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It may be surprising to realize that a large number of Phi Kappa Phi members live in other countries. In fact, they live in 128 countries other than the United States. Many of them are Americans living abroad, but with the exception of the Philippines, most are individuals who have studied in the United States and returned home. Because Phi Kappa Phi has a chapter at the University of the Philippines, it is not surprising to find large numbers of Phi Kappa Phi members living in that country. The other top-ten countries where our members reside are (in descending order): Canada, Japan, China, Germany, Malaysia, United Kingdom, Singapore, Taiwan, Japan, China, Germany, Malaysia, Indonesia, and France.

Our membership broadly reflects the international nature of modern American higher education. Beginning with the Fulbright exchange program established after World War II to help promote peace and mutual understanding through cultural and educational exchange, our colleges and universities have welcomed students from all over the globe and have sent U.S. students overseas to study. Now scores of international exchange programs and funding opportunities facilitate the movement of students across borders. In addition, many U.S. colleges and universities sponsor their own exchange programs for students and faculty. Because of the global nature of the economy, the exchange of talents and skills has become an essential part of career preparation in many fields. Phi Kappa Phi contributes to this important effort through our Study Abroad Grants, which provide travel money to students for study and internship opportunities overseas (see phikappaphi.org/abroad.shtml for more information).

Therefore, in keeping with the international characteristics of our membership, the Board of Directors has taken several steps in recent months to help Phi Kappa Phi better reflect our global reach. The Board has acted to remove wherever appropriate the term “national” from documents and communications to de-emphasize a single-nation presence. However, the Board is not ready to substitute the term “international” because our new chapter-development efforts have not yet moved in that direction, nor are we in a position to sponsor activities or to host conferences or meetings in other countries.

The Board also established an International Opportunities Committee for the current triennium made up of Phi Kappa Phi volunteer members to consider relevant issues and concerns. Their charge has been to explore broadly how better to serve our international members. One question they have considered, for example, is whether or not an alumni organization of Phi Kappa Phi located in selected cities or universities outside of the United States would be a feasible way of supporting international members. An opportunity they considered was the possibility of finding a way to insert a Phi Kappa Phi dimension in the partnerships that already exist between many American and international universities. Among other recommendations, the committee has suggested that our publications should offer regular feature articles and member profiles that focus on the international nature of the Society.

There are other Society developments that benefit all members, including those who do not reside in the United States. In recent years we have committed significant resources toward the extensive development of our website (www.phikappaphi.org) and now provide instant access to many services and benefits for members who log on. We are exploring other electronic means of communication as well. For example, the first issue of our new electronic magazine (now known as the Honor Cord) contains articles useful to recent graduates on writing effective cover letters, developing strategies for the job interview, and staying up to date with tips on travel, health, and exercise. A second issue of the Honor Cord with similarly useful articles is going on line as this article is being written. Our developing program of “Webinars” (live educational seminars broadcast via the Worldwide Web) will provide richly informative experiences for all members. The first Webinar this past August discussed the subject of networking for the young professional. A second Webinar is planned for early 2006.

These services and many others are available to all members, including those members who are widely dispersed among the countries of the world. Thanks to the Web, no matter where you live, the benefits of membership are only a few clicks away on your computer keyboard.

Paul J. Ferlazzo, PhD, is a professor of English at Northern Arizona University. He can be reached at paul.ferlazzo@nau.edu.

(A special note of thanks to Maria C. Davis, Senior Manager for Strategic Partnerships, at Phi Kappa Phi Headquarters for assistance with this article.)
The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

W

When we were growing up, my sister and I used to play "school." I would wait impatiently for Karen to create quizzes and assignments, and then she would direct the class (me) through a shortened school day. I would take a quiz that she had written; she would grade it while I waited; and then she would give me the good news. Karen's method of quiz creation was what you would expect from a young person: she would write down all of the multiplication problems that she could think of, in no particular order, or write up a list of spelling words from the words she knew. Writing a test took time, but we believed that it was the student, not the teacher, who was required to think and reflect during this process.

I soon learned that the genesis of any exam, assignment, or preparation of class materials is reflection. Choosing a text, writing an essay prompt, creating a set of directions for a lab experiment, designing a lecture or class discussion, developing a syllabus or class schedule, and many more behind-the-scenes activities in which teachers engage require that they reflect on the process of learning and on their experiences with numerous students.

Randy Bass, director of the Center for Electronic Projects in American Culture Studies at Georgetown University, argues that “it takes a deliberate act to look at teaching from the perspective of learning” (“What’s the Problem,” Inventario). Indeed, it is too true that some educators fail to use the “data” that are available to them — students and their experiences, frustrations, successes — to maximize learning opportunities in the future. Some educators simply go through the motions. However, many effective educators make an intentional effort to continually reflect on their classroom practices to learn what has worked and what has not. Increasing numbers of educators at all levels are turning those more informal reflections into formal educational-research projects.

THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING

For a long time in the post-secondary arena, such educational research was seen as less significant than research in one’s academic field. Today, that perception is changing. The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) is a developing component of academia that encourages and validates educational research ethically conducted by teachers within their own disciplines and within their own classrooms. SoTL proponents encourage teachers at all levels to continue their reflections and to expand them into a rigorous and systematic approach to educational research.

At its foundation, SoTL is similar to what all effective educators have been engaged with for decades. This form of educational scholarship encourages educators to ask questions such as, “Why doesn’t that concept make sense to my students? Where is the block occurring? Is it better to present X before Y, or will a student be better able to process X if presented with Y first?”

For many, SoTL simply proposes a change in attitude or approach to student problems. Anthony Ciccone, professor of French and director of the Center for Instructional and Professional Development at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, suggested just that at a seminar I attended a couple of years ago. He suggested that rather than explaining in frustration, “Why don’t they get it?!?” when students struggle with a concept or skill, educators ought to ask sincerely, “Why don’t they get it?” and then pursue the answer systematically and carefully.

SoTL practitioners do not propose that there is a magical solution which will allow educators to uncover the definitive teaching method for all students in all situations and in all disciplines. The philosophy of SoTL emphasizes that teaching is not just an accumulation of universally effective methods. Proponents state what teachers know to be true: effective teaching is the elusive goal we all pursue throughout our careers. The pursuit of it involves reflection on our teaching practices, intellectual consideration with our peers as to the elements of

(continued on page 5)
What Do People Want?

Last March, Burger King added the new breakfast sandwich, Enormous Omelet, to its menu. It weighs in at 740 calories with forty-six grams of fat and combines basically two of its already unhealthy breakfast sandwiches into one. The fast-food chain’s decision received considerable criticism in the press and made many wonder if Burger King’s management had heard of Morgan Spurlock’s movie, *Super Size Me*.

But Burger King is not alone. Ruby Tuesday, a fast-fare restaurant chain, also recently revised its menu by eliminating many low-fat and nutritious items. It also has removed information about caloric and fat content previously listed on the menu — part of its heavily advertised “Smart Eating” program.

These marketing decisions seem at odds with the public outcry of Americans against the unhealthy dietary culture typified by a McDonald’s cheeseburger and an order of fries. Not long ago, the Surgeon General proclaimed that obesity was an epidemic and that fast food was, in part, to blame. Americans, it seemed, recognized that there was a problem and demanded healthier alternatives at restaurants. At least, they claimed to.

Burger King, Ruby Tuesday, and others jumped to fill this apparent market niche by offering healthy items. The problem was that few people actually bought these items. The restaurants soon discovered the difference between what people say they want and what they actually buy.

This difference is crucial for marketing managers at many companies who want to figure out what people want. Every year, businesses spend millions to determine what consumers like and dislike.

One way they do this is through consumer surveys. Representatives stand in malls or use the telephone to prompt answers from people about what they like or how they feel about certain product features. Businesses acquire a lot of useful information from surveys, but marketing experts agree that answers to surveys can be misleading because, as the opening examples illustrate, they may not reflect how people will actually behave in the marketplace.

The creation of New Coke is now a textbook example of the potential pitfalls of survey research. In the mid-1980s, in response to a slight loss of market share to Pepsi, Coca-Cola decided to revamp its product and come up with a “new and improved” cola. It spent $4 million conducting more than 200,000 taste-test surveys. In these surveys, respondents tasted unlabeled samples and liked the sweeter recipe of New Coke over the original recipe, 60 percent to 40 percent; and, in comparison with Pepsi, 52 percent to 48 percent. Marketers at Coca-Cola decided that they had a winner — the new optimally designed recipe for cola — which would replace the original.

The market, however, soon deemed New Coke a pathetic loser as consumer groups wrote hundreds of thousands of letters, organized rallies, and refused to buy New Coke. Within a year, they convinced Coca-Cola to bring back the original recipe.

The problem with the survey was that the respondents told Coca-Cola the taste that they liked best, not what product they were going to buy. And, after all, many who buy Coke are buying not only cola, but an association with the brand itself. Asking which bubbly brown liquid tastes better is a different question from asking which brand of cola you will purchase.

Another difficulty with interpreting answers to surveys is that, because participation is voluntary, the people who choose to respond may have different preferences from those who do not. Making matters worse are those con artists who pose as market researchers only to sell you something on the spot. Such scams further drive people away from participating in legitimate market research. What is left is a small pool of highly patient respondents. Such a sample is probably not the best representation of a market for, let’s say, a new time-saving device.

Fashion designers have come up with clever alternatives to surveys to figure out what teenagers will want to buy. Some market-research consultants, for example, specialize in identifying “trend setters” among teen groups. They find teens who are confident, independent, and self-aware. These consultants assume that these de facto leaders’ purchase decisions will be imitated by other teens. The research consultants spend time with these teens, getting to know them, their habits, and their style. They host focus groups and sponsor concerts and parties to observe, chat, and learn about the coming trends. From this information, clothing designers make clothes that are more likely to sell.

Even after a manufacturer has come up with a product which it thinks people will buy, management still has the problem of figuring out how much consumers will pay for it. Holding a new blender in one hand and asking a mall shopper how much he or she will pay for it might not give reliable answers. Some, for example, would state a low price in hopes that, when available, the blender will be at a bargain price. It also has been well documented that many respondents state prices higher than they would actually pay to avoid giving the impression of being overly frugal.
When it comes to money, in the case of surveys, “talk is cheap.”

To get reliable information about how much a consumer will pay for a new product, marketing researchers use methods that require actual payment. For example, subjects may be recruited to participate in a laboratory experiment in which they are given a sum of money to make purchases in a simulated showroom. The showroom includes several products, including the new blender. The subject then observes prices and decides whether to buy the blender, one of the other products, or walk away with the given money.

A more direct way to do this is to simply hold a special auction, called a Vickery auction, in which several subjects, say ten, submit a bid for the new blender. The winner is the one with the highest bid, but the winner actually pays the amount of the second-highest bid. In this way, all subjects are, in theory, expected to bid exactly what the blender is worth to them.

In one auction, the researcher gets all subjects’ reservation prices from these ten bids.

In a Vickery auction, subjects can do no better by bidding any other amount than their reservation price. However, in practice it is observed that subjects actually bid more than what the product is worth to them. This phenomenon has been attributed to the fact that these subjects get caught up in the competitive energy of the auction and try to win the product even, perhaps, at a price higher than their reservation price.

Researchers in Germany have recently devised a clever method to achieve reliable-pricing data that is not victim to the competitive effect of the Vickery auction. The Becker, DeGroot, Marschak (BDM) method, as it is known, presents to the subjects the new product (again, take the blender) and asks each of them to state a number between $0 and $50. Next, a single number $x$ is randomly drawn and compared to each subject’s stated number. If the random number is lower than the subject’s number, that subject wins a blender and pays $x$. Otherwise, she does not receive a blender and pays nothing. As in the Vickery auction, the subjects’ optimally stated number is her actual reservation price. However, because each subject has an individual chance to obtain the product, the competitive element of the Vickery auction is not present. Whether or not the blender is actually sold in the experiment, the market researcher has learned reliable information that, when combined with subjects’ income and demographic data, will be helpful in setting the price for the new blender.

Market research helps manufacturers, as well as restaurants, offer products that consumers want. Researchers at Burger King and Ruby Tuesday will now remember that consumers may say that they prefer salads when they dine out, but when faced with an actual purchase, they still order a burger and fries.

Anthony J. Dukes is an associate professor at the School of Economics and Management, University of Aarhus in Denmark. He holds a PhD in economics from the University of Pittsburgh and conducts research concerning the economics of advertising, marketing, and commercial media.

(The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, continued from page 3)

the learning process, and sharing what we know about assignment and test creation, student motivation, areas of difficulty in our discipline, and alternative models of assessment.

Some SoTL proponents encourage instructors to take on specific long-range projects. One of my colleagues in the English Department at the University of Wisconsin Colleges is studying the retention of documentation skills beyond our core composition courses, and another is examining the practice of teaching the moral or ethical dimensions of literary works. Even before they have what some might consider firm results, these colleagues will present their ongoing research at conferences so that their own approaches can be enhanced and so that others might benefit from their research into teaching practices. These educators spend years studying the theory in journals, books, and conversations with colleagues. They apply a model or models in their classroom, gather data, analyze results, and adjust classroom practices as warranted.

While I fully support such larger projects, I believe that the real benefit of SoTL to education is in the small adjustments all of us can make. All educators can benefit from reminding ourselves of what Tony Ciccone recommended; we need to be vigilant in systematically focusing each day on what is happening in our classrooms, how our students are learning, where problems are occurring in the learning process, and how we can improve our practices to help them. We need to sincerely question why students struggle with particular ideas or ways of learning and pursue possible explanations or solutions for a given situation.

I also believe that all of those who are not educators can benefit from a better understanding of what it is that teachers truly do. When I think about how my sister and I played school, I see how much we did not know about the educational experience and about the lives of teachers. Understanding the scholarship that educators engage in is like going behind the scenes of teachers’ lives. When parents, legislators, community members, schoolboard members, and voters go behind the scenes of education, all of us are better able to support educators in the ongoing scholarship of teaching and learning.

Jennifer M. Stolpa Flatt is an associate professor of English at the University of Wisconsin-Marinette, where she also teaches Spanish. She can be reached at jflatt@uwcm.edu.

For an introductory piece on SoTL, see Randy Bass’s “What’s the Problem,” which is available online through Inventio at http://www.doiit.gmu.edu/Archives/feb98/randymbass.htm.
On Being a Scientist

[For this column, Phi Kappa Phi correspondent Ethel Cetera once again interviewed Dr. Olivia Pate, a professor of anatomy and neuroscience. — ET-C]

ETC: Dr. Pate, today I would like to ask you about teaching and advising the next generation of scientists, your replacements, if you will.

Dr. P: Well, there’s a dance in the old dame yet.

ETC: True. I didn’t mean to imply that you would be retiring anytime soon. But what I’m getting at is the care and nurturing of an apprentice scientist, particularly at the graduate-student level. In the United States, young people seem to need special encouragement to enter science careers and to stay in them once they have entered. I believe you have supervised many graduate students in their successful pursuit of PhD degrees. I would like to talk about what it means to be a scientist. But before we do that, could you first just outline the time line and educational expectations for a scientist in your field?

Dr. P: My field, neuroscience, can be considered under the general rubric of biomedical sciences. There is an educational pipeline that issues scientists at the end. It consists first of an undergraduate degree with a strong foundation in science and math, followed by graduate school, typically more than four years for a PhD degree. Most fields of biomedical science do not require an intermediary master’s degree. Most, however, require several years of post-doctoral training before a graduate can hold a permanent job.

ETC: What do students study during this time?

Dr. P: PhD students take advanced courses in science and carry out original laboratory research, culminating in the writing of a book-length scholarly work called a dissertation. The research must be of sufficient caliber to publish in scientific journals.

ETC: What should students know to help them succeed? I have read several reports that many of those entering the science pipeline leak out somewhere along the way.

Dr. P: The leaky pipeline is a concern for all science educators. The ones who leave may do so for many reasons. Three that come to mind are lack of encouragement and support (particularly for women and underrepresented minorities), uncertainty about job opportunities, and fears that personal life and a scientific career cannot be balanced.

ETC: Those are all valid concerns, but I suspect not unique to science.

Dr. P: You’re right. They are also probably common to any career that requires an uncommonly long period of education and training. However, in science, the production at the end of the pipeline is worrisome. Students may waste valuable years and resources if they leave without completing a PhD or if they drop out as scientists after they obtain their PhDs.

ETC: Well, what insight or advice can you offer to young scientists or their mentors?

Dr. P: First, there is the question of motivation. The right students need to study science. Usually they are self-selected. I believe the essential motivator is insatiable curiosity. Without it, I believe that students should choose other careers.

ETC: But is curiosity enough? I remember a great stanza from Omar Khayyám. It seems to be about a young person’s eager curiosity being crippled by education:

Myself when young did eagerly frequent
Doctor and Saint, and heard great Argument
About it and about: but evermore
Came out by the same Door as in I went.

Dr. P: Well, if your point is that education may stifle exploration and creativity, I would have to concur. Even as a mentor for PhD students, I have to be careful to allow them a lot of freedom to take experimental chances and make mistakes. But the person who becomes a scientist, while he or she may be beguiled by the lyrical fatalism of that poem, does not buy into it. The poem suggests that the world remains unchanged by either science or religion. A scientist would find this idea to be profoundly mistaken. Scientists do not find the door to be the same, not after we have examined it, tested it, and thought about it. When we acquire a deeper understanding of any physical entity or scientific theory, our perceptions of it and its possibilities are forever changed.

ETC: I have heard it said that scientists are catalysts for change. Do you think that this desire for change is innately human? I guess no other species has used its collective efforts to change the planet as much as we have.

Dr. P: Yes, we change the planet and have done so throughout the history of our species, probably first through prehistoric innovators who were the “scientists” of their time. Humans have evolved rapidly as a dominant species because of three characteristics: the desire to know, the ability to question, and both the desire and ability to adapt the environment to suit ourselves.

ETC: What is it about some people that drives them to direct their intellect in this particular way, rather than, say, as novelists or composers?

Dr. P: I think that scientists, and I would include engineers in this description, are abundantly endowed with a biological imperative for human innovation, and we have a particular slant on how we implement it. We have a great respect and affinity for rationality that is backed by objectively verifiable evidence, and a stubborn
tendency to question dogma. These qualities are fairly unique to the scientific mind.

ETC: Forgive me, but that sounds cold and inhumane, almost Vulcan. Surely scientists also consciously operate within a framework of societal responsibility. Because of scientific advances, we have adequate food, sanitation, and health care that our ancestors did not have.

Dr. P: Yes. That is true if you are among the 20 percent of the world’s population that resides in developed countries, but not true for two billion people on the same planet but outside the margins of science-driven progress. On the other hand, I do not think there is any human-made tragedy that has not been blamed on scientists: the atomic bomb, overpopulation, fish full of mercury, landfills full of disposal diapers. But I do not mean to be flippant. This great disparity between the haves and have-nots is a major challenge for scientists, as well as for economists, politicians, theologians, and all others who strive to improve human welfare. Scientists must do their part.

ETC: Do you advise students on making socially conscious decisions concerning their research?

Dr. P: That is complex to answer. Some students at my university work on projects that have nearly immediate applicability, for example vaccine development or the remediation of polluted water. However, others, including my own students, work on more esoteric questions, which are nevertheless worthy because they may contribute to larger, as yet unimagined solutions to global problems.

ETC: Are you saying that science for its own sake is a worthy human endeavor?

Dr. P: Not exactly. What I am saying is that scientific values are worthy concepts. Mentors must uniformly nurture in students the key values that science promotes, namely imagination, rationality, and independence of thought. Scientific understanding is synonymous with free thought, evidence-based debate, and tolerance for that which is new or poorly understood. Without them we would fall victim to soothsayers and frauds.

ETC: You mentioned earlier that young people who leave science may do so because they are afraid that personal life and a scientific career cannot be balanced. What advice do you have on this point?

