and turned into a “secular material thing” through rankings. From this interpretation, GURs would not exist, but be a distraction from addressing other root problems in higher education.

With their combined perspectives, Shahjahan and his co-authors hope this analysis will invite others to explore innovative programs and practices that seek to construct educational alternatives to the dominant institutional models perpetuated by GURs. Future research can explore additional perspectives to counter colonial relations within education. Shahjahan and his colleagues believe scholars must continue to tell their stories and imagined alternatives. Such diversity of perspectives is necessary for a healthy global higher education system.
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Riyad Shahjahan is an assistant professor in Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education. His areas of expertise are in globalization and higher education, teaching and learning in higher education, equity and social justice, and anti/postcolonial theory. He has been conducting both empirical and theoretical work, focusing on a) the role of international organizations (IOs) in globalizing higher education policy, through empirical/theoretical analysis of IOs’ current policy initiatives (e.g. the OECD, World Bank, UNESCO, etc.), and b) rethinking the traditional objects of study/practice in higher education from global and non-western critical perspectives, particularly using anti/postcolonial theoretical perspectives.
Professionals like Steve Weiland are interested in scholarly communication in the digital age, including the advent of what are now called “enhanced e-texts” in journals and as books. His interest began with recognition that campus attention to online teaching had the effect of obscuring an equally dramatic transformation taking place in academic research and publishing represented, for example, in the Open Access movement (Mittel, 2013). He found additional support for this interest in probing scholarship in the information sciences and in the work of innovative organizations and projects like the Institute for the Future of the Book and “The Library Beyond the Book.”

Over the past few decades, the microcomputer has had a profound influence on scholars in how articles and books are planned, drafted, reviewed, revised, published, and circulated (Porter, 2003). The impact of advances in technology has been a topic of research and debate, including what the transformation of work habits, for many scholars, means for “information practices” (as librarians say) and interactions with colleagues. Still, most academic scholars have not capitalized on the opportunity to incorporate interactive elements in their publications. To a degree, journals and book publishers have discouraged scholars from experimenting with digital formats (Jakubowicz, 2009). Weiland follows the work of advocates for “enhanced” scholarship who believe it would offer more freedom for writers and readers alike. Enhanced scholarship creates a new form of academic composition and sense of empowerment (Bath & Schofield, 2015).

A publishing “game changer”

Enhanced e-books present information similar to e-books, but they offer readers additional resources in audio, video, and graphically enriched text. Enhanced e-book authors can also connect directly with readers through video clips, making the enhanced e-book a more interactive and immersive experience. Scholars such as Jacob Wright are probing the prospects for innovation. Wright is an associate professor of theology at Emory University and the author of an innovative enhanced electronic study, “King David and His Reign Revisited” (available from iTunes), based on his conventional print book on King David (published by Cambridge University Press). He believes that “the enhanced e-book format is a game changer. Now we can …”

Over the last decade, some of the most innovative scholarship in the humanities has come from those investigating the history of the book. The digital transformation is a complex interdisciplinary phenomenon essential for understanding emerging technologies such as the enhanced e-book (Bath & Schofield, 2015). As technology has advanced, few scholars have looked at the enhanced e-book. To date, little inquiry has been done on this new expository form of scholarship and academic prose, which presents an excellent opportunity for timely research with implications for scholarly communications and academic careers.
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For the last decade, Associate Professor Matthew Wawrzynski has been at the forefront of co-leading a professional collaborative experience for Higher, Adult, and, Lifelong Education (HALE) students with his colleagues in the Center for Higher and Adult Education, Ann Austin and Roger Baldwin, to Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU), a university based in Port Elizabeth in the Eastern Cape, South Africa. The project has helped researchers form a strong and mutually beneficial relationship between the two institutions.

In the experience co-led by Wawrzynski, several HALE master’s and doctoral students travel to South Africa for two weeks every two years as part of the professional collaborative experience offered through the Center for Higher and Adult Education. Preparation for the students’ experience consists of several components. One part includes a seminar where students learn more about the South African context by engaging with a variety of scholarly articles and readings, such as Nelson Mandela’s autobiography. Another component consists of working in small teams, under the direction of one of the HALE faculty leaders, to develop a set of workshops and presentations identified by colleagues at NMMU. When they arrive at NMMU, students present their workshops over the next week to a variety of administrators, faculty, and staff. Other experiences for the HALE students include visiting workshops given by NMMU staff.

During Wawrzynski’s early work with the collaborative experience, he along with NMMU colleagues, began developing a research project to better understand student co-curricular engagement in a South African context. Now, together with his research assistants on this project—Dawn Brainham, Nate Cradit, Yeuuki Mlambo, and Sapna Naik—Wawrzynski has further developed the survey, which has grown to include learning outcomes of student involvement. In addition to adding to the global literature on student engagement, the locally designed survey instrument allows specificity in measuring student involvement at NMMU.

Using the recent iteration of the survey, data are gathered on specific activities students participate in, the number of hours they participate, and their self-reported learning on outcomes specific to NMMU. More recently, Wawrzynski has worked to involve selected NMMU students in gathering data for the research project via tablet PCs and iPads. An incentive for NMMU students to collect survey responses is the ability to keep the tablet for their own academic and educational pursuits. The research team at MSU then runs the analyses on the data and works with colleagues at NMMU to write a report, which is disseminated to various stakeholders to help them understand the learning that is happening through co-curricular activities and to further develop their programming efforts.

Wawrzynski says, “One of the great benefits of working with NMMU is seeing the change being implemented every time we go back. Change seems to often happen in a short period of time (months), not years as it does in the U.S. You really get to see the fruits of your collaboration.” The workshops MSU graduate students present are aimed at making recommendations for improving student affairs practice at the institution. During his next visit, two years later, Wawrzynski is able to see changes that took place as a result of those workshops.

Wawrzynski believes the project has ample opportunity to develop in the coming years. He says, “every time we do the survey, it’s peeling a layer away” to better help understand student engagement in the South African context.