Dr. P: This is really a question of balancing one’s values with one’s goals throughout life. At its most quiet, everyday level, this balance defines the basis for our individual well-being. I would say this to a young scientist: One way to figure out what is most important to you is to imagine a good day in your life five or ten years from now, a real day, not a fantasy day. What kind of work would you like to be doing? What kind of life would you like to be going home to? Reflect on where you would like to be professionally and personally, and how you would like to feel physically, psychologically, and spiritually. Those define your values. Conversely, what specific accomplishments do you aspire to in order to fulfill your life’s purposes? Those should be your goals. Ask yourself if your values and goals are compatible. If they are not, then they need reassessment or modification.

ETC: The balance between goals and values also exists at levels beyond our personal lives. In broadest terms, it means that we must closely monitor the human biological imperative to learn everything there is to know.

Dr. P: I agree that we must supervise our collectively insatiable thirst for exploration, invention, and discovery. Scientists are compelled to ask, “Can it be done?” But we also have a moral imperative, whether from innate piety, received doctrine, or plain fear, to ask, “Should it be done?” This is where scientists are likely to be weakest because we rely so heavily on objectively verifiable evidence. In moral debates, such evidence is rarely at hand.

ETC: Could we use the example of the use of human fetal tissue in research? Should we categorically refuse to engage in this type of research because it might lead to human cloning and the devaluation of human life, or should we cautiously proceed because we might learn how to clone replacement kidneys and hearts?

Dr. P: The difficulty with balancing goals and values on this issue is that we do not clearly understand either one. Policies on fetal tissue research ideally should be based on the best thinking available from many quarters — scientific, ethical, legal, psychological, and economic — and I hope they will be. Science gives us a language to permit true debate and a process to permit the gathering of objective evidence, but, by itself, it does not provide the answers to moral dilemmas. Science itself must be balanced with the goals and values of other human endeavors.

ETC: Dr. Pate, to summarize the course of this conversation, I think that you have given two points of advice to young scientists. One is to go into science with self-awareness and further develop one’s qualities as a scientist. The other is to maintain a balance between one’s goals and values. Do you have any other advice?

Dr. P: Yes. From time to time, do an elegant experiment. One of the highest compliments one scientist can pay another is to say in a public forum that an experiment is elegant. As scientists are not excessive in their praise of each other, this sort of accolade is rarely heard. An elegant experiment is often clever, sometimes simple, and always well-designed. It leads straight from A to B without any hand-waving or stretch of the imagination. It is not a hodge-podge of indirect evidence. Once understood, it makes perfect sense. I wish I could do one more often.

ETC: Dr. Pate, thank you very much for your time.

Dr. P: My pleasure.

Evelyn Tiffany-Castiglioni, PhD, is associate dean for Undergraduate Education and head of the Department of Integrative Biosciences, College of Veterinary Medicine, Texas A&M University. She conducts research on the neurotoxicity of environmental contaminants. She recently edited In Vitro Neurotoxicology: Principles and Challenges (Humana Press, 2004).
The Totems of Haida Gwaii

The once colorful totem poles of the Queen Charlotte Islands, now bleached and cracked, stare out to sea with quiet dignity. They have borne witness to the tragic decline, and then hopeful resurgence, of the Haida people.

The Queen Charlotte Islands, or Haida Gwaii in the Haida language, are located off the coast of northern British Columbia, Canada. The native Haida thrived on these islands for perhaps ten thousand years. Their near decimation took only a few decades. The grief for the loss is palpable. The abandoned village sites, once teeming with activity, sit quietly as nature reclaims the ruins.

The Haida culture was shaped by nature. The Haida’s closeness to the sea, sky, and nature is evident in their art, mythology, and cosmology. Orcas, bears, eagles, ravens, frogs, moons, rainbows, and humans grace the towering cedar totem poles, telling the history and lineage of a family or an individual. Intertwined are mythical animals, such as Sea Wolf, reflecting the Haida belief that there is no separation between the natural and supernatural worlds. The Haida did not consider themselves superior to animals; rather, they traditionally viewed animals as possessing attributes of, and souls like, humans.

One image flows into another on Haida poles. The watchmen may flow into the eagle, who flows into the frog, who flows into the thunderbird, who flows into the whale. Each figure had meaning, similar to a family crest. The work of the carvers was likewise intertwined. A master carver carved one side of the pole, and an apprentice carved the other side, copying the master’s work as perfectly as possible. Consequently, new master carvers were trained and standardized ways of illustrating figures passed on.

These totem poles have captured the hearts and imaginations of people far and wide. The first photographs of Haida villages, taken in 1878, show imposing arrays of totem poles. The villages were located by the shore, sandwiched between the dense forests and the abundant seas. The totem poles, following the contour of the shoreline, faced out to sea. Boldly painted in primarily red and black, these stunning poles displayed the prestige and wealth of a village and could not be missed by anyone passing in a canoe or boat.

Europeans had been in contact with Haida villages since the late 1700s, when a fur trade was established with the villages. Contact with these outsiders had an irreversible effect on Haida society. The story of Chief Koyah of SGang Gwaay is illustrative. In 1789, Chief Koyah was engaged in fur trade with John Kendrick. Kendrick became enraged when he discovered that the villagers had pilfered some minor items of linen from his boat. Seizing Koyah, Kendrick bolted one of his legs to a gun carriage, tied a rope around his neck,
whipped him, painted his face, cut off his hair, threatened him with death, took away his fur skins, and turned him ashore. This humiliation caused Chief Koyah to lose his standing with his people. He became an Ahliko, or one of the lower class. This story is often repeated on Haida Gwaii and is a story that resonates. Ultimately, the entire Haida people were forced to become a lower class. Shortly after the humiliation of Chief Koyah came devastating epidemics of smallpox and tuberculosis, contracted from the outsiders, and outright massacres by these same outsiders. The loss of life was so profound in the southern villages that the few survivors could not maintain village life and so migrated north to the less-remote Haida village of Skidegate. By the 1890s, the southern villages were completely abandoned. After this period came the plunder of the villages by curio dealers, anthropologists, and others. Many of the totem poles of Haida Gwaii have been carried away from the islands, and with each of them went a piece of the Haida spirit, with which the poles were imbued. These poles are in museums and private collections all over the world.

A missionary system, complete with boarding schools for the children, and laws passed by the Canadian government forbidding potlatches (repealed in 1951) further degraded and nearly destroyed the culture.

In the last few decades the Haida have been actively, even urgently, reconnecting with their pre-contact past, before the time of the humiliation of Chief Koyah. Their children can now learn Haida — a language nearly lost — in the public schools. Local artists produce traditional Haida art forms — argillite carving, weaving with cedar bark and cedar root, and the carving of totem poles. Haida artists, such as Bill Reid, have achieved world renown. He and other Haida artists have carved the first totem poles to be raised on the islands in more than a hundred years. Accompanied by potlatch ceremonies, as in bygone days, the raising of these new totem poles signifies a new beginning for the Haida Nation.

The Haida Nation held the attention of the world when, during the 1980s, the Haida and environmentalists joined together to protest logging of old-growth forests on Haida Gwaii. The protest resulted in a dramatic standoff with the loggers. A resounding victory took shape in the form of the newly created Gwaii Haanas National Park Reserve. This reserve protects the southern third of the islands of Haida Gwaii and is administered jointly by the Council of the Haida Nation and Parks Canada.

In 1981, UNESCO proclaimed SGang Gwaay, one of the village sites in the reserve, a World Heritage Site. Here can be seen the best collection in the northwest of totem poles standing in their original sites. The totem poles at SGang Gwaay. Photo by Heidi Motzkus.

The Haida are currently engaged in attempts to repatriate artifacts taken from the villages. Of particular concern are the mortuary poles. These poles had a cavity hollowed out at the top, in which a bentwood coffin box was placed that contained the remains of a chief. In Haida belief, it is essential that the mortuary pole (and all types of totem poles) and the human remains be allowed to decompose and return to the earth. Preserving the mortuary poles in museums is viewed as imprisoning the soul of the chief whose remains are in the pole.

The protected status provided by the reserve preserves the totem poles from plunder and damage by tourists. However, in keeping with Haida tradition, these poles also will be allowed to fall, decompose, and return to the earth. After much discussion among Haida leaders, it has been decided to use minimally invasive measures, such as a pole to prop up a leaning totem pole, to delay the ultimate deterioration of the poles. But deteriorate they will, as was intended in the beginning. Today the majestic totem poles of Haida Gwaii are an echo of a proud and glorious past. Soon these historic poles will be, in Bill Reid’s words, “memories of memories.”

Heidi Tolles Motzkus is a PhD candidate in Cultural Studies at Claremont Graduate University. She teaches in Los Angeles and has held the positions of dramaturge and theatre critic.

The protected status provided by the reserve preserves the totem poles from plunder and damage by tourists. However, in keeping with Haida tradition, these poles also will be allowed to fall, decompose, and return to the earth. After much discussion among Haida leaders, it has been decided to use minimally invasive measures, such as a pole to prop up a leaning totem pole, to delay the ultimate deterioration of the poles. But deteriorate they will, as was intended in the beginning. Today the majestic totem poles of Haida Gwaii are an echo of a proud and glorious past. Soon these historic poles will be, in Bill Reid’s words, “memories of memories.”

The totem poles at SGang Gwaay. Photo by Heidi Motzkus.

SGang Gwaay Mortuary Pole. Photo by Heidi Motzkus.
I grew up in Alabama, where college football is king. No, that is clearly an understatement — college football is religion, war, life itself. All other collegiate sports are “Things We Look at Between Football Seasons.” Take the swim teams here at Auburn University for example. In the past two decades, Auburn’s men’s and women’s teams each have won several National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) championships and have sent a number of athletes to Olympic glory. But such success barely registers on the public mind when compared with the frenzy that accompanied the football team’s first undefeated season in more than a decade, during 2004.

The rivalry in all things, but mainly football, between the University of Alabama and Auburn University is legendary. Rivalry is too mild a word. Other colleges have rivalries — we have deep loathing. My wife, originally from Kansas, simply cannot comprehend the storm of emotions that surrounds the yearly Auburn/Alabama football game; all I can say to her is, “You had to grow up here.”

The premium placed on football has resulted, unfortunately, in some serious NCAA violations. Both universities have been on major NCAA probation during the past fifteen years. These are not proud moments for any university that purports to be an institution of higher education. And, of course, the salary of the head football coach here at Auburn is probably at least triple that of the current interim university president, and easily ten times more than your average tenured professor.

Our authors in this issue talk about the skewed value system that big-time college athletics seems to have fostered on so many campuses. The sad thing is that there is so much joy to be had in athletic competition — it can indeed bring out the best in an individual and a team. In a way, the success of Auburn’s football team last year is a good example. Before the season, Auburn had at least three seniors-to-be who were probably guaranteed first-round NFL draft choices. Yet they all three chose to come back and play their senior year, risking career-ending injuries that could have cost them potentially millions of dollars. In this age of “grab the money and run,” their return was a wonderful lesson in character and loyalty, and it was nice to see that commitment rewarded by an excellent season (and, needless to say, finally those millions of dollars in the NFL).

So how do we maintain the good aspects of college athletics and repair some of the bad? Our authors have some ideas to share. Leading off, Gordon Gee, the Chancellor of Vanderbilt University who in 2003 abolished a separate athletics department at Vanderbilt, writes of why he made that move and about some further ideas he has for reintegrating athletics into the fabric and mission of the university.

Sandra Meyer, president of the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics, tells us about some of the most recent academic reforms instituted by the NCAA and about the role of academic/athletic advisors in carrying out those reforms, even when they do not necessarily agree with the rules that they must monitor and follow. Edward G. Lawry then strongly questions the role of academic/athletic advisor services in universities, suggesting that such services are unfair to regular students who do not have access to the extensive and free resources that they represent. Lawry also discusses issues of academic rigor and the possibility of reform both from within and outside of athletics.

Eugene Tobin relates the surprising news that many of the same problems that plague Division I schools (academic underperformance of athletes, isolation of coaches from the main-stream of faculty life, skyrocketing travel and competition expenses) also are beginning to plague Division III colleges, institutions that do not even grant athletic scholarships. Next, Brian Porto looks at the gains and shortcomings of the Title IX revolution in academics and athletics, the most glaring shortcoming being that women’s athletics programs have patterned themselves on the highly problematic men’s program model. Porto advocates a second Title IX revolution based on the participation model, which includes such elements as abolishing all athletics scholarships and returning to one-platoon football.

Douglas Toma then takes a very different stance on what he terms the “spectator sports” in college athletics. Colleges use spectator sports to build a collegial identity and enhance national presence, which helps them in the fierce fight for needed resources. Commercialism and professionalism in big-time athletics are analogous to the commercial aspects of institutional life that are increasingly coming to dominate universities in the United States.

Be sure to read the news from the Society Headquarters plus individual member news and Phi Kappa Phi Bookshelf notes in our “Member Focus” section beginning on page 43. If you have individual member news to be included in a future issue, e-mail it to kaetzjp@auburn.edu.

Thanks go to Professor John Morgan of Auburn’s Department of Art for getting us together with James Lawton, a student in his department, who has done some of the very fine illustrations in this issue. James is a talented artist and illustrator, and we thank him for his work.

Enjoy the issue!
I accept with honor Phi Kappa Phi’s invitation to contribute my perspective on college athletics to its Forum. Since leading a movement to restructure Vanderbilt University’s athletics program in 2003 by eliminating the position of Athletics Director and by absorbing our entire Athletics department into our Division of Student Life, I have been viewed by some as a reformer in intercollegiate athletics. Phi Kappa Phi Forum has invited me to contribute according to that role.

As many people know, despite our best intentions—or, more accurately, when we refuse to put into practice our best intentions—universities are not always ideal citizens.

Over the past few years, Vanderbilt and other universities and colleges have increased our emphasis on the ways that scholarship can be employed as service and how the gifts of the university can be shared with and enhanced by our greater community. Service learning is an accepted and familiar part of college curricula, and an emphasis on active citizenship has changed the prevalent mood on many a campus from one of profit to one of participation. But all of the self-styling of engaged activity and moral consciousness that colleges and universities may present also serves to raise the bar for us. How well we comport ourselves directly affects our abilities to follow through with our goals of engagement and service, for who wants a gift from a source that is tainted and compromised? Social responsibility must be required of a university inside as well as outside its boundaries. The amount of respect with which we treat those most directly affected by our policies—in this case, our students who happen also to be athletes—announces to the rest of the world the truth of our moral posture.

ATHLETICS AND THE EDUCATIONAL ENTERPRISE

That college athletes are enrolled in classes that do little to challenge them—“Basket weaving 101” is a joke almost too tired to mention and certainly too tired to tell—is a common popular conception. The sorrow of this conception is that the target is wrong: student athletes should not be the punchline of a joke. Rather, the problem is a system that seeks to exploit their talents while giving them little in return for their efforts. When the emphasis is shifted, suddenly the joke does not seem so funny.
A system may be too impersonal to tell effective jokes about, but it is not immune to having reforms thrust upon it. In the past year, we have made some laudable efforts, including:

- The Coalition for Intercollegiate Athletics that was held at Vanderbilt in January 2005;
- Edward Malloy’s widely reported insights at Sports Business Journal’s December 2004 forum on the business of intercollegiate athletics;
- Myles Brand’s more aggressive stance at the NCAA.

An assertive and fearless push by reformers who are either brave or foolish, depending upon your interpretation, has rendered the NCAA more flexible and more adaptable to concerns of ethics and academics.

The small experiment we began at Vanderbilt seems to be taking hold.

Universities and colleges simply can no longer avoid a serious and systematic examination of sports policy because interwoven with the constant litany of scandals and misdeeds are very real and difficult questions of education as a whole, of law and business, of sociology and politics. These questions bump up against areas of sensitivity such as social class, race, gender, and economics. They are not all comfortable questions, but they have to be answered. They are questions provoked by a changing world, and by a world which, despite its habits, may need to steer more mindfully the direction of its change.

We need to look in an ordered way at the influence that intercollegiate athletics ultimately has on the educational enterprise:

- how perceptions of and public policies toward colleges and universities are affected by athletics;
- how institutions quantify the costs of athletics versus their benefits;
- what is the appropriate role of external entities in the oversight and regulation of our institutional programs;
- how involved faculty should be in athletics policy;
- and what is the appropriate relationship between college and professional athletics.

Most importantly, colleges and universities have to, in good conscience, reconcile big-time athletics with our educational mission. We have to believe in our students, above all else. We have to put our heart back where it belongs, so that we can ever be a beacon of light to ourselves, let alone to others. The time has arrived for us to move forward and to realize an agenda of reform.

**NEEDED REFORMS**

I am so happy to see that one of the reforms I proposed to the NCAA four years ago has finally manifested. The number of athletics scholarships a school is able to award will now be tied to the graduation rates of its athletes in legitimate academic programs. Schools falling below a threshold rate will have to relinquish a certain number of scholarships for the next year’s entering class.

That is absolutely shining news, although not quite enough on its own to bring intercollegiate athletics back into alignment with the educational mission of colleges and universities. So here is the rest of what I propose:

- First, student-athletes should be required to complete a core curriculum, which not only would guarantee that they were part of a legitimate academic program but also would alleviate the relentless pressure on members of faculty to ease athletes through their classes.
- Second, colleges should make a binding four-year commitment to students on athletics scholarships. Every scholarship given to athletes should be guaranteed for four years, regardless of how they perform on the field or how they get along with their coach, so long as they remain academically eligible and in good academic standing. We need to back up the promises we make to students so they know that to us they are more than just meat on the field.
- To underline that point, I propose that television and conference revenues should be tied to graduation rates. If coaches and schools are no longer rewarded with huge television revenues despite their poor academic achievements, the culture will experience a dramatic change — almost immediately, I can assure you!
- Colleges and universities also need to review carefully the ways in which we value or devalue the role of our coaches. Currently, the security of a coach’s contract does not at all reflect whether the members of that coach’s team pass their classes or even graduate. This fact conveys the message that even university trustees are more invested in athletics outcomes than in academics outcomes. And even coaching positions become revolving doors along the quest for victory: a coach must bring a team to win big, and win immediately. Sports journalists have not unfairly observed that this practice drives up coaches’ salaries and raises contract prices for all coaches.
INTEGRATING BUDGETS

Integrating the athletics budget into a university’s central budget keeps the priorities of athletics in alignment with a university’s other strategic priorities. Athletics revenue cannot outrun academics in primacy when it is collected under the same rubric as academics and overseen by the same eyes that oversee academics and student life. In athletics, as in all things, the further one moves from the core and the heart, the more dispersed the original focus becomes. Pulling athletics into the university’s heart makes aligning athletics with a university’s greater mission much, much easier. Presidential oversight ensures that athletics does not detract from but supports an institution’s strategic goals. For although athletics success for its own sake may bring revenue (how much it brings after it has paid for itself is arguable), that success is ultimately a waste of resources if success in athletics does not support the university’s academic life in the longer term.

We must continue to evolve the culture of intercollegiate athletics. Or perhaps *involution* is an even more accurate term than evolution because reforms of intercollegiate athletics that seem so radical are really only a return to the first principles of ethical humanism that inform our colleges and universities. These reforms require an examination of ourselves, to see whether the values that we claim to promote and the values that we actually promote are connected, or even similar.

I do not think such reform is an impossible task. Eventually we will get back to where athletics are properly part of the process of the whole university. A revolution is brewing at our universities, led by our faculty and increasingly joined by our alumni and our savvy and perceptive students, who perceive that intercollegiate athletics has become a burden — not only in terms of our values, but also financially. That so many people are paying attention suggests that such a shift, such a change, is now inevitable. Universities can work with this shift, or we can allow it to sweep over and discredit us and all the good that we try to do.

When universities — especially state universities — allow athletics budgets to remain out of balance while academic activities and faculty salaries are frozen as a result of shortfalls in revenue, everyone can see that conditions are sadly askew. The rate of increases in spending in athletics departments typically far exceeds the rate of increase in any other university area. To bring those conditions back to rights, the NCAA has formed a panel of college presidents to study the cost of college sports. I am honored to be serving on that panel.

STUDENT LIFE

When we incorporated the athletics program at Vanderbilt into the Division of Student Life, we did so to ensure that the operations of our athletics program would always be in alignment with our mission and goals as a university. We did so ensure that athletes would be seen as fully rounded scholars, as students instead of as preprofessional athletes whom the institution assumes do not care much about a diploma anyway. Vanderbilt wants to make certain that our student-athletes take real classes, that they attend those classes, that their grades stay healthy, and that they graduate. We do this to encourage them to be successful in all of campus life, cultural and social, not just athletic. And because Vanderbilt is in every way an equal-opportunity university, when we make sure that athletes will always be treated according to our humane mission and that their treatment will arise from the heart of university operations, we open opportunities to all of our athletes yet again.

When Vanderbilt made the decision to rework its operations, our decision originated from within us as an institution. It was not externally invented or imposed for us to complain about or lean on; it evolved here, out of our truest values. The change belonged — and belongs — to us. It is now part of our self-definition. And because we created our own change, the change “took.”

Excellence in higher education always arises from crafting policies in the best interests of our students. Reform that endures and that changes not just the foreground but the background as well must come from consensus and conciliation within an institution. Change should be based on a desire to do what is right and from real leadership within an institution.

Every reform I have ever gotten credit for making in college athletics I made out of one motivation, which is the only motivation that counts: I care about students. I care about what happens to them, and I want to see that they are given the best possible opportunity to excel as human beings. Universities and colleges that would take advantage of students by exploiting and capitalizing on their talent, without seeing them to a meaningful and well-earned diploma, do not deserve to teach the humanities because what they are doing is hardly humane. They have forfeited their moral authority on any subject. Higher education, in all its dimensions and facets, should always be for students. They are our life, and they are where our treasure is.

Gordon Gee is Chancellor of Vanderbilt University.
MELODY, CHORUS

Every hour I am cornered by men, by lips, by books,
By promises made, promises broken.

In my diary under lock and key, is darkness to darkness.
Words that I hide from myself are rumbles, mumbles, a close
Closed language of two old women under an umbrella.

Every hour she is cornered between clouds and rain,
Between lips, books, diaries, between tongues.

Hours exist on the stolen moments of leaves, whispering under
The window.
Two old women pass beneath the raindrops mumbling promises
Made in a diary.

My lips, my tongue, my books are strife with words
They seep out like water from the black soil.

Each hour leads to the paper night and I am a chain of white dolls
Cornered by men
There are hundreds of me, hundreds of them.

Every hour is a mirror for the heart to gaze into
A man that reflects another man that
And I, testing the waters, might easily drown.

CHERYL DERBY

Cheryl Derby is a working poet in Troy, New York. Originally from Syracuse,
New York, she owns a used bookstore and has published in journals such as
Comstock Review, Nimrod International, and Texas Review.
The proper niche of intercollegiate athletics in higher education has been a topic of debate for decades. Issues stemming from lack of institutional control over athletics programs, unethical conduct by institutional-staff members, academic scandals, and so on have cast a negative light on college sports. Criticism abounds about how our institutions of higher education can change the culture of intercollegiate athletics and make it compatible with each institution’s mission. Some contend that sports and higher education will never be compatible. Others believe that more restrictions — more rules to catch the perennial “cheaters” — will help “legislate” ethics. Integrity then will be restored, if indeed it has been missing.

Inextricably involved in this controversy are the academic/athletic advisors who have, perhaps, one of the most challenging jobs in higher education. Their primary concern is the integrity of their institutions and the welfare of student-athletes. They act as liaisons between the academic and athletics communities and are primarily responsible for ensuring that student-athletes have as much academic success as their ability can afford. However, many people view academic/athletic advisors as eligibility brokers, those who keep student-athletes eligible to play. In reality, the only ones who can keep the student-athletes eligible are student-athletes themselves.

In the past few years, the governing body of intercollegiate athletics, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), under the leadership of Dr. Myles Brand, former president of Indiana University, has undertaken initiatives to institute academic reforms that hold student-athletes more accountable for their progress toward a degree. A brief summary of pertinent legislation will be helpful in understanding the reforms.

**Mandatory Academic Support for Student-Athletes**

In January 1991, the NCAA Division I membership adopted a proposal mandating academic counseling and tutoring services for all Division I student-athletes. The supported premise was that an institution that recruits student-athletes should give them an opportunity to receive a full educational experience, not solely an athletics one. Basically, the objective was to maximize the academic performance of all student-athletes.

During the next eleven years, the list of approved academic services expanded to include counseling services for career awareness, eating disorders, and other areas, and beginning in 2002 institutions were permitted to finance any academic-support services determined to be appropriate and necessary for stu-
dent-athletes’ academic success (for example, life skills, assessment of learning disabilities) (NCAA Division I Academic Reform Initiatives — Academic Support Discussion Document, April 16, 2004).

Initial Eligibility Legislation and Graduation Rates

While mandating academic counseling and tutoring services for all Division I student-athletes, the NCAA has also over the years instituted abundant academic legislation. Proposition 48 (requiring high school graduates to have a 2.00 GPA in eleven academic-core courses and a minimum SAT score of 700 or ACT of 15) caused controversy when introduced in 1986, as did Proposition 16 (using a sliding scale of grade points and SAT scores to determine initial eligibility, including a minimum of 820 on the SAT and a 2.0 GPA). NCAA Bylaw 14.3.1.1.1 has caused similar controversy. It states that student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2003, need to meet the requirements on the “Initial Eligibility Index.” This index allows college coaches in every sport to recruit high school athletes who achieved no better than a 400 on their SAT if they have a 3.55 or above high school GPA.

Although Proposition 48 succeeded in increasing graduation rates among all athletes, no data have yet been collected on the effects of Bylaw 14.3.1.1.1. Questions abound: Will this cause high school grade inflation? Did the previously required 820 unfairly penalize disadvantaged students from inner-city schools? Is there a moral issue? Are more underprepared student-athletes now entering our universities and colleges?

THE “NEW” NCAA ACADEMIC STANDARDS

When referring to the “new” NCAA academic standards, basically there are two reforms: Academic Progress Rate (APR), beginning its second year, and the 40/60/80 progress-toward-degree requirement. What are these reforms? What requirements do they place on student-athletes? What impact do they have on academic-support staffs?

Academic Progress Rate

The Academic Performance Program (APP), according to the NCAA Division I Board of Directors’ Directive, is intended to do the following:

- Reward teams that demonstrate commitment to student-athletes in their progress toward a degree and penalize those that do not.
- Encourage successful academic performance of all student-athletes on all sports teams.
- Reward institutions/teams that achieve significant academic success.
- Penalize those that have a history of academic underachievement.

The APR, calculated by each institution in the fall, is a term-by-term measurement of eligibility, retention, and graduation. Those included in the cohort are enrolled student-athletes receiving institutional aid based on athletics ability (institutional athletic aid) in the requested semester/term. Student-athletes may earn two points per semester for a total of four. Points are assigned if a student-athlete has earned eligibility (one point) and returns after the fall (one point); points are assigned in the spring using the same criteria. Student-athletes who are eligible and return to their institutions thus can earn four points per year (4/4). At the start of each academic year, each Division I team’s APR will be calculated by adding up all points earned by student-athletes and dividing that number by the total possible points that could have been earned. The APR will be totaled for four years before historical penalties are implemented although contemporaneous penalties will take effect during the 2005–2006 academic year.

Dr. Liz Friedman, associate director of Student-Athlete Support Services at Michigan State University, correctly observes that “NCAA admissions requirements have relaxed while at the same time the standards for maintaining satisfactory progress have increased.” Although the APR will have a significant effect on an institution’s athletics programs and coaching staffs, the policy that affects student-athletes more directly is 40/60/80.

A Closer Look at 40/60/80 and Academic Constraints

According to the progress-toward-degree requirement (40/60/80), once student-athletes declare their majors, they must have completed 40 percent of their degree-program requirements going into their third year, 60 percent going into their fourth year, and 80 percent going into their fifth year, thus, according to the NCAA, moving student-athletes to graduation in five years.

Why might this be problematic? Is it unrealistic to think that a student-athlete will not be able to complete forty-eight degree-counting credits (if a major requires 120 credits) at the end of two years? Of course not. Similarly, isn’t it quite possible for a student-athlete to complete seventy-two degree-counting credits after three years? Ninety-six degree-counting credits after four years? That is an average of twelve credits a semester, and a student-athlete must be enrolled in at least twelve credits at all times to be eligible to practice and compete.
Student-athletes who have an intended major from the onset of their academic careers and who never veer from that academic path should have no problem meeting 40/60/80. But how many non-athlete first- and second-year students, or even third- and fourth-year students, change their minds about majors and career paths? Student-athletes are no different. However, rather than enjoying the luxury of as many semesters as they would like to explore possible majors, student-athletes must decide on a major as early as their first semester to meet 40/60/80. According to Cathie Helmbold, an academic/athletic counselor at Auburn University, “The 40/60/80 requirement forces student-athletes to stick to a major once they reach a certain point even if they change their minds. Otherwise, they forego competing.”

POSSIBLE EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES

In essence, then, we penalize serious student-athletes for changing their minds about majors/career paths, especially if they are enrolled at an institution which has majors with very few if any free-elective credits. Therefore, student-athletes may continue in a major not of their liking to be able to compete. In her doctoral dissertation, Gayle Fenton, director of Student-Athlete Services at Long Beach State University, reports, “With having to make 40 percent in only two years, the student-athlete population has lost one of the main benefits of being college students: the opportunity to learn about themselves and what their interests are. Having to meet 40 percent in two years means that in order to be eligible, they must find a major fast/soon and stick with it, something that goes against all student-development theory.”

Reinforcing Ms. Fenton’s and Ms. Helmbold’s conclusions, the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics (N4A) in its Practices and Concepts for the Success of NCAA Academic Reform, believes, “New progress toward degree-percentage requirements may cause student-athletes to accept enrollment in majors that predict eligibility rather than encourage exploration of more challenging or personally meaningful major fields of study. The N4A is concerned that current legislation may not encourage sound educational outcomes.”

Another consideration concerns underprepared student-athletes who need remediation to develop their basic academic skills. Jennifer Quirk, director of Academic and Student-Athlete Support Services at Fairleigh Dickinson University, states, “For those [underprepared] student-athletes, the new markers can be difficult to achieve with needing to improve their basic skills and meeting degree-percentage requirements. Student-athletes required to take basic (non-credit) preparatory courses are generally also the ones who cannot successfully take more than fourteen or fifteen credits a semester.”

ROLES COACHES PLAY

N4A’s Practices and Concepts for the Success of NCAA Academic Reform states that “Coaches must share accountability for the academic achievement of student-athletes they select for admissions consideration.” Some suggestions include the following:

- Graduation rates should be compiled and published for each head coach and follow that head coach from institution to institution.
- A good graduation record would serve as an incentive for recruiting, hiring, contract renewal, and bonuses.
- A poor graduation record would serve as a disincentive for recruiting, hiring, contract renewal, and bonuses.

How can coaches be held accountable? This area is specifically addressed through the APR. Some college coaches, especially in Division I men’s basketball, say that maintaining a satisfactory APR is not compatible with trying to build a winning program because so many of the top players become professionals before exhausting their four years of college eligibility. Therefore, coaches suggest refining the APR.

Tim Richardson, an academic counselor at Boston College, believes, “The new NCAA academic standards make more people in athletics departments ‘stakeholders’ to student-athlete academic achievement. The incentive/disincentive program coupled with APR indexes illuminates more and more the true mission of a school’s athletics programs.” Basically, accountability for APR statistics has to include not only student-athletes but also coaches and athletics administrators as well.

Regardless, when underprepared student-athletes are admitted to our institutions (and they will be, given the latitude of Bylaw 14.3.1.1.1), the onus for student-athletes making progress toward a degree and maintaining academic eligibility will fall upon the academic/athletic advisors.

THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF ACADEMIC/ATHLETIC ADVISORS

If part of a coach’s job is to get students into an institution, then, as many mistakenly surmise, the academic/athletic advisor’s job is to keep them eligible. Dede Allen, associate director of Athletics at the University of Alaska Anchorage, states, “Our phi-
losophy is that it is our responsibility [as advisors] to provide the leadership and mentorship for the structure that allows student-athletes to find success, not provide their success, as that must be earned.”

Many in the academic/athletic-advising profession are used to hearing, “Oh, you’re one of those people who keeps athletes eligible.” Ms. Helmbold reiterates that “Obviously, the implication is that I am responsible for maintaining eligibility when the only person who can guarantee that is the student-athlete.” Academic/athletic advisors do not go to classes, take exams, or write papers. They provide student-athletes with successful-student behavioral strategies to succeed in the classroom. Also, given eligibility requirements legislated by the NCAA as well as by many athletics conferences and individual institutions, academic/athletic advisors must monitor their student-athletes’ progress toward their degrees and acquaint them with and encourage them to use resources (such as tutors and mentors) helpful in making their college experience successful.

Scott Herrin, a former academic/athletic advisor at the University of Southern Mississippi, says, “I always told my athletes and parents that I am your life advisor, not just your academic advisor.” Dr. Bob Nathanson, associate professor of Teaching and Learning at Long Island University, Brooklyn Campus, has worked with hundreds of student-athletes over the years. He believes “that our institutional responsibility with student-athletes goes way beyond merely enabling them to ‘survive’ with the goal of ‘staying eligible’ but rather to thrive as members of our campus community.” After all, academic/athletic advisors and faculty are educators, not rule enforcers.

Academic/athletic advisors are active participants in all areas of academic/athletic evaluation, support, and guidance, contributing to every aspect of student-athletes’ academic and athletics careers from initial academic evaluation of prospects, to student-athletes’ progress toward a degree to maintain or achieve athletics eligibility, to degree completion, (Practices and Concepts for the Success of NCAA Academic Reform, N4A Task Force, September 2004). N4A’s mission is to cultivate and improve the opportunities for academic success for student-athletes by providing informed, competent, and holistic advising while enhancing communication between the academic and athletics communities. Its members subscribe to this mission and follow N4A’s Code of Ethics.
THE MIDDLE GROUND

The hardest thing about death is that I wanted to tell you about the long drive to the burial ground, and the car was heavy; and there was roadwork and unfinished rutting on the macadam, jolting us all the way, and dust trailing like a long address. And I would mention the clouds, shocked sheep gathering that day and the freshness of dirt and the ease of its severance: never again to awaken to your future or awaken at dawn to your uncombed dreams, the stars falling into the gray lawn and the papers spread on the table and the toast, itself, sprawled in the middle ground, like the gift ungiven, at last put out in the rain, fragrant and bright and astounding.

BECKY KENNEDY

Becky Kennedy is a linguist and college professor. She has published articles on topics in theoretical linguistics and psycholinguistics. Her poetry has appeared in many publications including The Massachusetts Review, The Southern Poetry Review, Soundings East, Poem, the New Zoo Poetry Review, and the White Pelican Review. One of her poems has been nominated for the Pushcart Prize.
Problems with academic integrity in college athletics are undoubtedly as old as the system itself. The problem in its nakedness is easy to state. Because players must be students in good standing to play and in order to protect and enhance the success of college teams, colleges had to make sure the players made the grades to stay eligible. There have always been ways, beyond encouraging study, to enable academically unmotivated star athletes to pass their courses.

In the long history of this saga, academic integrity was mostly left up to the individual colleges. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the efforts that had been made by the NCAA to get control of and institutionalize academic integrity for the sake of fairness became compromised by social history, especially the rise of the quality of athletic play as a result of the increased admission of African American students into institutions of higher education. Freshman ineligibility was abandoned in 1968. In 1973, the NCAA struck down a grade-point-average predictor that had prevented some athletes from getting athletics scholarships. Walter Byers says, “Losing the 1.600 rule was one of the most painful experiences in the twenty-two years I had then served as executive director [of the NCAA]. It was a terrible day for college athletics. Supposedly responsible educators had voted for sports expediency” (Unsportsmanlike Conduct, p. 165). In those days Faculty Representatives to the NCAA for the most part were appointed as friends of the athletics programs, not as watchdogs of academic integrity.

Call me a cynic, I plead guilty. But I’ll call you a Pollyanna. The cheating and the altering of records to keep athletes available for games goes back to the 19th century. It’s uncorrectable. It’s systemic. The problem begins when players who lack academic qualifications are accepted to schools, and then everyone involved twists themselves in knots trying to deny the original sin.

— Frank Deford
ACADEMIC SERVICES

As the juggernaut of athletics departments gained speed, the problem of academic integrity began to take on greater institutional character. Where before, fraternity buddies might steal a test or students who were special fans might write a paper for an athlete, now, increasingly, athletics departments themselves were building huge “academic services” empires to systematize and control the crucial eligibility problems that they faced. As we all know, today most Division I-A schools have multimillion-dollar facilities and huge armies of personnel in the form of advisors, counselors, and tutors to aid recruits with their scholastic endeavors. This system has complicated the academic-integrity questions enormously.

First there is the possibility of the systematization of cheating. Scandals involving tutors writing papers for athletes have been common, and most people believe that for every scandal that becomes public, many more remain undetected. In recent years, the universities of Minnesota, Tennessee, and Missouri all have been tainted by these sorts of integrity-shattering events. While these scandals simply mimic age-old cheating efforts in their aims, the rise of the control over the athlete’s academic life by athletics departments has produced new issues about academic integrity.

The chief problem is the careful manipulation of the athlete’s program of study. As with so much of what is wrong with college athletics, this activity is a “legal” way of dealing with the pressures and is often defended by the school’s administration as a way of “honoring the commitments” we make to athletes. Offices of academic services for athletes have come to take enormous control of the athlete’s curricular life and study habits. Savvy advisors from the athletics departments know which academic program is easiest to major in, which courses to avoid and take, and which professors are sympathetic and unsympathetic to athletes. (A corollary phenomenon that has arisen on campuses is the faculty member who prejudices athletes as “dumb jocks” and/or unmotivated and often makes course completion and grade achievement unfairly difficult for athletes.)

GRADUATION RATES

This manipulation ought to make us doubt that graduation rates are a good indicator of the academic health of college athletic teams. Athletics departments are right to complain that the way these rates have been computed skews reality. A student who transfers in and graduates does not count in your favor, but one who transfers out and graduates from another institution counts against you; count-

ing in this way makes no sense. Recently the NCAA has made these calculations much more sophisticated, but only time will tell if they represent reality. On the other hand, when we see graduation rates that are better among athletes than they are among the regular student body, it should give us reason to hesitate before applauding.

The only way to figure out what is going on here is to gather information by sport about the academic abilities and preparation levels of athletes and compare that with the average in the student body. I do not know if anyone has gathered those statistics, but we do know that in football and in men’s basketball, the players tend to fall below their counterparts in the student body in the measures of academic ability and preparation levels. We would expect that players of those sports would do worse academically than the average student, presumably in their graduation rates as well. If they do not do worse, then it is likely to be because they have so much more help than the average student — in selecting easier programs of study, or in tutoring, or by some combination of these advantages.

In fact, a recent study by William Bowen and Sarah Levin on the elite academic schools that do not provide scholarship aid to athletes (Reclaiming the Game: College Sports and Educational Values Princeton University Press, 2003) shows that recruited athletes do less well academically than they should by comparison with similarly able and prepared students. Bowen and Levin conclude that the culture of athletics works against academic achievement. If schools that do give athletics scholarships (and therefore take in students even more unprepared for college work than the schools that Bowen and Levin studied) have similar or better graduation rates for athletes compared to the rest of the student body, something seems sociologically very wrong. Not long ago, the head of Oklahoma State University’s office of Academic Services for Athletes announced that the graduation rate for football players who entered Oklahoma State in 1999 was (within the NCAA measure of six years) very likely to be 100 percent. It suggests that the culture of athletics at Oklahoma State is one of extraordinarily positive academic reinforcement, as opposed to the Ivy League where it degrades academic interests.

EQUALITY AND ACADEMIC RIGOR

This careful planning of the athletes’ academic programs with the huge effort to spoon-feed the material to the athletes through tutors, regular study-halls, the latest computer labs, and so on has made some believe that another sort of academic-integrity problem has arisen. The issue is the way in which
athletes are treated as students compared with the way other students are treated. Even if this treatment does not mean that there is cheating on tests and papers, it may mean that athletes are prevented from taking advantage of the normal educational environment that institutions provide. Separation of the athlete from the life of the “regular” student body has become so extreme that we find significant reaction to it, most famously in the recent abolition of the athletics department at Vanderbilt University to overcome the “athletic culture” of separation. [See Gordon Gee’s article on page 11.]

Another issue that raises a question of academic integrity is whether athletics supporters (who may include faculty and administrators) believe that rigorous academic training is necessary for all students to the university. We might think of this as the John Thompson issue. Coach Thompson (former Georgetown University men’s basketball coach) was outspoken about the idea that the benefits of the athletic life at college should not be restricted by a too-austere adherence to so-called “academic standards.” Thompson created a stir by walking off the court when the famous “Proposition 42” was passed by the NCAA in 1989. He insisted that using SAT scores as a standard for prohibiting a freshman from competing discriminated against African Americans because of a cultural bias in the test. But there was a more-powerful argument in Thompson’s outburst, and it has continued to operate within the culture of athletics (as well as other places). This argument is the “value-added” understanding to educational assessment. Even if athletes do not manage to graduate with rigorously academic degrees, it is still possible to agree that they have benefited from the time spent at the institution and the activities undertaken there, including athletics. In addition to the classroom work, athletes may gain poise and confidence and a sense of the power of organizations by submitting to the rules and adapting to the habits of the team. They also may make contacts with alumni and fellow students who are or will be successful and who could help them with employment after they leave school.

This view also supports the efforts of athletics departments to get their players through school with some sort of degree, even if it is not educationally the most rigorous. For some underprepared athletes, to get any sort of degree is a benefit, to get even some years of exposure to college is a benefit, and to get the experience of the team activities and the networking that can come from their position in the athletics program is a benefit. This value-added view continues to play itself out in the current efforts of the NCAA to dish out incentives and disincentives to athletics programs based on progress toward graduation measures. Cynics continue to maintain that insisting on higher graduation rates and greater completion of graduation requirements each year will hardly make much difference in academic integrity because it will mean an even greater effort on the part of athletics departments to take control over the academic lives of their players and to watch even more carefully for easier ways to keep the marginal students in their programs eligible and to restrict the more academically prepared athlete from taking any risks. It may put even more pressure on tutors and other lower-level employees of athletics departments to cheat to keep the athletes eligible.

These problems make us focus on the paradox of college athletics itself — that it is supposed to be an academic or educational enterprise on the one hand and that it is clearly a multibillion-dollar entertainment business on the other. Even the existence of the facilities that house departments of academic services within athletics departments expresses this paradox. Such facilities are supposedly support systems for the education of students. But every coach and every athletics director values them primarily as forces to keep athletes eligible and, especially, as recruitment tools.

So it seems to me that the issue of academic integrity boils down to two kinds: cheating and the skewing of academics in the service of athletics. Simple cheating, such as having someone else do your work for you, has been around forever and probably cannot be stopped outside of the effort we continually make to remind people of their personal integrity. One thing that can be said is that the temptation to engage in simple cheating probably would be lowered if the stakes were lowered. Recently we have seen in the case of Baylor’s men’s basketball program a tragic loss of all decency because of the huge stakes involved. If there were not so much money on the line and if coaches’ jobs did not depend so much on winning, the pressure to cheat would be reduced. The idea of longer-term contracts for coaches tied as much or more to various measures of athletes’ success in academics than to win-loss measures might seem to be a reform that could help here. However, it would be difficult to propose a standard that could fit so many different schools, and of course, a contract can always be bought out, as they routinely are now.

**REFORMING THE SYSTEM**

I like to say that there are two kinds of reforms for college athletics, the ones that aim at reform of the system and the ones that aim at reform within the system. Personally, I do not see how true reform can come to athletics without a reform of the system. For me that means that the huge money and fame incentives to win, and to win championships, have to be eliminated, and with that elimination, the huge expenditures of resources must go as well. Most
ideas to effect a reform of the system are dismissed as extremism. Nonetheless, a solution to the problem of skewing academics to favor athletics would seem to require a reduction in the size or influence of the athletics departments themselves. Perhaps this also is just a question of the necessity of reducing the money involved in athletics.

But other steps could be taken. Outlawing of athletics department offices responsible for athletes’ academic lives might be one such step. This would, however, be fraught with danger, for some institutions would smuggle such an office into their regular systems, or “vigilante” cheating might gain power.

A second, much more radical possibility would be to abandon academic rules at any level beyond those enforced by the individual schools. Then, the schools that wanted to ignore academic integrity and have great teams could do it, but they would also have to put up with their reputations. This plan might not work either because schools that did not have enough academic integrity to hold athletes to some standard would probably simply deny that they were doing so.

A third way might be to require a great deal more disclosure of the academic records of athletes in the hope that if we could get a system of reporting of sufficient depth and ensure its honesty, then embarrassment at lack of academic integrity would rein in the worst institutional offenders. Jon Ericson, the founder of the faculty reformers known as the Drake Group, has thought quite a bit about this solution and believes that it could work. The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), another faculty-senate-based reform group, also advocates this practice. The idea ultimately depends upon the integrity of the faculty and administration at each institution. Publish the academic record of athletes — who their advisors were, what courses they took, what the grade-point average was within each course (which could weed out faculty who never fail anyone and who give A’s to almost everyone), what their majors were (thereby finding out if the majors were clustered such as at Georgia Tech, where 56 percent of the football players majored in management a couple of years ago). The success of this effort would depend on whether athletics departments could get even more imaginative in hiding what goes on. If done with care and enforced widely, publishing this information could have an effect on the academic-integrity question because the administration and faculty themselves could not ignore the evidence. Of course, if we started to require rigorous academic work of our athletes, we might soon find that the quality of the games would decrease. Then we would be confronted with another kind of crisis.

Another issue of academic integrity has just received a good deal of attention with the publication of William Bowen and Sarah Levin’s Reclaiming the Game. This issue is how the isolation of athletics culture on campuses cuts athletes off from other non-curricular educational opportunities. This growing isolation is ironic considering Title IX equality problems on our campuses. Title IX insists that women must be given equal educational opportunities and goes on to define intercollegiate athletics as one of these opportunities. However, if intercollegiate athletics actually restricts a variety of educational opportunities, it is not so clear that colleges should encourage any student to engage in them. Of course, independent of the quality issue, the question is whether the educational integrity of institutions is under attack from athletics.

Lastly, the question arises as to whether the whole apparatus of intercollegiate athletics — the scholarship system, the money that is connected to it, and the emphasis it gets in the marketing of institutions — also attacks the academic integrity of high schools. In addition to the crazy scandals of payoffs to high school coaches by recruiters, such as in the recent case at the University of Alabama, what sorts of pressures are at play in the education of high school athletes who are seeking colleges to showcase their talents? Remember that the NCAA has a great deal to say about what the entrance requirements are of future athletes who compete under their system. Recently changes have been made that reduce the minimum test scores permitted for recruits provided that their grade-point averages meet high levels. There is little question that this change places an enormous burden on high school faculty who may decide the fate of academically underachieving students who need better grades than they might deserve to capture that scholarship. While study of these problems is largely absent, it would be surprising indeed if the emphasis that colleges place on athletics does not filter down to high schools, resulting in similar problems.

Edward G. Lawry is a professor of philosophy at Oklahoma State University and has been active in the athletics reform movement for many years. He is a past member of the Executive Committee of the Drake Group and an original Steering Committee member of the Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics.
In no other country of the world is athletics so embedded within the institutional culture of higher education as it is in the United States. At its best, athletics contributes to campus spirit, builds community, and provides meaningful experiences outside of the classroom. The late A. Bartlett Giamatti, former president of Yale and later Commissioner of Major League Baseball, once observed that “athletics teaches lessons valuable to the individual by stretching the human spirit in ways that nothing else can.” As countless athletes have testified, by competing one learns “life lessons”: teamwork, discipline, resilience, perseverance, how to “play by the rules,” and how to accept outcomes that one may not like. One of the most difficult challenges that higher education faces is preserving the contributions that athletics makes without losing sight of the fact that colleges and universities are primarily academic institutions.

Worrisome Trends

In recent years, worrisome trends have emerged, such as the growth in the length of the season, an increased number of contests, and a prevailing view that the only valid measure of a successful season is the opportunity to compete for a national championship. Collectively, these trends have contributed to an increased specialization and intensification in college athletics programs that threaten institutions’ educational values.

Although intercollegiate athletic competition has long been a valuable complement to colleges’ and universities’ educational missions, in recent years the all-consuming nature of sports programs, beginning with youth sports, has created expectations and behaviors that threaten the relationship between athletics and the academy. An athletics “arms race,” once seen exclusively as a Division I phenomenon, has led to increased spending on facilities and staff. This problem is true of institutions that offer admission to almost all qualified applicants, as well as of colleges and universities that are highly selective. Although well-publicized infractions and indiscretions at Division I powerhouses such as the University of Miami, Ohio State, and the University of Georgia fill the sports pages with regularity, an equally serious and much more insidious set of problems can be found two levels down the athletics pecking order at Division III, where there are no athletics scholarships, no Bowl Championship Series, no luxury boxes generating millions of dollars in revenue, and where many field houses and stadiums are sparsely attended by parents and handfuls of students.

Academics and Athletics in Division III

Close observers of Division III athletics long have noted — first as a matter of pride, and more recently, as a sign of concern — that athletics has a far greater effect on the composition of the stu-
dent body and arguably the campus culture of their institutions than at the great majority of Division I schools. For example, the University of Illinois, a member of the Big Ten conference with an undergradate enrollment of approximately 29,000 students, sponsors nineteen intercollegiate teams with approximately 450 participating student athletes. But as Robert Malekoff, a former athletics director at two Division III institutions, has observed, in the New England Small College Athletic Conference, with enrollments averaging about 1,700 students, colleges such as Amherst, Bowdoin, Connecticut, Hamilton, Middlebury, Trinity, and Williams may field twenty-eight or more teams with roughly six hundred athletes participating. In general, the most selective institutions in terms of admissions typically sponsor the greatest number of varsity sports, with approximately 35 to 45 percent of their students participating.

Across the country, colleges and universities are struggling with the tradeoffs involved with recruiting athletes (and their families) and with updating facilities for dozens of varsity sports. But they are also wrestling with attitudes, expectations, and behaviors that are — if not distinctive to the current generation of athletes — notably different in terms of goals and values. The effects of recruiting athletes on admissions selectivity and the management of enrollment differ markedly across Division III. On one level, recruitment of athletes helps to build enrollment — especially male enrollment — at some colleges that would like to have more good students (and, especially, more well-qualified male students). In contrast, the aggressive recruitment of athletes at other colleges with large pools of qualified candidates can create serious problems by affecting competition for scarce places in their entering classes and thus altering the composition of the student body.

Thus, on a number of campuses, there is not only the basic problem of the all-consuming nature of athletic competition but also the growing “divide” between “recruited” athletes (defined as those, who, as applicants, were on a coach’s list submitted to the admissions office) and other students, including “walk-ons” (defined as students who played on intercollegiate teams but were not “recruited”).

This academics-athletics divide takes many forms. On some campuses, it can be seen in the substantial differences between recruited athletes and other students in test scores, in high school grades, and in subsequent academic outcomes such as rank in class. At other colleges and universities, the divide is most noticeable in recruited athletes’ choices of fields of study and, in particular, in patterns of residential and social life. The cultural forces widening the divide within both athletics and higher education are deep-seated and are increasingly evident in growing concerns about the relationships between faculty members and members of the coaching staff.

A growing number of coaches, like their players and college faculties in general, have become more specialized, less involved in the overall life of the college, and increasingly isolated (occasionally by preference, frequently by institutional practice) from their academic colleagues. Steve Lewis, president emeritus of Carleton College and a close observer of campus life since the 1960s, has suggested that the very nature of a college’s shared mission and purpose is being pulled apart by centrifugal forces: “A few decades ago if an athlete was slacking off in class, his teacher might bump into the coach over coffee and inquire what’s going on; and they might work something out about who would talk with the student and how.” Today, Lewis notes, “The familiarity of faculty with coaches is much lower than it was in decades gone by; and we and our students are paying the price for that lack of knowledge and communication.”

The competitive emphasis in Division III was once geared to geographically close, traditional rivalries. Today, however, many coaches and athletes view the “big” game or even the conference championship as little more than an invitation to the NCAA tournament — and a season’s success is predicated on earning that invitation. Similarly, of course, the athletics “arms race,” once seen exclusively as a Division I phenomenon, is now very much a part of the Division III culture, and it shows no sign of abating.

What is most disturbing about the overall trend lines, as James L. Shulman and William G. Bowen’s The Game of Life (Princeton University Press, 2001) and Bowen and Sarah Levin’s sequel, Reclaiming the Game (Princeton University Press, 2003) convincingly demonstrate, is that the athletics culture in Division III shows a constant progression: what happens first in high-profile sports eventually affects lower-profile sports; the academic underperformance one finds among male athletes is now evident among women athletes; and dreams of national championships are now the driving force behind too many programs, admission decisions, and failed educational policies.

In Reclaiming the Game, Bowen and Levin empirically show that the underperformance of recruited athletes is not primarily a result of the time that they spend on the athletic field or the intensity of their athletic experience. The most startling evidence in support of this proposition is that recruited athletes underperform whether they are playing or not, while “walk-on” or unrecruited athletes who do compete underperform little or not at all. For the most part, the underperformance of recruited athletes at highly
selective Division III institutions appears to be directly related to factors associated with their recruitment and admission — that is, to their interests, motivations, and other commitments. Parenthetically, Bowen and Levin’s research demonstrates that students who devote significant time to nonathletic extracurricular activities such as music, theatre, or the school newspaper do not underperform academically.

ATHLETICS IN DIVISION III INSTITUTIONS

The challenges that we face today reflect societal trends, institutional choices, and fundamental changes in the academy and in the organization of intercollegiate athletics. In June 2003, in response to concerns raised by many college and university leaders, The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation launched the College Sports Project (CSP). Two fundamental and interconnected objectives serve as the cornerstones of the CSP: first, athletes are primarily students — their academic outcomes and engagement with a wide variety of campus activities should be representative of their peers — and second, students who participate on intercollegiate-athletic teams should do so in an environment that is integrated with and complementary to the educational values of the institution. Restoring athletics to its complementary role within the educational missions of Division III institutions requires a collective and sustained effort at many different levels from students, faculty, staff, presidents, deans, trustees, alumni, and parents.

THE COLLEGE SPORTS PROJECT

Notwithstanding these constructive responses, there are clear signs that many presidents are worried about the heightened and intensified nature of their own athletics programs and are concerned with the growing cultural divide that isolates coaches and athletes from the mainstream of campus life and from their institutions’ educational missions. Recognizing these concerns, CSP sponsored a pilot institute on “integration” in June 2005. Senior-leadership teams composed of presidents, academic- and student-affairs professionals, coaches, athletics directors, and faculty members from ten institutions participated in two days of discussions on subjects ranging from the hiring, evaluation, contractual status, and professional development of coaches to the importance of broadening institutions’ definitions of success in athletics to reflect coaches’ roles as teachers and mentors. Integrating athletics directors, coaches, and student-athletes into the academic and co-curricular life of institutions is a long-term goal, representing nothing less than a culture shift that will require extraordinary institutional and individual efforts to change behavior, break down stereotypes across institutions, and ensure that college and university mission statements accurately reflect athletics practices.

THE NEED FOR “REPRESENTATIVENESS”

Many Division III presidents also agree that measuring academic outcomes and ensuring the “representativeness” of all students are issues that cut across institutional lines and are independent of differences in admission selectivity, endowment size, location, or athletic success. By representativeness, we mean not only comparable outcomes, but also at least roughly similar patterns of interest in the kinds of majors that athletes select, in their opportunities to study abroad, write senior theses, pursue internships, and participate in the myriad aspects of college life. Ideally, students who participate on varsity teams should look like their classmates from the standpoint of academic preparation (test scores and high school grade-point average), academic outcomes, and engagement in college life.

At selective institutions, representativeness at the time of admission must be a crucial common denominator. Recruited athletes should not enjoy a substantial admissions advantage greater than that accorded any other student with a special talent, nor should
they be awarded preferential financial-aid packages (based only on their athletic ability) over other applicants. Less emphasis should be placed on rankings of candidates by coaches, and the admissions office should be expected to admit those students, including students recommended by coaches, thought to be qualified and motivated to take full advantage of the educational offerings of the college — and not just to be “over threshold” in terms of formal qualifications.

To measure representativeness, the CSP invited all Division III institutions to express their interest in sharing data on students’ attainment levels at the time of admission and then again at the end of four years. More than 135 presidents responded positively to this request. With financial support from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and with the cooperation of Middlebury College and Northwestern University, a data analysis center has been created at Northwestern. The center will receive and analyze record-level data (class rank, graduation rates, test scores, grades) from participating institutions and provide confidential reports to each college and university based on the information submitted. These reports will include data that benchmark the institution’s results to those of all participants. Upon request, the center also will provide reports for conferences or other subgroups, but only with the unanimous consent of the institutions in the subgroup. The usefulness of these data depends on a shared, intentional, institution-wide commitment to achieve full academic and athletic integration. Future integration initiatives will take place on a conference-wide basis as CSP institutions join with NCAA leaders to ensure that student athletes and the athletics coaching staffs are fully integrated into colleges’ and universities’ campus culture and educational missions. Interested readers may wish to check the CSP’s Web site (www.collegesportsproject.org) to follow the latest developments relating to these initiatives, including a set of “best practices.”

In the end, restoring athletics to a complementary place within the educational missions of Division III institutions requires the strong, active, collective leadership and cooperation of students, staff, faculty, deans, presidents, trustees, alumni, and parents. Changing the culture is essentially a matter of priorities and will, and in that regard, it is more like a marathon than a sprint.

---

Eugene M. Tobin, former president of Hamilton College, is program officer for the Liberal Arts Colleges Program and director of the College Sports Project at The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.
THE FIRST TITLE IX REVOLUTION

Title IX, the federal statute that prohibits sex discrimination in federally funded education programs, helped to spawn and to foster a social revolution in the United States during the past generation. Enacted in 1972, Title IX states:

No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

The revolution that Title IX inspired and advanced resulted in an exponential increase in participation by women in all facets of higher education. Perhaps the best evidence of this is enrollment figures; at my alma mater, the University of Rhode Island, more than 55 percent of the undergraduates in 2003–2004 were women. In my home state, the University of Vermont had an undergraduate student body that was 56 percent female in 2003–2004, and next door in New Hampshire, the undergraduate population at the University of New Hampshire during that year was more than 57 percent female.
Athletics, though, is the aspect of college life in which the impact of Title IX is most visible. In 1972, when I was an undergraduate, fewer than 30,000 women played sports sponsored by their colleges, whereas 170,000 men did so. By 2003–04, 202,500 women (and 291,500 men) played sports sponsored by their colleges; women were 41 percent of the varsity college athletes in the United States, an increase of more than 400 percent since 1971.

Still, the revolution was felt far beyond the athletics fields, including in graduate and professional schools. In 1994 women received 38 percent of the MD degrees awarded in the United States, as compared with only 9 percent in 1972; 43 percent of the JD degrees, compared with 7 percent in 1972; and 44 percent of the PhD degrees awarded to U.S. citizens, up from 25 percent in 1972. I experienced this revolution directly. The PhD program in political science that I entered in 1974 had only one female among thirty graduate students, whereas my first-year law-school class at Indiana University ten autumns later was approximately 40 percent female.

Nobody embodies the changes wrought by Title IX better than Dot Richardson, the shortstop on the U.S. team that won the gold medal in softball at the 1996 Olympics. Thanks to Title IX and the social change surrounding it, Dot Richardson attended UCLA on an athletics scholarship and then graduated from medical school at the University of Louisville. These opportunities were unavailable to her mother's generation and even to women who were just a few years older than she.

But the social revolution of which Title IX has been a major part is incomplete. To be sure, National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) member colleges now offer an average of 8.32 women's teams, up from 2 per college in 1972 and 5.6 per college in 1978. Nevertheless, in 2004 only 44 percent of the coaches of women's college teams were women, whereas in 1972 women coached more than 90 percent of women's college teams. In other words, the enormous gains that female undergraduates have made in access to opportunities in athletics as a result of Title IX have been offset to some extent by diminished access to college-coaching positions, which are still dominated by men, even in women's sports. Indeed, men coach more than half of the women's college teams, but women coach less than two percent of the men's college teams nationwide.

Disparities also remain between coaches of men's teams and coaches of women's teams; the latter, of course, are more likely than the former to be women. In the spring of 2004, the California Higher Education Commission reported that the average salary for head coaches of men's teams at public colleges in that state was $63,321, while the comparable figure for head coaches of women's teams was $49,307. Similar disparities exist at the three New England universities cited earlier. In 2002–03, head coaches of men's teams at the University of Rhode Island earned an average salary of $62,915, while the comparable figure for head coaches of women's teams was $43,967. Assistant coaches of men's teams earned $31,897 per year on average, and assistant coaches of women's teams earned $22,122. At the University of Vermont the salary gap was narrower, as head coaches of men's teams averaged $33,952 in salary, while head coaches of women's teams averaged $29,659. Assistant coaches of men's teams earned an average of $12,869 per year in salary; their counterparts for women's teams earned an average of $11,809 annually.

At the University of New Hampshire head coaches of men's teams earned $51,038 per year in salary, and head coaches of women's teams earned $43,698. Assistant coaches of men's teams averaged $24,939 in salary, while assistant coaches of women's teams earned an average salary of $19,435.

Problems even remain in the area of participation, where Title IX has had its greatest success in college sports. On average at NCAA Division I colleges (the largest and most athletically competitive schools), student bodies were 54 percent female in 2003–04, but women were just 43 percent of the athletes. This gap was even larger in Division II, where 57 percent of the students, but only 40 percent of the athletes, were women, and in Division III (small colleges not offering athletic scholarships), where the percentage of women in student bodies exceeded the percentage of women athletes by an average of fifteen points.

Nevertheless, the failure to produce absolute equality between men and women in college sports is not the greatest deficiency of Title IX. After all, revolutions are works in progress, and a bit of backsliding may be inevitable. The more important critique of Title IX is that in demanding "equality," it encouraged advocates for women's college sports to develop them according to the highly problematic male model. The problems associated with the male model of college sports are well known, necessitating only a brief treatment here. A quick survey of headlines in the “Athletics” section of The Chronicle of Higher Education during the spring and fall of 2004 identifies these problems: “NCAA Penalizes Cal State at Northridge for Academic Fraud” (April 16), “NCAA Penalizes University of Washington for Football Coach's Gambling” (November 5), and “Colleges’ Expenditures on Athletics Can’t Be Calculated, Panelists Tell Knight Commission” (November 5). Financial shenanigans and excess, academic fraud, and breaches of personal responsibility by coaches and athletes are legion in college sports.
In recent years, tension between the “equal opportunity” requirements of Title IX and the princely spending on football and men’s basketball associated with the male model of college sports has spawned a heated debate about how colleges can comply with Title IX while continuing to fund men’s sports at adequate levels. The response at too many colleges has been to eliminate (or to cap roster sizes in) men’s nonrevenue sports, particularly wrestling, swimming, and gymnastics, so as to avoid hurting football and men’s basketball. This is the wrong approach. It will not achieve true gender equity because it denies men the chance to participate, and it will not bring fiscal sanity, academic integrity, or personal responsibility to college sports either. Thus, current conditions cry out for a second Title IX revolution.

THE SECOND TITLE IX REVOLUTION

The financial and legal pressures associated with Title IX compliance offer a wonderful opportunity for colleges to achieve gender equity in their sports programs without eliminating men’s nonrevenue sports. This is especially true for less athletically prestigious members of the NCAA’s Division I-A (such as my graduate alma mater, Miami of Ohio) and for members of Division I-AA, such as Rhode Island, because their football teams are costly to maintain and do not earn sufficient income from gate receipts (or rare television appearances) to support themselves, let alone other sports on campus. The answer to the conundrum of how to achieve gender equity without sacrificing men’s nonrevenue sports is to replace the longstanding “commercial model” of college sports with the “participation model,” which can bring about the second Title IX revolution.

The participation model is based on the premises that (1) athletics liberated from commercial pressures are valuable to a liberal-arts education, and (2) the principal beneficiaries of college sports should be athletes, not coaches, fans, television networks, or journalists. Some data from the 1999–2000 academic year will illustrate the glaring difference between the commercial and the participation models of college sports. During that year the University of Texas at Austin, where the commercial model has long reigned supreme, spent $42 million to finance twenty teams. In the same year, Harvard, where the philosophy of the participation model governs, spent $6.7 million on forty-one teams.

The participation model has six main features. First, it would prohibit athletic scholarships; financial aid to athletes would be based on the same criteria that apply to nonathletes, namely, academic merit and financial need. Second, in addition to ending athletic scholarships, the participation model also would end autonomous athletics departments, which are breeding grounds for financial excess and impropriety. Athletics revenue, whatever its source, would enter the college’s general fund, to be distributed throughout the institution to meet a wide array of needs. Third, coaches would have to be teachers. They would be required to have at least a Master’s degree in physical education or a related field and to coach more than one sport or teach classes in addition to coaching. In return they would be eligible for five-year rolling contracts that would increase their job security, thereby reducing pressure to win as many games and to earn as much money as possible as quickly as possible.

Fourth, the participation model would help athletes to be students by eliminating freshman eligibility for varsity sports, spring football practice, “redshirting” (holding players out of competition for a year while they mature physically and improve their athletic skills), and academic-advising programs exclusively for athletes. Freshman eligibility hinders adjustment to the academic demands of college. Spring football practice limits opportunities to participate in college life beyond the athletic department. Redshirting (for nonmedical reasons) distorts the customary four-year undergraduate cycle and benefits coaches more than athletes. Academic advising housed in the athletics department is an invitation to academic fraud, as recent revelations at the Universities of Minnesota and Tennessee and at Louisiana State University have demonstrated.

Fifth, one-platoon football, whereby the offensive unit remains on the field to play defense when the ball changes hands, would replace the current, two-platoon game, which has been in place since 1965. One-platoon football would facilitate Title IX compliance while saving men’s nonrevenue teams, especially at colleges where football is not profitable, because it would cut football rosters from ninety or one-hundred players to between fifty and sixty players, thereby funding two players in a less-expensive women’s sport or men’s nonrevenue sport for each football player whose roster slot is eliminated.

Finally, colleges would suspend from competition, pending the outcome of legal proceedings, athletes who have been accused of academic fraud, the use of illegal drugs, or sexual or domestic assault. The same fate would befall coaches accused of violating an employment contract or a faculty/staff handbook. Contrary to popular belief, this practice would not violate the presumption of innocence because that presumption applies only to criminal prosecutions, and campus disciplinary proceedings are not criminal prosecutions. Besides, an immediate suspension would remove the incentive for a college to seek to...
delay criminal proceedings for a star athlete until the end of the season.

Implementing the participation model is more easily said than done. It will require major cultural change, which never occurs quickly, easily, or completely. Still, it can happen, especially at colleges where football and men’s basketball are unprofitable, if college faculty unite behind the participation model and build an effective advocacy organization on its behalf. The faculty must lead this fight because they have the most to gain and the least to lose from the reform of college sports. They stand to benefit from quieting the Mardi-Gras atmosphere that surrounds big-time sports, and they are unlikely to lose business opportunities if participation replaces commerce in the athletics department.

An effective advocacy organization does not just mean professors talking to other professors, which is necessary but not sufficient. It means establishing a national office in Washington, D.C., and campus units nationwide. It means hiring a staff that is experienced in public education and legislative lobbying and that can call on allies in the legal profession when litigation is necessary. Title IX has provided a golden opportunity for colleges to abandon commercialized sport in favor of the participation model, but faculty members must seize this opportunity and build a movement for fundamental change in college sports.

CONCLUSION

Two conclusions emerge from this survey of the impact of Title IX on college sports. One conclusion is that colleges and advocates for Title IX enforcement must surely continue the work of the first Title IX revolution, which remains unfinished. The aims of this continued effort must be expanded athletics-participation opportunities for college women, a fairer allocation of resources between men’s teams and women’s teams, and the hiring of more women coaches for women’s teams. The second, even more important conclusion is that colleges must set their sights on a second Title IX revolution in the years ahead. The goal of this revolution must be to replace commerce with participation as the basis of college sports. Only this change can bring gender equity, fiscal sanity, academic integrity, and personal responsibility to college sports.

Brian L. Porto is a Vermont attorney, a political scientist, and a freelance writer. He comments regularly on legal and social issues in sports for Vermont Public Radio and is the author of A New Season: Using Title IX To Reform College Sports (Praeger 2003).
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THE OAK AND THE GRAVE

Père Lachaise,
Paris, France

Two hundred years it took the oak
To find the grave after its roots
Knuckled down to it in the yard.

Another hundred years,
a knotty elbow at the edge
embraced it, and the oak stretched
its bony arms and leafy hands
over a sea of stones, and took
another century to lift
as if in praise the crypt from the earth
skew the lid, spill the fine
white dust from crevices
carved by hand to signify
this final matter, claim it, expose
the traces of a name and date.

GERRY MCFARLAND

Gerry McFarland writes and lives in Seattle, with his wife, Allegra. His poems have appeared in many places, including Crab Creek Review, Limestone, Zyzzyva, Berkeley Poetry Review, Pontoon #8, and Sanskrit. He was awarded the 2005 Sam Ragan Prize and was a finalist in the 2003 WinningWriters.com war poetry contest.
J. Douglas Toma

Amateur Ideals, Commercial Realities, and Strategic Uses: Exploring the False Divide Between Spectator Sports and the Overall University
It is common to frame intercollegiate athletics and higher education as existing in opposition, even attributing the challenges of the latter to the presence of the former. Instead of viewing spectator sports and higher education as being “us versus them,” a better approach, I contend, is to focus on how universities use college sports to advance the resource acquisition that serves agendas which all agree are legitimate and significant, particularly academic ones. I also encourage attention to how this practice is becoming more natural as universities become ever more like spectator sports on campus — more reliant on appeals to commercial interests and thus less visibly “amateur” in nature.

In this article, I examine the uses of spectator sports to universities, particularly in supporting external relations. I also employ spectator sports to illustrate the needed accommodation in higher education of commercialism and professionalism in an environment framed by amateur ideals. I explore these ideas more fully in Football U.: Spectator Sports in the Life of the American University (Michigan, 2003).

**THE PURPORTED DIVIDE**

Critics decry college sports for being inappropriately commercial and essentially professional, far from the amateur ideals on which they are justified. The Drake Group, a collection of faculty interested in reform, frames its purpose as “help[ing] faculty and staff defend academic integrity in the face of the burgeoning college sport industry.” The coalition certainly poses some worthwhile reforms, particularly those that suggest better integrating athletes into institutional life. I could not agree more with proposed policies that emphasize the importance of class attendance for all students and ensuring that games scheduled do not conflict with that goal. The same is true of extending the extraordinary counseling and support services readily available to students who participate in varsity sports to all students, ensuring that athletes and other students alike make steady academic progress in rigorous programs, and allowing first-year students to acclimate to university life before participating in college sports.

The “us versus them” orientation of the Drake Group is troubling, however — that the university must combat the spectator sports that will surely destroy it. It breeds work by those such as Murray Sperber, who in his last book, Beer and Circuses: How Big-Time College Sports Is Crippling Undergraduate Education (Holt, 2000), attributes the decline of meaningful undergraduate education at large universities to a combination of overly popular spectator sports and the pursuit of prestige by universities through enhancing research. Sperber argues that large universities do use spectator sports, but really only to attract and then distract students so that faculty can focus on pursuits other than teaching. I also focus on the uses of spectator sports, but suggest that in employing them institutions can better acquire the resources needed to support core endeavors such as undergraduate education.

Sperber is correct in his argument that spectator sports contribute to keeping alumni engaged in the life of institutions — at least the athletics corner of it. I disagree with his argument that spectator sports are central in attracting students, however, although they do contribute somewhat through raising the profile of institutions for out-of-state students. Campus amenities, such as the luxurious fitness centers, dining commons, and student residences that seem to be under construction or recently opened on campuses everywhere have the same marginal influence. In considering admissions, Sperber equates the frosting with the whole cupcake in seeking to underscore the influence of spectator sports on campus. Students still choose to attend large universities based on location, price, and prestige, and their satisfaction once there requires far more than the “beer and circuses” associated with spectator sports, as entire research literatures on college choice and student retention suggest.

Spectator sports, moreover, have considerably less influence than Sperber suggests in distracting students once on campus. For alumni, spectator sports, namely football, are likely the only way that they realistically and meaningfully can engage with institutions, with a relatively minor investment of effort. Students, however, have myriad connections with the university daily, including intellectually. Football may interest them on Saturday — as might the party scene surrounding the event — but it is only one aspect of their experience on campus at large universities. Sperber inflates the importance of spectator sports in undergraduate life and thus its contribution to challenges in undergraduate education. In other words, he manufactures a false divide between spectator sports and the purposes of higher education.

At large universities, undergraduate education does coexist with other activities and initiatives, including those that are more commercial and professional in nature, such as sponsored research and spectator sports. Contrary to what Sperber suggests, however, universities are quite able to multitask. Just as does
undergraduate education, other functions and activities at the research university — even spectator sports, albeit indirectly — contribute in important ways to legitimate, and perhaps even essential, ends.

Two other books, both co-authored by William Bowen using the Mellon Foundation’s longitudinal “College and Beyond” data, The Game of Life: College Sports and Educational Values (Princeton, 2000) and Reclaiming the Game: College Sports and Educational Values (Princeton, 2003), are more empirically sophisticated than Sperber (though not without significant flaws, as discussed in the Spring 2002 issue of Journal of College and University Law). Still, they also fall into the same trap of considering college sports apart from the real context of higher education, including the external influences that have become even more important in institutional life.

The books suggest a divide between athletics and academics, underscored by differences at our most elite institutions between those who compete in varsity sports and other students on several variables: in credentials used to determine admission, personal goals and values, academic achievement as measured by class rank, majors pursued, life path following college, and so on. Athletics thus contributes to the composition of classes and ethos of campuses in not necessarily positive and productive ways, sending signals inconsistent with what Bowen and his colleagues suggest are proper educational values.

Such a divide is, I argue, increasingly artificial, particularly as funding at institutions overall is increasingly linked to commerce. Accordingly, the articulation of educational values, if realistic, must be more complex and pragmatic than the pure and idealized conception that Bowen poses.

THE LANDSCAPE OF COLLEGE SPORTS

Any discussion of intercollegiate sports needs to begin by differentiating between spectator sports and everything else and recognizing that the challenges related to spectator sports are far from an emerging issue. Many, if not most, scholarly treatments of the topic fail here.

A natural and clear divide exists between the spectator sports that attract wide attention — sports such as football at institutions that compete in the major Division I athletic conferences — and all other college sports. The most pronounced problems in intercollegiate athletics reside in spectator sports, where vast interest among the broader public encourages the commercialism and professionalism within an amateur framework that invites corruption and exploitation. Spectator sports, although prominent, represent but a fraction of participation in varsity sports (even though they do generate the bulk of athletics department budgets).

Participation in other sports — in men’s swimming or wrestling or in women’s gymnastics or golf — even within our largest athletics programs, is commonly related to the student-development ends that mark other campus activities. It can be, in fact, exemplary of what extracurricular activities should endeavor to engender in students — with such sports, there is little, if any, divide here between the “us” of the university and the “them” of athletics. Conflating the challenges associated with spectator sports with intercollegiate athletics in general, which happens far too regularly among scholars, is not only intellectually disingenuous but also obscures the real discussion.

The same is true of the propensity of those to suggest that commercialism and professionalism in spectator sports are somehow significantly more acute or even a new phenomenon — that it has not been essentially the same problem for more than a century.

SPECTATOR SPORTS AND THE COLLEGIATE IDEAL

Because so many people are paying attention, spectator sports have uses to universities, particularly in articulating the “collegiate ideal.” I contend that expressing the collegiate ideal, particularly to external constituents, is essential in positioning institutions to be effective in pursuing resources.

Resource acquisition is of paramount importance not only in maintaining but also in building individual institutions, including research universities. (All institutions seem interested in building and the idea of “getting to the next level” is ubiquitous in vision statements.) In the inexorably linked quest for prestige and appeal for resources in U.S. higher education, it is not enough to be a research powerhouse. Large universities also must incorporate the collegiate atmosphere and aura originally associated with small colleges and that universities continued to embrace as they evolved from colleges at the turn of the last century.

Institutions recognize that the popular conception of higher education is as “collegiate,” having very little to do with purely academic pursuits even at large universities. They also appreciate that the collegiate ideal has long signified privilege in higher education in the United States, even to the point that institutions that turn away from collegiate life are perceived (not always correctly, of course) to lack academic rigor. Elsewhere in the world, students “attend university,” emphasizing scholarly pursuits. Americans, on the other hand, “attend college.” Success for U.S. universities certainly requires attention both to more serious pursuits, but also to the collegiate ideal that is so
important in underscoring status and even legitimacy at our institutions.

Spectator sports enable the expression of the collegiate ideal on large campuses. Indeed, institutions that do not have a collegiate look and feel commonly identify the pressing need to develop the markers of the collegiate ideal, including introducing or enhancing spectator sports. (There are also kinds of buildings and landscaping that are understood in U.S. culture to be collegiate and that institutions can integrate onto campus, of course.)

The distinctive and pervasive institutional culture and intimate and robust campus community that identify the collegiate ideal can be difficult to achieve on large campuses. Spectator sports highlight the unique forms through which particular institutions express the collegiate ideal, as well as their own institutional culture more broadly. Any organization, institutions of higher education included, requires the repeated expression of shared symbols, language, narratives, and practices to give form to the norms, values, and beliefs that define its unique culture. Smaller communities, as at a liberal arts college, can express culture in intimate ways, particularly in the practices that are the most complex and thus most meaningful declaration of culture — rituals, taboos, rites, and ceremonies.

At large universities, spectator sports are a way to express institutional culture, particularly through providing concrete means to make norms, values, and beliefs more understandable. In and around the stadium on football Saturdays, the university community can display its culture in tangible and unique forms — its colors, logos, and mascots (symbols); songs and slogans (language); stories, legends, and myths (narratives); and rituals and ceremonies (practices). In doing so, universities can demonstrate how they differ from other institutions in ways that are appealing and accessible to those associated with many people (such as alumni), highlighting qualities, such as community, at the core of the collegiate ideal.

Furthermore, spectator sports provide institutions that are essentially local in their reach with what amounts to a national brand, adding distinctiveness and importance to campuses with few other areas of national prominence. Spectator sports (along with geography) are what distinguish otherwise indistinguishable large universities (and otherwise indistinguishable states) on a national level. When teams are successful and appealing, spectator sports are the source of national prestige for large institutions — standing that comes in few other forms, if any, at all but a few institutions.

Although contrary to logic, particularly those outside of academe can equate success on the football field with excellence generally. It is human nature to want to be associated with something broadly perceived to be significant — and to want to support such entities in tangible ways. Spectator sports, sometimes uniquely, provide this on campuses that are otherwise often widely known for little else.

### THE USES OF INSTITUTIONAL IDENTIFICATION

Scholars often neglect that institutions develop and then underscore their unique cultures with a purpose, particularly in relation to external constituents: to encourage identification with the institution among key constituents. Through institutional identification, institutional culture has uses, causing constituents to think of a given institution as “their” institution.

Institutional identification results from constituents considering their institution to be distinctive, central, and enduring — and appreciating that others view their institution in the same way. Although plausible claims of excellence in teaching, research, and service also must be part of the mix, spectator sports allow a community to relate to something that they perceive to be significant — a perception that is heightened because they know it is widely shared. Spectator sports provide a convenient vehicle through which external constituents, in particular, can relate to universities and thus identify with them, coming to think of the institutions as their own.

Through the external-relations functions, U.S. universities exploit the tendency of people to want to associate themselves with such esteemed places, translating identification with institutions into tangible support for them. External relations also draws on the local pride and civic boosterism that institutions have used since the nineteenth century to leverage the resources needed to advance their academic and other ends. Universities have long encouraged community support to build institutions to rival those of “back East” and at least match those of their neighbors. Local pride and institutional identification are thus the keys to the effective external relations that enable institutions to realize their ambitions not only to sustain themselves, but also to establish the programs, secure the personnel, and develop the facilities that enhance their perceptions and claims of importance.

In connecting key constituents to the institutions that they come to want to support, spectator sports are thus a critical tool in external relations at large universities, serving those in alumni relations, development, governmental relations, public affairs, and admissions. These events make institutions accessible and desirable — and thus seeming worthy of support.

In many of their other activities, research universities do not have such an advantage. Much of what they do, say most nonapplied research, is distant.
and incomprehensible to the parents, legislators, and donors who support universities. Highlighting spectator sports and other approachable functions such as undergraduate education and economic-development activities provides cover. They are thus central in the strategic approach to the acquisition of resources necessary for institution building at large universities.

Building identification among key constituents through those means that are available to universities, such as spectator sports, is perhaps their critical pursuit. It provides the foundation of resources that enables all manner of institutional undertakings, including the core academic ones.

AMATEUR IDEALS AND COMMERCIAL REALITIES

Using spectator sports as a tool in enhancing identification and acquiring resources can be a double-edged sword, of course. While serving academic life, albeit indirectly, spectator sports can be distant from it. Spectator sports are not focused on student development but instead on the experience of those attending or watching games, most of whom spend little time thinking about the university otherwise. (The opposite is true, once again, of all other nonspectator college sports, which do little to enable resource acquisition but have aims similar to other extracurricular activities.)

The amateur ideal at the foundation of spectator sports is a fiction that inherently invites corruption, exploitation, and deception, as institutions attempt to fit the square peg that is a commercial and professional venture into the round hole of the amateur ideal. As athletic departments are increasingly pressed to balance their budgets, the temptations toward further commercialism and professionalism and the need to win on the field or on the court have grown ever stronger. These trends push spectator sports even further from the amateur ideals on which they are justified.

But a similar point can be made about U.S. universities more generally — institutions that justify their existence on the basis of serving the local communities that support them can stray from these ends when seeking national standing. When institutions focus on the prestige that comes with large research programs, it can be at the expense of other missions — namely undergraduate teaching and public service (though certainly not to the degree that Sperber suggests). As with teaching and service, amateurism in sports is more about the process than the reward. Initiatives and activities that advance national standing are often more analogous to the commercial world. Institutions, of course, do not necessarily announce these more commercial pursuits to external constituents or undergraduate students. Instead, they focus on what is more accessible — collegiate life, which is linked with the teaching and service to which constituencies other than faculty can more directly relate . . . and spectator sports.

Framing spectator sports as amateurism is increasingly difficult. We have long been calling spectator sports one thing while the reality has been another thing entirely. In much the same way, large universities have framed their missions only in academic terms, considering the collegiate and commercial aspects of institutional life, if at all, as a necessary add-on but not as being central. Yet institutions have sold themselves to external constituents and undergraduate students through the collegiate ideal, essentially “hiding the ball” in terms of activities (say, research in the humanities) that are less accessible to relevant audiences and likely to be less popular with them. Large institutions have used the collegiate ideal, particularly in the form of spectator sports, to present a familiar and friendly face to the public that supports them. Institutions have similarly highlighted teaching and campus life — and have framed their increasingly and perhaps essentially commercial nature in such “amateur” terms, suggesting that it is more about process than ends (“it is not whether you win or lose, but how you play the game”).

Much of institutional life at large institutions is about winning, however. Amateurism in athletics falls apart when incentives to win cause it to focus on competition and success and not simply on the personal development of student-athletes through participation in sports. Because institutions are in a constant and intense battle for resources and prestige, they frame their efforts in much the same way. Particularly at large institutions, enhancing national standing through building research programs is about competition and success.

My argument here is not necessarily about changing universities, but making what they do and how and why they do it more transparent. Indeed, public perceptions about high-profile sports are increasingly realistic, particularly on the part of a more aggressive and more cynical media. The power of spectator sports then may be used as a lens for understanding the landscape in U.S. higher education more generally — the unarticulated significance of competition in institutional life, particularly as it is directed toward achieving the essentially commercial end of institution building at U.S. universities.

J. Douglas Toma is associate professor at the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia and dean of the Franklin Residential College. He is the author of Football U.: Spectator Sports in the Life of the American University (Michigan, 2003).


True history and good stories work at cross purposes. History, in fact, is a rambling mess, which stories tidy up. Successful narratives feature heroes and heroines, clear plotlines, and neat beginnings and endings. To make real happenings fit these narrative forms, the raconteurs of history must shuffle things around and sweep more than we care to admit under the rug. In real life, clumsy Goliath generally overwhelms clever David, but you would never guess it from the tales we hear or read.

Individual lives are easier to contain, and perhaps that is why history is so often served up in the form of biography. This tendency certainly has been true in recent years. Readers by the millions have devoured books on Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Franklin, and Hamilton — the Founding Fathers, those few patriots who, like David, beat back Goliath (the mighty British Empire) to forge a nation. Bestselling authors such as Joseph Ellis and David McCullough have taken these majestic figures off of their marble pedestals and humanized them, placing their private lives on public display.

In 2001, McCullough set the standard for “Founder Chic” (as academic historians have labeled this trend) with his monumental *John Adams*. In his latest book, *1776*, McCullough seems to take a different turn. Broadening his scope from personal biography to military history, he introduces characters unknown to most Americans. In this narrative of the Continental Army from mid-1775 to early 1777, he presents a wide sampling of letters and diaries of common soldiers, along with those of their officers. In rhythmic prose, clear yet richly textured, he evokes powerful images of an army struggling to survive.

That is the backdrop, but it is not the main story. As the narrative proceeds, what appears at first glance to be a portrait of an army evolves into a tribute to the leadership of George Washington. Joseph Ellis, in his latest book, *His Excellency*, calls Washington “The Foundingest Father of them all.” McCullough, in *1776*, echoes this sentiment by detailing Washington’s “truly exceptional” performance at a critical juncture during his military career.

McCullough’s narrative is masterful, but the packaging is troubling. The year 1776 resonates because it marked American independence; indeed, it resonates so convincingly that there is no subtitle for this book. Yet McCullough refers to the declaring of independence, the moment of our nation’s birth, only in passing. He says nothing about what American civilians were doing during that eventful year, in which their political, social, and economic lives were turning topsy-turvy. Instead, he tells only the military story, zeroing in on a single, highly touted figure.

Military tales have their own narrative demands. To make battles into stories, authors focus on strategies, maneuvers, decisions. This focus means that officers assume command not only of their soldiers, but also of the stories. They are the agents who move the plot along. Military writing, like Founder Chic, treats history from the top down. We, the readers, then buy into these tales by rooting for one side. These narrative structures reinforce a very narrow view of patriotism — our nation out-competes the others — while masking a deeper patriotism, based on the American Revolution’s insistence that people must govern themselves.

Historically speaking, McCullough’s treatment of the Continental Army is far from complete. In three hundred pages, McCullough devotes only two isolated paragraphs to the Quebec Expedition, the only major American offensive during the opening eighteen months of the Revolutionary War. The attack on Quebec was the largest battle between June of 1775 and August of 1776 — the bulk of the time frame covered in his book — yet it finds no place in McCullough’s narrative.

McCullough is not alone in ignoring Quebec, for the notion that we started our revolution by invading another country has always troubled U.S. historians. But McCullough has another reason to bypass this important episode: Washington was not there, and he uses Washington to drive his narrative. In *1776*, we read how George Washington slept (or did not sleep) at troubling times. We are introduced to a supporting cast of officers who develop relationships with each other and with Washington. We do not, however, learn much about relationships among common soldiers, and we are treated to only fleeting glimpses of their personal lives.

These characters, as individuals, do not grow or evolve. They function instead as a popular chorus. The feisty but untrained farmers-turned-soldiers serve as foils for our hero, who has to rein them in. We see them fleeing from battle at New York, as Washington braves enemy fire to rally the troops.

All this makes for a very good story but also for misleading history. In fact, common farmers led the way in casting off British authority back in 1774, and by the time that Washington assumed command in the summer of 1775, the Continental Army was already a functioning unit. Before
Washington signed on, Continental soldiers had already killed more British soldiers in a single battle (Bunker Hill) than they would at any other time.

In his previous book, McCullough writes, “John Adams, more than anyone, made it [independence] happen.” He concludes 1776 with a similar proclamation: “Without Washington’s leadership and unrelenting perseverance, the revolution almost certainly would have failed.” But without John Adams, American citizens still might have declared independence, and fighting under some other commander-in-chief, American soldiers might still have prevailed in battle. The converse is not true. Without the drive of American citizens, the bedrock of revolution, both John Adams and George Washington would have been inconsequential figures.

Gary Nash, in The Unknown American Revolution, approaches history from the bottom up rather than the top down. Reflecting a more democratic perspective, he casts a very different set of characters in leading roles: blacks, Indians, women, white males of “the lesser sort” (as they were known at the time), and a host of crusaders for justice and equality. In Nash’s narrative the traditional roles are reversed: Washington, Adams, and company play only bit parts, serving as foils to his “unknown” heroes and heroines.

Although Nash’s approach might appear new to nonacademics, he works within an established tradition. Almost a century ago, Progressive historians brought the lower classes into play by arguing that the Revolution was concerned not only with “home rule,” but also with “who should rule at home.” Social historians in the past few decades have taken up where the Progressives left off, treating issues of race and gender as well as class and bringing to light a host of previously forgotten historical players. In The Unknown American Revolution, Gary Nash takes on the overwhelming task of weaving the diverse strands of this new research into a single narrative. “The book’s thrust,” he writes, “is to complicate the well-established core narrative by putting before the reader bold figures, ideas, and movements, highlighting the true radicalism of the American Revolution that was indispensable to the origins, conduct, character, and outcome of the world-shaking event.”

Nash’s tapestry is necessarily large and complex, held together more by theme than by plot. His protagonists, an unruly lot indeed (as his subtitle implies), push forward a wide array of radical agendas. Evangelical Christians challenge ecclesiastical authority. Tenant farmers threaten their landlords. Urban laborers riot to achieve economic and political ends. Men without property claim the right to vote. Abolitionists seek to end slavery, while slaves themselves find their own paths to freedom. Indians seek to preserve their sovereignty, while Indian-hating whites, whom Nash admits are radical in their own way, resist governmental authority and take matters into their own hands.

How these various subplots relate to the dominant narrative of the American Revolution — colonials seeking political independence from Great Britain — is open to question. Some episodes, such as the Stamp Act riots or the toppling of British authority by Massachusetts farmers the year before Lexington and Concord, are certainly linked to the central story. The role of tenant uprisings or religious bickering is less clear, but Nash argues that an overarching climate of unrest contributed both to American independence (“home rule”) and the attempt to reshape American society (“who should rule at home”). In any case, this encyclopedic compendium of strident discontent — economic, social, political, racial, and religious — establishes convincingly that during the American Revolution, the dispossessed fought to claim their share.

However relevant, the information that Nash introduces is so overwhelming that it will be difficult to incorporate within the limits of a “core narrative.” We like to keep our stories neat and orderly, uncluttered by too much complexity. Ironically, the narrative of our nation’s founding should be even more complicated than the one that Nash has presented. The “middling sorts” also need to find a place on stage, alongside Washington and Adams, favored by McCullough, and Nash’s “lesser sorts.” To highlight all of these groups, taking into full account critical variables such as class, race, region, religion, and gender, and including the complex web of alliances between these groups as well as their more visible conflicts, would take us well beyond the boundaries that traditionally contain a narrative. The sprawling story of the American Revolution is becoming harder, not easier, to tell.

Ray Raphael is the author of twelve books, including People’s History of the American Revolution, The First American Revolution, and most recently, Founding Myths: Stories that Hide Our Patriotic Past. He can be contacted through his Web site, rayraphael.com.


Southern writers have big shoes to fill. We are all familiar with Thomas Wolfe’s unforgettable reminder that “You can’t go home again.” And Faulkner’s famous lines, “I don’t hate the south. I don’t. I don’t,” will always ring in the ears of southern readers who understand Quentin Compson’s love-hate relationship with his native land. But even though these themes have already been treated by the literary giants who came before the present generation of “new” southern writers, Joshilyn Jackson’s gods in Alabama addresses the age-old theme of the displaced southerner’s relationship with home and family with an interesting twist.
From the very first sentence, Jackson draws the reader in: “There are gods in Alabama. Jack Daniel’s, high school quarterbacks, trucks, big tits, and also Jesus. I left one back there myself, back in Possett. I kicked it under the kudzu and left it to the roaches.” Only a writer with a keen eye and a deft hand could pull off a story that is set in an area of the country where George Bush and Jesus share space on one in every three Tahoe bumpers — where even admirable characters are racists — and still present these incongruities in a way that touches the readers’ hearts rather than giving them heartburn.

Jackson’s main character, Arlene Fleet, promised God ten years ago that she would stop having sex, stop lying, and, most importantly, never go home again to Possett, Alabama, if He kept His end of the deal: to make sure the body of Jim Beverly, the high school football quarterback whose head she bashed in on Lipsmack Hill, is never found. In spite of her new life in Chicago, Arlene continues dutifully to call home every week out of respect for her Aunt Florence and Uncle Bruster, who raised her and who still care for her mentally ill mother. Aunt Florence, the typical southern-female force to be reckoned with, is hurt and angry that her niece has not returned home in a decade. She uses kind Uncle Bruster’s retirement party as leverage to guilt-trip Arlene home again.

What Aunt Florence does not know, though, is that Arlene is in a serious relationship with a delightful lawyer named Burr. When Burr insists that if Arlene will not introduce him to her family, he will end their relationship, she finds herself in a quandary: Burr is black, and her family is racist. Add the appearance of a ghost from the past, Rose Mae Lolley, who was also on Lipsmack Hill the night that Arlene hit Jim Beverly over the head with the bottle, and the plot quickly thickens as Arlene and Burr head to Possett to meet her family and attend the retirement party. Of course, foremost in Arlene’s mind is doing damage control. She is breaking one of her promises in the deal with God, and she is terrified about what might happen next.

The novel is strong on plot, and Jackson’s characters are a nicely delineated, though somewhat stock: the formidable older female, the crazy mama, the pretty cousin, the headstrong “odd girl out” who loves the family but leaves for saner territory. The women in the novel are far stronger and better developed than the men, with the exception of Burr. While not quite as memorable as Lucille in Mark Childress’s Crazy in Alabama, Arlene Fleet tells a story worth reading. And Joshilyn Jackson is a name to remember.

Marian Carcache’s short stories, articles, and reviews have appeared in Shenandoah, Chattahoochee Review, Southern Humanities Review, Bronte Society Transactions and other journals. Her work has been anthologized in Due South, Belles Lettres, Crossroads: Stories of the Southern Literary Fantastic, and, mostly recently, Climbing Mt. Cheaha: Emerging Alabama Writers. Under the Arbor, an opera made from her short story and for which she wrote the libretto, appeared on PBS stations nationwide, was nominated for a regional Emmy, and was a finalist in the New York Festivals. She is recipient of the Alabama State Council on the Arts’ 2003–2004 Fellowship Award for fiction. Marian grew up in rural Russell County, Alabama, and now lives in Auburn with her son and five dogs. She teaches English part-time and is studying Traditional Chinese Medicine as an apprentice at Auburn Acupuncture.
PRESENT TENSE

I sat in the back of my thin blue truck
with you once, used the excuse of a lazy
eye to avoid you, withdraw a bit of you
for keeping if you go,
when you go.
I am not a man of easy life.

I interpret light heaven side down,
project it to the back of my skull
and watch the scenes unfold,
cell by cell,
quickstop movement and shadows
adding depth, indicating when to pause,
when to breathe, when to touch you, gently,
on the back of your hand,
above the wrist and
beneath the time you’ve taken from me.

You are the closest I have come to turning back
to the sand, the salt, the
barren wives of Orpheus and Lot,
to denying the downward pull,
the decay of flowers, pine needles and
earth in my fingers because I have
touched my grave inside you.

You are closest I have come to looking up
and straight ahead.

SEAN ROSS

Sean Ross teaches ninth- and tenth-grade English at a
school for the arts in Phoenix, Arizona. He has written
for many years, and his work has appeared in The George
Washington Review, The Georgia State University
Review, and The Beacon Street Review (among others).
He can be reached at mrross480@yahoo.com.
Letters to the Editor

COMPUTER GAMES

I enjoyed my last issue of the Forum, especially the “President’s Page” [Summer 2005, Vol. 85, No. 2, page 2]. It was interesting to see some of the luminaries who have been members of this fine organization, including liberal icons such as Carter, Clinton, and Gore. It’s a shame that there have been no famous conservative members in 108 years!

I also enjoyed Andrea Ickes-Dunbar’s provocative article on testing [“Testing, Testing,” Forum on Education & Academics, page 3]. As a teacher, I share some of her frustration with “no child left behind” and unreasonable achievement goals. Unfortunately, she goes off the reservation with her conspiracy theory that standardized tests actually may be a vehicle for carrying out a covert political-power agenda under the guise of equal opportunity. It’s precisely this kind of hyperbole that hurts our credibility and makes teachers and their unions the greatest obstacles to reform.

Keep up the good work.

Mike Connors
Palm Coast, Florida

I must state at the outset that I am not a member of Phi Kappa Phi; my wife is. You published a column called “Testing, Testing” in the Summer 2005 issue of the Forum. I must say that is the longest celebration of mediocrity that I have ever read. Toward the end the author threatens to retire — she would almost certainly advance the cause of education by doing so.

Robert C. Whitten
Cupertino, California

Now that you have explored the fascinating world of comics and computer games [“Sequential Art: The Comics,” Summer 2004; “Computer Games,” Summer 2005], I just can’t wait for the Barbie and Ken fashion issue.

I would like to point out a couple of things about the gaming issue of the magazine. The first is that I am amazed that the issue did not mention games of chance, especially those conducted by online casinos. From what I understand, the internet would not exist if it were not for the revenues generated from online gambling and pornography.

Second, the article that lauded computer games for allowing its users to experience learning curves is somewhat flawed. Many gamers buy publications that contain tips on how to beat the games. Perhaps some gamers would never think of using these publications. But there must be a sizeable market for them, or they would not exist. Perhaps children are learning that cheating can be rewarding in some situations.

Donald Cart
Amherst, Ohio

I just wanted to take the time to thank you for the Summer 2005 issue of Phi Kappa Phi Forum. As editor-in-chief of GamEnlight (http://www.gamenlight.com), I am always on the lookout for articles that propose an insightful, valuable credit to video and computer games.

Collectively, the articles discussed games on a realistic level and provided interesting, useful, even critical information for those not only interested in the industry, but also for those wishing to join it. Individually, they also provided an eye-opener for people who know relatively little about games, how they affect people, and what they have to offer. Considering the more-than-occasional “bad rap” that video and computer games have received and continue to receive, articles like these are needed.

Ami Kriho
(http://www.gamenlight.com)

Upcoming Issues of the Forum:

Winter/Spring 2006: Is the Sky Falling?
Summer 2006: Founders
SPEAKING OF SLEEP

At night when the oil of sleep rejects its own slick crossing over, take any offer of arms or legs or heavy downpour where water is taught to heap and heap upon itself all that rest requires.

Most of the body exists as liquid — casting its own red wash into the faith of muscle where atoms are mostly empty space . . .

Too soon you snap and fracture with sound, heavy with morning’s ideas: first steam, then straw, then weight. On the verge of yourself you settle, become straight, acquire bones. Intent on speech, you breathe out vowels with friction, then speak in language that everyone understands.

PATRICIA SPENCER

Patricia Spencer works as a composition consultant in the writing center at Indiana University’s southeast campus. She is a native of Indiana and holds a Bachelor of Arts in English from Indiana University. She has worked as the assistant editor of The Louisville Review. Her poetry has appeared in Poem, Southern Poetry Review, Cimarron Review, Ellipsis, Artful Dodge, Sou’wester, Midwest Poetry Review, Santa Barbara Review, The Hampden-Sydney Poetry Review, and others.
Exciting New Benefits for Active Phi Kappa Phi Members

**PHI KAPPA PHI PARTNERS WITH DELL TO OFFER DISCOUNTS**

Effective immediately, active (annual dues paid) Phi Kappa Phi members will receive up to 30 percent off of Dell products, including desktop computers, notebooks, plasma TVs, printers, MP3 players, and more! The size of the discount depends on the specific product. In the market for a new home computer? You’re looking at between $75 to $400 off of your Dell computer purchase. This new partnership with Dell is just one example of Phi Kappa Phi’s commitment to providing you with valuable benefits throughout your academic and professional life.

**NEW PARTNERSHIP WITH LIBERTY MUTUAL**

As a member of Phi Kappa Phi, you can now save on your auto and home insurance with Group Savings Plus® from Liberty Mutual.

Some of the benefits you will enjoy are:

- An exclusive group discount of up to 10 percent off of already-competitive rates.
- Guaranteed rates for 12 months.
- Convenient payment plans.
- Round-the-clock claims service.

For more information about the new partnership with Liberty Mutual, visit PhiKappaPhi.org.

Boston-based Liberty Mutual is one of the largest multi-line insurers in the property and casualty industry. The company is the eighth-largest provider of personal lines insurance in the United States, and sells full lines of coverage for homeowners, automobile, valuable possessions, and personal liability, as well as a wide range of traditional and variable life insurance and annuity products, through more than 370 local sales offices, two call centers, and through payroll deduction and direct billing to more than 8,500 participating companies, credit unions, and professional and alumni associations.

**“WOMEN FOR HIRE” NETWORK MEMBERSHIP**

As an exclusive benefit for Phi Kappa Phi members, Women For Hire is offering a free network membership ($38 value). Women For Hire Network is a company committed to empowering career-focused women through a variety of programs that includes such features as “Ask Tory & Team,” which allows you to submit a personalized question for a guaranteed response; a network Web site; and newsletters. It also includes a free monthly conference call hosted by various experts. Visit http://www.womenforhire.com/network/index. Ask for full membership details. To take advantage of this free offer, e-mail michelle@womenforhire.com and include Phi Kappa Phi in the subject line.

For more information on all member benefits, including instructions on how to redeem member discounts, visit the secure “Members Only” portion of the Phi Kappa Phi Web site at PhiKappaPhi.org.

**NEW PARTNERSHIP WITH BECKER PROFESSIONAL REVIEW**

For all active Phi Kappa Phi members pursuing a career in accounting, a new member benefit has been secured to help you prepare for the CPA exam. An exclusive new partnership with Becker Professional Review will allow active Phi Kappa Phi members to receive a $250 discount on Becker’s four-part CPA-preparation course. Additionally, a $100 discount is available to Phi Kappa Phi members who enroll in the Stalla Review for the CFA Exams’ CFA review course.
In Memoriam:
James T. Barrs

On September 1, 2005, James T. Barrs, long-time member and national officer of Phi Kappa Phi and copy editor for the *Phi Kappa Phi Forum*, passed away at age 100, on the eve of his 101st birthday.

To say that Dr. Barrs will be missed is an understatement of epic proportions. Quite probably the Society’s oldest member at the time of his death, James Barrs leaves a legacy of volunteerism and pride in Phi Kappa Phi surpassed by none. As immediate past Society president Wendell McKenzie puts it, “Jim Barrs lived 101 of our Society’s 108 years (nearly 94 percent); his devotion to Phi Kappa Phi was significantly greater.” Executive Director Perry Snyder expressed these thoughts on Dr. Barrs’s passing: “Dr. Barrs had such a zest for life. His enthusiasm was contagious. He was an inspiration to all who shared his commitment to honor and excellence.”

Born on September 2, 1904, in Georgia, James Barrs attended the University of Georgia as an undergraduate and then Harvard University, receiving his PhD in comparative philology in 1936. He served as principal and teacher of Latin, French, and mathematics at Lavonia High School in Lavonia, Georgia; as registrar, English teacher, and dean of Academic Administration at South Georgia College in Douglas, Georgia; professor of English and acting chairman of the department of English at Washington College in Chestertown, Maryland; and finally as assistant, associate, and full professor of English at Northeastern University in Boston, Massachusetts, from 1945 to 1971. Dr. Barrs epitomized the ideal of a love for learning for which Phi Kappa Phi stands.

In addition, his commitment to the Society itself was unparalleled. A charter member of the Northeastern University chapter, he was secretary and then president of the chapter. Beginning in 1965, he served as Eastern Region vice president until 1986 and vice president of the new Northeast Region from 1986 to 1989. During his time as a regional vice president, his travels up and down the eastern seaboard to spread the gospel of Phi Kappa Phi and to recruit colleges to establish new chapters became legendary, as did the number of chapters he helped to get started.

After his time on the Board ended, Dr. Barrs brought his formidable learning to bear on the *Forum*, beginning in 1991 as a volunteer copy editor. He worked on every issue until he passed his 100th birthday in 2004, “retiring” with the Fall 2004 issue. As his son, Andy Barrs, relates about his father, “He admitted to me with a gentle smile that I will never forget that he had two goals in the final stages of his life: to reach the age of 100 and to be a copy editor for the *Forum* at the age of 100.” He reached both of those goals.

Northeast Region vice president Ron Johnson of Old Dominion University recalled how Dr. Barrs’s enthusiasm for Phi Kappa Phi was instrumental in getting him involved in the Society and in getting a chapter set up at ODU: “It was my extreme pleasure to have known Jim Barrs for nearly thirty years. His devotion to Phi Kappa Phi was clearly evident in his active role as Eastern and Northeast Region vice president for twenty-four years and then to continue to serve as copy editor for the *Forum*. I thank Jim Barrs for giving me the motivation to continue serving the Society myself. We will miss his deep devotion to Phi Kappa Phi.”

Society president Paul Ferlazzo sums up everyone’s feelings for James T. Barrs in this way: “Throughout his life, Jim Barrs gave generously of his time to Phi Kappa Phi. He will be deeply missed by all who knew him.”
Profiles in Philanthropy:
William J. Wolfe

In this Profile in Philanthropy, Phi Kappa Phi would like to recognize and convey appreciation to visionary philanthropist William J. Wolfe of Tucson, Arizona. Mr. Wolfe chose to make a gift to Phi Kappa Phi of stocks that had appreciated in value. Working with his financial advisor, he made a tax-wise gift to endow a Graduate Fellowship in memory of his paternal grandfather, Alfred M. Wolfe. This interview, conducted by Executive Director Perry A. Snyder, introduces Mr. Wolfe and his reasons for making a leadership gift to the Foundation.

PAS: Where and when were you initiated into Phi Kappa Phi?

WJW: In 1994, the year I received the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Art from the University of Arizona (UA).

PAS: What did the honor mean to you then?

WJW: I was deeply grateful to be given Phi Kappa Phi membership together with the distinctive honor of graduating magna cum laude from the UA College of Fine Arts.

PAS: And what does Phi Kappa Phi mean to you now?

WJW: It’s an endless thrill to be associated with such an extensive and splendid organization dedicated to the pursuit and love of learning. I enjoy reading the Society’s publications and keeping up with news of its widespread encouragement for scholarship.

PAS: Why did you choose to honor your grandfather [Alfred M. Wolfe] by having a Phi Kappa Phi fellowship named for him?

WJW: My paternal grandfather has meant a great deal to me throughout my life. More than anyone else, he inspired me to take up public school teaching for a career, to place great value on family life, and to regard nature with unceasing awe and wonder. In many ways, except for preferring city life to farming, I have modeled my own life after his. He was a one-room country school teacher of grades K–8 for some thirty years in Indiana. Among his many pupils were his own three children. Besides teaching, he delighted in farming as a livelihood and in writing as an avocation. He was the first person in our family history to earn a college degree. In fact, majoring in Classical Studies, he acquired his degree in 1897 — the same year that Phi Kappa Phi was established!

PAS: How do you feel, knowing that your grandfather’s memory will live on in perpetuity as a result of your gift?

WJW: I’m inexpressibly glad that in this significant way I can memorialize him and his good name in the fields of education and English, about which he cared very much. I designated the fellowship for graduate studies in English because my grandfather proved to me his exemplary knack for beautiful penmanship, eloquent conversation, and literary creativity.

PAS: If a Phi Kappa Phi member were to call you tomorrow to ask about your making a leadership gift to Phi Kappa Phi, what would your response be?

WJW: I would say first that Phi Kappa Phi is a community of scholars, high achievers in many areas of learning, and that it is a unique honor to be joined with people who truly appreciate educational excellence. I would say next that whoever helps to ensure due recognition and proper reward for meritorious scholarship is bound to enjoy sharing in support of the Society’s ideals.

PAS: Will you trace your gift from the time you first thought about endowing a fellowship until it was completed?

WJW: It was the July 2004 issue of the Phi Kappa Phi Focus that started me thinking about a fellowship. After seeing the pictures there of the 2004–2005 graduate fellowship winners, with captions naming their institutions and fields of study, I picked up the phone and called Phi Kappa Phi’s 800 number. You and Mrs. Barro answered each of my questions and offered suggestions that facilitated the process. As we were completing the details, you came to see me, and we had a quite satisfying visit. Literature on tax-deductible donation available from the Society Headquarters also was helpful in making the new fellowship endowment a happy reality.
Partnering for Success Workshops

Join other Phi Kappa Phi volunteers to share ideas and proven strategies for improving your chapter. Make plans now to attend one of these workshops.

St. Louis, MO
June 3–4, 2006
Marriott Airport Hotel

Portland, OR
August 5–6, 2006
Red Lion Hotel

Baton Rouge, LA
October 7–8, 2006
Cook Conference Center

For more information, go to PhiKappaPhi.org

Important Chapter Deadlines:

Promotion of Excellence Grant Applications: January 27, 2006

Literacy Grant Applications: February 1, 2006

Study Abroad Grant Applications: February 15, 2006

Graduate Fellowship Applications due to local chapter: February 1, 2006

Graduate Fellowship Nominations due to Headquarters: March 1, 2006

Welcome New Chapter!

Congratulations to chapter 296, Texas A&M International University, (Laredo, Texas) installed as a chapter of Phi Kappa Phi on November 6, 2005.

Welcome Aboard, Molly!

The Chapter Relations Department is pleased to welcome our new Chapter Relations Director, Molly Stauffer. Molly joined the Phi Kappa Phi Chapter Relations team on August 1, and she will work primarily with the chapters in the Northeast and South Central Regions as well as chapters in the upper portion of the Western Region, including Alaska, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah.

Molly was raised in Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania, and attended New York University. At NYU, she became involved in community service, which led her to join Teach for America after graduation. She was a high school teacher for four years (Special Education and Biology), recruited for three years with Teach for America, worked with Monster.com as an Educational Presenter, and then found her way to Phi Kappa Phi. She is ready, willing, and able to be a resource and looks forward to building relationships with her chapters.
Fiscal year 2004–2005 was characterized by growth in many areas of the Society, including its finances. Contributing to this expansion were moderate increases in both membership and sales revenues and more significant growth in contributions and investment income.

Dues and membership revenue showed a 2.1 percent increase over the previous fiscal year. Because there has been no fee change in membership dues in more than two years, this growth is directly related to an increase in the number of renewing and active-for-life members.

Two major gifts resulted in a 60 percent increase in contributions revenue. William J. Wolfe endowed the Alfred M. Wolfe Fellowship, and Larry Sommers contributed approximately $14,000 toward a Named Study Abroad Grant (see page 45 for an interview with Mr. Wolfe). In addition to these donations, a check for $1,230 was received from the estate of Florence Trail Dowling, a former member of the Society. Even though donations to the Fundraiser and to specific Foundation programs were in line with the budget, contributions to the Foundation through the billing statement failed to meet expectations.

Investment income (interest and dividends) showed significant growth over the previous year. Two factors contributed to this growth: an increase in the money-market rates and increased dividend distribution by corporations. Total investment income for the year amounted to $871,436, an amount approximately $300,000 higher than last year’s figure.

Because investment performance was moderate in comparison to last year, net capital gains were down by approximately $700,000. Overall, investment portfolios grew by 6.6 percent, compared to a 23 percent growth rate last year. The market value of the Phi Kappa Phi investments at the close of the fiscal year on June 30, 2005, was $28,597,011.

Online sales and the sale of merchandise at the Convention were mainly responsible for a modest $2,700 increase in sales revenue. A merchandise promotional piece will be printed in 2005–2006 to help boost this source of revenue.

Royalties and Subscriptions showed a decline over the amount reported for the prior year. Decreases in both Forum revenue and MBNA royalties were responsible for the decline. We hope that a recent rate increase for credit card usage will result in increased revenues from that source for fiscal year 2005–2006.

Total Revenues for the year amounted to $4,882,745. This amount is $.5 million higher than the amount budgeted for the year.

Factors affecting expenses for 2004–2005 included the reconfiguration of the awards program, the Triennial Convention, the establishment of the new Marketing and Member Benefits Department, the engagement of Public Relations consultant services, and the hiring of a second Chapter Relations Director.

Reallocations from publications funding to the salary, public relations, and related budget lines made possible the hiring of consultants and the establishment of the new Marketing and Member Benefits Department without straining the budget. Total expenses for the year amounted to $3,136,257. This amount is 5 percent higher than last year’s corresponding figure but was 14 percent under budget projections. Net income for 2004–2005 was $1,746,488. Budgeted net income totaled $695,904.
Separate and Unequal: Homer Plessy and the Supreme Court Decision that Legalized Racism

Harvey Fireside

Separate and Unequal describes the vibrant black Creole community of New Orleans that brought the Plessy v. Ferguson test case before the Supreme Court. The Plessy decision upheld Louisiana’s segregation law, with only one justice dissenting. The book also presents evidence that constitutional measures to ensure full citizenship to African Americans had been used for decades to shield corporate business from state regulations.

Harvey Fireside was inducted into the Ithaca College chapter of Phi Kappa Phi in 1986.

How Communities Build Stronger Schools: Stories, Strategies and Promising Practices for Educating Every Child

Ann Wescott Dodd and Jean L. Konzal

If it takes a village to raise a child, Ann Wescott Dodd and Jean L. Konzal believe that it takes a community to make a school. Educating children to be confident, competent, caring adults requires much more than teaching them only the 3 R’s — a challenge no school can meet by itself. Thus, Dodd and Konzal present a radical democratic vision of the public school where everyone — not just students, teachers, and parents — plays a part in shaping our children and, consequently, our future.

Ann Wescott Dodd was inducted into the University of Maine chapter of Phi Kappa Phi in 1983.

Breaking Out of the Pink-Collar Ghetto: Policy Solutions for Non-College Women

Sharon H. Mastracci

Widely interdisciplinary in appeal, this book reports on the successes of innovative job-training opportunities for non-college women who end up in low-paying, low-mobility, pink-collar jobs. The author examines the relative effectiveness of various programs in helping these women gain access to high-wage, high-mobility employment opportunities. The book addresses vital issues concerning the effects of gender segregation in career counseling and employment and training policy.

Sharon H. Mastracci was inducted into the University of Texas at Austin chapter of Phi Kappa Phi in 1998.

Running with the Bulls: My Years with the Hemingways

Valerie Hemingway

With clarity and candor, Valerie Hemingway recounts her two years spent as personal secretary, confidante, and friend to Ernest and Mary Hemingway, the last two years of Ernest Hemingway’s life, and her later marriage to Gregory Hemingway, one of Hemingway’s sons. From a rooftop encounter with Fidel Castro to smuggling manuscripts and artwork out of Cuba after Hemingway’s death, Valerie Hemingway played an indispensable role in the lives of two generations of Hemingways.

Valerie Hemingway was inducted into the Montana State University chapter of Phi Kappa Phi in 1989.
Phi Kappa Phi Webinar to Feature America’s Top Career Counselor

“60 Seconds and You’re Hired!”
Tuesday, February 7, 2006
1:00–1:45 p.m. Central Time
Presented by Robin Ryan

Phi Kappa Phi’s upcoming Webinar on interviewing techniques is designed to help you get the job you want at the salary you deserve. This live, interactive, online presentation will cover:

- Answers to tough interview questions;
- How to establish your career identity and personal brand in the opening minutes using the 60 Second Sell™;
- Important questions to ask that will impress the employer;
- Interview pitfalls to avoid;
- Negotiation techniques for securing the best salary and benefits package possible.

Author, career coach, and national speaker, Robin Ryan has appeared on Oprah, Dr. Phil, NBC Nightly News, CNN, CNBC, CBS Evening News, PBS, and is considered America’s top career coach. Robin’s books can help you advance your career: 60 Seconds & You’re Hired!; Winning Résumés; Winning Cover Letters, and What to Do with the Rest of Your Life. Robin’s career counseling practice offers various services and packages to help you land a better job or promotion. Details at: www.RobinRyan.com.

This opportunity is FREE to active (annual dues paid) Phi Kappa Phi members. For information on how to participate, visit PhiKappaPhi.org/webinar.

Second issue of Phi Kappa Phi E-zine now Available

The second issue of the Honor Cord has been posted at www.phikappaphi.org/HC_October2005/index.html.

It features articles on traveling abroad, the job search, networking skills, identity theft, fitness, the Phi Kappa Phi Bookshelf, and links of interest to all members.

Check it out today!
**Member News**

**Rhodes Scholar**

Chauncy S. Harris, Jr. (University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire), is one of thirty-two Americans to be chosen as 2005 Rhodes Scholars. Harris is a geography and history major. The Rhodes Scholarships provide for two to three years of study at the University of Oxford in England. Mr. Harris is the first Rhodes Scholar to be elected from the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire.

**Member Wins NSF Mentoring Award**

Elizabeth Yanik, PhD (Emporia State University), a professor of mathematics at Emporia State University, was one of nine winners of the National Science Foundation's 2004 Presidential Award for Excellence in Science, Mathematics, and Engineering Mentoring. She was honored along with the other winners at a White House ceremony; a $10,000 grant is part of the award.

**Tau Beta Pi National Outstanding Advisor**

Sally G. Steadman, PhD (University of Wyoming), has been named as the 2005 Tau Beta Pi National Outstanding Advisor. Dr. Steadman is advisor to the Alabama Upsilon Chapter and instructor of engineering at the University of South Alabama. She was honored at the 100th annual national convention of Tau Beta Pi on October 8.

**Alpha Lambda Delta Awards**

Members Jason Gapko (University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire), Sravanya Gavini (University of Alabama-Birmingham), Janine Ireland (Wesleyan College), Jessica Meulbroek (University of Wisconsin-Platteville), and Peter Vu (East Tennessee State University) have been named to receive 2005–2006 Alpha Lambda Delta Fellowships.

**Members Receive Tau Beta Pi Scholarships and Fellowships**

The Tau Beta Pi Engineering Honorary has announced the winners of its 2005–2006 Undergraduate Scholarships and Graduate Fellowships. Among the winners are several Phi Kappa Phi members. Winners of the $2,000 Undergraduate Scholarships were Kyle A. Frazier (Mississippi State University), Kellen D. Sick (University of Southern California), Melodie E. Benford (Louisiana Tech University), Cressel D. Anderson (Cedarville University), Sajjad Hassan (University of Alabama-Birmingham), and Bijan Hosseininejad (Youngstown State University). Winners of the Graduate Fellowships were Drew A. Hall (University of Nevada, Las Vegas), Michael S. Lorence (Virginia Military Institute), Luke A. Parchment (United States Naval Academy), Karan Singh (Louisiana State University), Raymond R. Foltz (The Citadel), Erin K. Onceda (University of California-Davis), Keith E. Jackson (Clarkson University), Daniel J. Abbott (University of North Carolina at Charlotte), and Nicholas R. Ballor (Michigan Technical University).

**College Academic Team**

Members Daniel Boothe (Radford University) and Trevor Thompson (U.S. Naval Academy) were among only twenty students to be named to the 2005 USA Today All-USA College Academic Team.
**Member News continued**

**Tony Atwater**, PhD (Youngstown State University), has been named president of Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

**Molly C. Ball** (Clemson University) received the Faculty Scholarship Award for highest scholastic achievement at Clemson University.

**Charlotte Barnes** (Florida State University) has had a song, “Shining City,” that has earned a music publishing agreement through Paramount Group in Nashville, Tennessee. In addition, her first book, *Creative Mojo: The Brainstormer's Book of Gift Ideas for Anytime*, has been published by PublishAmerica.

**Linda Bleicken**, PhD (Georgia Southern University), has been named provost at Georgia Southern University.

**Bruce E. Burstein**, PhD (The Ohio State University), has been named dean of the College of Arts and Science at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville.

**W. Franklin Coppersmith, III** (Samford University), has been promoted to Deputy General Counsel at DuPont Photomask, Inc. in Round Rock, Texas. DuPont Photomask is the manufacturer of photomasks, a critical component in the production of semiconductors.

**David E. Daniel**, PhD (University of Illinois Urbana/Champaign), has been named president of the University of Texas at Dallas.

**Robyn Dawes**, PhD (Carnegie Mellon University), was honored by the American Psychological Society (APS) with a Festschrift, a collection of essays about Dawes’s work, written by colleagues from across the nation. Dawes’s work in such areas as judgment and decision-making, cooperation and social dilemmas, and intuition and irrationality earned him the honor. The Festschrift is based on presentations given during a day-long discussion of his work held at the APS meeting in Los Angeles, May 26–29, 2005.

**Richard DeVault**, PhD (Northwestern State University of Louisiana), received the Distinguished Teaching Award from the Mathematical Association of America, Louisiana-Mississippi section. The award is presented annually to an outstanding college or university instructor of mathematics. DeVault teaches mathematics at Northwestern State University of Louisiana.

**Stephen W. Director**, PhD (Carnegie Mellon University), has been named provost of Drexel University.

**Christina H. Dorr**, PhD (Ohio State University), was awarded a Doctorate of Education in December 2004. She is a library media specialist with the Hilliard City Schools, Hilliard, Ohio, as well as teaching as an adjunct professor at both Kent State University and Ashland University.

**Reginald Fennell**, PhD (Miami University), has been named as one of three editors for the *Journal of American College Health*, which is the professional journal for the American College Health Association (ACHA). Dr. Fennell served as president of the ACHA in 2003–2004. Dr. Fennell is a professor of health education at Miami University.

**Donald J. Foss**, PhD (Florida State University), has been named vice president for Academic Affairs at the University of Houston Main Campus.

**Barbara Freed**, PhD (Carnegie Mellon University), had her film, *A Model for Matisse: The Story of the Venice Chapel*, screened at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City as part of their recent exhibit, “Matisse: The Fabric of His Dreams — His Art and Textiles.” The film also was screened at the Danish Louisiana Museum of Modern Art (October 26) and the National Gallery (November 5).

**Lillee Gelinas, RN** (University of Louisiana-Lafayette), vice president and chief nursing officer at VHA, Inc., has been named as a fellow in the American Academy of Nursing (AAN). She will be inducted this fall. Fellows are selected to the AAN by their peers for outstanding, sustained contributions to nursing and health care. Gelinas works with VHA’s member health-care organizations and local offices to help members achieve clinical excellence.

**Dr. Sandra W. Holt**, PhD (Tennessee State University), director of the University Honors Program and Southeast Region vice president of Phi Kappa Phi, was recently nominated for the prestigious ATHENA Award by Women in Higher Education in Tennessee.

**Fred Jandt**, PhD (California State University San Bernardino), has been named dean of the Palm Desert Campus of CSUSB.

**Bor Jang**, PhD (Auburn University), has been named dean of the College of Engineering and Computer Science at Wright State University.

**Louise S. Jenkins**, PhD, RN, FAHA (University of Maryland), has been named codirector, Institute for Nurse Educators, University of Maryland School of Nursing. She also serves as the coordinator of the “Teaching in Nursing and Health Professions” post-graduate certificate program and as codirector of the Clinical Education and Evaluation Laboratory, which is a collaborative venture of the Schools of Nursing and Medicine of the University of Maryland in Baltimore.

**Roy W. Koch**, PhD (Portland State University), has been named provost of Portland State University.

**A. Wayne Lacy**, PhD (Auburn University-Montgomery), was the featured speaker at McKendree College’s second Phi Kappa Phi initiation ceremony. Dr. Lacy is a former Southeast Region vice president of the Society.

**Richard J. Leblanc, Jr.**, PhD (Louisiana State University), has been named vice president for academic affairs at Southern Catholic College.
James Martin, PhD (Campbell University), was named 2005 Professor of the Year by Campbell University students. Martin is associate professor and chair of the Department of Government, History, and Justice.

Ryan Martin (University of California-Davis) was given the 2004 Herbert A. Young Award for outstanding academic achievement at UC-Davis. A major in Neurology, Physiology, and Behavior, Mr. Martin wrote two abstracts while researching in neurological surgery and volunteered in the emergency room at the UCD Medical Center.

Beverley Berlin Más (Florida Atlantic University) was named a distinguished alumna of the Harriet L. Wilkes Honors College on the John D. MacArthur Campus (Jupiter, Florida) of Florida Atlantic University. Ms. Más is an academic counselor at Palm Beach Community College in Palm Beach, Florida.

Robert E. Myers, PhD (University of Maryland), was recently welcomed as the new president of Daniel Webster College in Nashua, New Hampshire. Myers’s most recent post was as chancellor of Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University’s extended campus, where he executed initiatives to improve the quality and currency of both faculty and curricula.

James L. Moore III, PhD (Ohio State University), received the 2004 Ohio School Counselor Association’s Research Award. He was honored at the All-Ohio Conference in November 2004. He also received the 2004–2005 Research Award for Counselor Education and Supervision. The award honors significant research in counseling, counselor education, or counselor supervision.

Larry A. Nielsen, PhD (Cornell University), has been named provost and executive vice chancellor of Academic Affairs at North Carolina State University (NCSU). As provost, Dr. Nielsen will serve as NCSU’s chief academic officer, managing all aspects of education and scholarship.

Susan K. Nutter (North Carolina State University), Vice Provost and Director of Libraries at North Carolina State University, has been named 2005 Librarian of the Year by the national trade publication Library Journal. In the time that she has been director, the NC State libraries have gone from a ranking of 101 to one of 32 as rated by the Association of Research Libraries.

Peter B. Orlik, PhD (Central Michigan University), received Central Michigan University’s 2005 President’s Award for Outstanding Research and Creativity. He is professor and chair of the Broadcast and Cinematic Arts Department.

Elizabeth Osius (Carnegie Mellon University) was awarded a $500 scholarship from the Washington Internship Institute for participating in its internship program in the summer of 2005.

Paula Parsche, PhD (University of South Florida), has received the Bane and Janice Wade Outstanding Teacher Award at Florida Southern University. Parsche, an associate professor of music, was given the award for her outstanding classroom-teaching performance.

Jaclyn Keegan Pasko (University of California-Davis) was awarded the 2004 University Medal at UC-Davis, the highest honor for a graduating senior. A genetics major, Ms. Pasko earned fifteen A+ grades and numerous scholarships and awards, as well as serving as a research assistant in developmental biology and criminalistics.

Scott Pilkington (Auburn University) is directing a landmine clearance project for refugee return and post-conflict agricultural recovery on the border between Eritrea and Ethiopia. Since retirement from military service as a Brigadier General in 1996, Scott has attended the University of Oxford, United Kingdom; Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama; and has directed landmine-clearance projects for the United Nations in Bosnia, Yemen, Iraq, and Ethiopia.

Beverly J. Pitts, PhD (Ball State University), has been named president of the University of Indianapolis.

Judith A. Ramaley, PhD (Portland State University), has been named president of Winona State University.

Sabah Randhawa, PhD (Oregon State University), has been named provost of Oregon State University.

Caroline Reed (University of South Florida) has been promoted to the rank of assistant librarian at the Jane Bancroft Cook Library, a joint-use library for New College
of Florida and the University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee. Caroline joined the Reference Department as a library technical assistant in 1997 and completed her MLS in 2002 from the University of South Florida. She has been an instructor librarian at the Cook Library since August of 2002.

**Sam A. Rihani, P.E., FASCE** (University of Maryland), has been elected to serve as chairman-elect for 2005-2006 of the Structural Engineers Association of Metropolitan Washington, D.C. (SEA-MW). He will serve as chairman in 2006–2007. SEA-MW is comprised of fifty structural engineering firms from Metropolitan D.C. and focuses its activities on business-related issues in the structural-engineering field. Rihani is Principal and Chief Executive Officer of BEI Structural Engineers of Fairfax, Virginia.

**Dr. Jun M. Rivera, PhD** (Tennessee State University), was elected president of the Tennessee Collegiate Honors Council during its conference at Lipscomb University, February 18–19, 2005.

**Judy R. Rogers, PhD** (Georgetown College), was named the eleventh president of Cottey College (Nevada, Missouri); her term as president began in June of 2004. Dr. Rogers served as vice president for leadership and ethics at Georgetown College, Georgetown, Kentucky, before her appointment at Cottey.

**Christine M. Smallman** (University of Toledo) was awarded the University of Toledo Outstanding Staff Award by President Daniel M. Johnson. Christine received a plaque and a check for $1,500. She also received the College of Engineering Outstanding Staff award and received a plaque and $1,000. She recently completed her master’s degree in disabilities studies at the university and will begin her doctorate in the spring of 2006.

**Cynthia J. Smith, PhD** (The Ohio State University), has completed a book entitled, *The Rise of the Rogue Executive: How Good Companies Go Bad and How to Stop the Destruction*. Dr. Leonard R. Sayles is co-author.

**Mindy Steinberg, PhD** (University of Louisville), Director of Admissions for Ivy Tech State College, Sellersburg, Indiana, was selected to participate in the 2005 Fulbright International Education Administrators program taking place in Germany in October 2005. She was one of twenty educational professionals from across the United States selected and was the only participant chosen from the State of Indiana. Dr. Steinberg received a full grant to attend this prestigious seminar.

**Karen Stump, PhD** (Carnegie Mellon University), has received the 2005 Ryan Award for Meritorious Teaching from Carnegie Mellon University (CMU). The award is given annually to faculty at CMU who have demonstrated unusual devotion and effectiveness in teaching. Dr. Stump is vice president of CMU’s Phi Kappa Phi chapter.

**Cyrus Taghavi** (University of California-Davis) was presented the 2004 Undergraduate Student of the Year award for outstanding achievement by a graduating senior in the Division of Biological Sciences at UC-Davis. Mr. Taghavi maintained a 4.0 GPA while serving as a research intern in medical microbiology.

**David L. White, PhD** (Appalachian State University), has been named dean of the College of Arts and Science at the University of West Georgia.

**Marcellette Williams, PhD** (University of Massachusetts), has been named vice president for academic and student affairs at the University of Massachusetts.

**John Wood** (McNeese State University) was recently profiled in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (April 29, 2005). Wood is a professor of English and director of the MFA program at McNeese State University, a noted poet, and a historian of photography.

**Ling-Yi Zhou, PhD** (Miami University), received the 2004–2005 Achievement in Scholarship Award from the University of St. Francis, Joliet, Illinois, where she serves as an associate professor of psychology. She also appears in the 2004 and the 2005 editions of *Who’s Who Among America’s Teachers*.

**Doris Briggs Zimmerman, PhD** (Youngstown State University), graduated in December 2004 from Kent State University with a PhD in Chemistry. Her dissertation was titled “*Adsorption, Chromatographic, and Thermogravimetric Studies of Mesoporous Carbon Materials with Deposited Silica*.”
In Memoriam

Ralph G. Allen, PhD (University of Tennessee), a Guggenheim-winning theater historian and author of the hit Broadway musical Sugar Babies, passed away on September 9, 2004, at the age of seventy. Dr. Allen was Phi Kappa Phi's first National Artist.

Dallas C. Allred, MD (Northwestern State University), passed away on March 3, 2005. A World War II veteran, an engineer, and finally an MD, Dr. Allred practiced as a family physician in Prescott, Arizona, for thirty-nine years.

Joy Cameron Bender (University of Southern California) passed away on April 23, 2004, at age 79. A graduate of the University of Southern California, Ms. Cameron was a teacher, principal, and educational leader for thirty-nine years in the Los Angeles area.

Huai Chiang, PhD (University of Minnesota), passed away March 30, 2005, at age ninety in Ithaca, New York. Dr. Chiang, a native of China who received his master’s and doctorate at the University of Minnesota and decided to remain in the United States rather than return to newly communist China in 1949, was an international leader in corn-insect research. He taught at both the Duluth campus and the Twin Cities campus of the university before retiring in 1984.

John E. Davis, PhD (Radford University), passed away May 27, 2005, after a long battle with lung cancer. Dr. Davis taught in the history department at Radford for thirty-five years. He began Radford's Weekend College and served as its director for ten years. In addition to serving as Radford's Phi Kappa Phi chapter treasurer for thirty years, he helped found the Radford chapter of Phi Alpha Theta.

Dorothy (Dottie) DeMoss (Texas Women’s University) passed away on January 12, 2005, at her home in Denton, Texas, after a three-year battle with cancer. She was a former president of the Phi Kappa Phi chapter at Texas Women’s University (TWU) and an emerita professor of History. She had taught at TWU for thirty-seven years.

Gerard M. Faeth, PhD (Pennsylvania State University), passed away on January 24, 2005, at age sixty-eight. He was an Arthur B. Modine Distinguished University Professor of Aerospace Engineering and Professor of Mechanical Engineering, University of Michigan, as well as a professor emeritus of mechanical engineering at Pennsylvania State University. Professor Faeth was internationally recognized for his diverse and lasting contribution to aerospace and mechanical engineering.

Paul Michael Felsberg (Florida International University) passed away on October 13, 2004, while serving as a 2nd Lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps. An athletic/academic endowed scholarship has been established at Florida International in Lieutenant Felsberg’s name.

Janis E. Jacobs, PhD (Pennsylvania State University), passed away on September 16, 2005, after a long illness. Dr. Jacobs was vice president and dean for Undergraduate Education at Pennsylvania State University.

Maurice Edward Joyner (University of Nevada-Las Vegas) passed away on February 15, 2005, at age eighty-one in North Las Vegas, Nevada. Mr. Joyner was a World War II veteran and retired from Westinghouse. He was also a member of the North Las Vegas Planning Commission and an Eagle Scout.

William J. McGrath (University of Bridgeport) passed away on July 4, 2004, in St. Cloud, Florida. Judge McGrath, a graduate of the University of Bridgeport, was admitted to the bar in 1959 and practiced law and served as a superior court judge in Fairfield, Connecticut.

Frederic D. Ogden, PhD (Eastern Kentucky University), passed away on July 3, 2005, at age eighty-nine. Dr. Ogden was the founder of the Political Science department at Eastern Kentucky University (EKU); he came to EKU after a decade of teaching at the University of Alabama. Dr. Ogden served as dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at EKU from 1965 until it split into three colleges in 1979.

Margaret Gillespie Sewell (Mississippi State University) passed away on April 10, 2005, at age fifty-eight, after a seven-year battle with cancer. Ms. Sewell was a staff member of the American Heart Association for Mississippi, serving as Director of Fund Raising and Field Services. She was tireless in service to her community, volunteering to help health organizations, the arts, and her church.

Connie Twining, ARNP (University of Wyoming), passed away on July 13, 2005, after a courageous battle with bone cancer. Ms. Twining received her BS in nursing at the University of Wyoming and her MS as a Nurse Practitioner at the University of Arizona, before joining a rural health practice in Tennessee. Her first love was educating her patients on how to make better choices for their health.

George Arthur Williams, PhD (University of Idaho), passed away on February 23, 2005, at age eighty-seven. A veteran of World War II, Dr. Williams received his PhD from the University of Arizona in Geologic Engineering. He worked for the U.S. Geological Survey until 1957, when he became a professor of geology at the University of Idaho, where he served as department head for seventeen years until his retirement in 1988.
Introducing the Phi Kappa Phi Plastic Membership Card

Phi Kappa Phi is now producing high-quality plastic membership cards. The size and weight of a standard credit card, these durable cards will fit perfectly in a wallet or purse and are printed using an embedding process to prevent fading. All new initiates will now receive a plastic membership card within three months of their initiation ceremony. Members are encouraged to keep their cards handy for easy access to the members-only Web site or when redeeming Society-related discounts.

Members inducted before July 2005 can order a new membership card for $6. The replacement fee covers printing and processing expenses. To order a replacement card, please visit the Phi Kappa Phi Web site at PhiKappaPhi.org or call 800.804.9880, ext. 10.
**I. HONOR CORD**
Braided navy and gold cords, ending in fringed tassels. (1 lb.)
Item #REC10 . . . $10

**J. STOLE**
Gold satin stole with the Greek letters and Society key embroidered in a striking navy blue. (1 lb.)
Item #REC20 . . . $24

**K. MEDALLION**
Two inch cloisonné medallion hanging from a royal blue ribbon, features a detailed rendering of the Society seal. (1 lb.)
Item #S-5 . . . $9
Item #S-5a (orders of 50 or more) . . . $8

**PEN SETS**

**L. BLUE MARBLEIZED PEN & LETTER OPENER SET**
Made of durable, wheat-colored canvas and embroidered with the Greek letters, this baseball cap makes an ideal present for any Phi Kappa Phi member. (.5 lb.)
Item #ACC11 . . . $15

**M. GREY CREWNECK SWEATSHIRT**
Navy jacket has a full length zipper with hood featuring the embroidered emblem. (2 lbs.)
Item #APP70 . . . . . $49

**N. UMBRELLA**
Large, royal blue golf umbrella imprinted with “The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi” and key. (3 lbs.)
Item #ACC80 . . . $16

**O. COFFEE MUG**
Navy blue and white 12 oz. ceramic coffee mug is perfect for everyday use. (1 lb.)
Item #ACC20 . . . $7

**P. LICENSE PLATE FRAME**
Die cast metal license plate holder features a chrome frame and the Greek letter monogram on a blue background. 12”x 6”. (2 lbs.)
Item #ACC21 . . . $15

**Q. BRONZE-PLATED PAPERWEIGHT**
Handsome and functional, the Phi Kappa Phi handcrafted paperweight features an antique gold finish and is embossed with the Society seal. Backed with velvet. 3” diameter. (1 lb.)
Item #ACC22 . . . $10

**R. MEN’S SEIKO WATCH**
Designed exclusively for Phi Kappa Phi, these Seiko watches feature the Society badge in a variety of designs. All watches come with a 3-year warranty and date function. (2 lbs.)
Item #JE31 . . . $175

**S. STERLING SILVER CHARM**
Vertical Greek letter charms are crafted in sterling silver and 10K gold. (1 lb.)
Item #JE24 . . . $16
Item #JE25 . . . $32

---

*Call for quantity discount pricing.*