

Higher Ground could serve as a primer for those who are considering a leadership position in a modern university and as a reflective piece for current leaders. In outlining the ethical challenges faced by higher education leadership, Keohane asks these individuals to question their readiness for the responsibility. The book is important also for those who study higher education and struggle with the question: Is leadership willing to address the most critical ethical issues of our society?

It was a wise choice for the Duke University Press to preserve the words and wisdom of Nannerl Keohane in a book. In my reading of literature on the college presidency, rarely have I experienced such a philosophical, reflective, and direct presentation of the ethical and moral obligations inherent in higher education leadership.

Ronald Henry (Ed.). *Faculty Development for Student Achievement: The QUE Project*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, 2006. 288 pp. Cloth: \$39.95. ISBN: 1-882982-97-5.

REVIEWED BY DAVID DiRAMIO, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS, LEADERSHIP, AND TECHNOLOGY (FLT) DEPARTMENT, AUBURN UNIVERSITY

There is a growing consensus that transformation is needed in higher education so that America can stay competitive in the global system. For many stakeholders, undergraduate curriculum reform is a logical place to start. This edited volume by Ronald J. Henry and associates offers a detailed account of the Quality in Undergraduate Education (QUE) project. QUE (1997–2004) was a multi-institutional endeavor that focused on standards and outcomes to improve instruction.

Like the carefully conceived and well-managed project itself, the book presents information concisely, using a straightforward writing style that avoids hyperbole and long-winded explanations. Crisply written chapters are devoted to the overall project's purpose and scope, the conceptual framework, and thorough accounts of each of the discipline-specific faculty groups charged with the arduous task of retooling undergraduate curriculum in chemistry, biology, mathematics, history, and English.

Anyone who has been involved in revising curriculum will tell you it can be a messy business. For example, some readers of this book might be put off at first by the QUE approach because it is rooted in a standards-based methodology familiar in primary and secondary school reform. Skepticism about both the "K12-ification" of higher education and standardization via "no college student left behind" may arise as faculty members

bristle at the notion of a one-size-fits-all approach to postsecondary curriculum improvement.

The authors address this concern early in the book by pointing out that QUE did not require total unanimity of learning outcomes by the faculty participants or the partner institutions they represented. The word "standard" is craftily exchanged for "outcome" to diffuse any pejorative jargon, and the whole issue is dismissed as unnecessarily diverting attention from the task at hand.

For readers who remain unconvinced about styling collegiate reform efforts on a public school system model that many consider "broken," alternative approaches exist in the literature, including the ELMO project (Hersek, Gross, Mason, & Bansil, 2006), use of learning communities (Smith, MacGregor, Matthews, & Gabelnick, 2004), and other interdisciplinary approaches (Jones, 2002). In the interest of institutional diversity, different methods for revising the curriculum are most welcome, including the QUE project chronicled in this compilation.

A bright spot in the book concerned cooperation between two- and four-year institutions for coordinating curriculum. The teamwork described extends well beyond the traditional articulation agreement between schools to include the subtleties of transfer patterns, remediation issues, and administrative collaboration. Faculty leaders and administrators searching for an exemplar of possible healthy relationships between community colleges and public universities may want to read this book, particularly the section on the Georgia system.

Moreover, for those specifically interested in undergraduate curriculum reform in one of the featured academic disciplines—chemistry, biology, mathematics, history, and English—this book is a must-read, complete with examples of learning outcomes and subject-specific rubric samples. The appendix of resources is lengthy and valuable, even for those who do not embrace a standards-based schema for reform.

While the words "faculty development" get top billing in the book's title, detailed discussion about faculty development is absent. In a process that can be best described as osmosis through page turning, readers will sense that faculty members were indeed "developing" in various ways as they struggled through committee work, consensus building, and curriculum improvement with their colleagues, but few if any references to the emerging body of scholarly literature on faculty development exist within this work. Although this book would likely come up in a library search query, I would not recommend it for a dissertator compiling a literature review of core readings about faculty development.

The lessons-learned analysis provided in the conclusion is useful; but empirical findings assessing the QUE process itself, perhaps from participant and stakeholder surveys using Likert scales or rank ordering, were conspicuously absent. Instead, the project implemented a reflective critique approach as sole source for assessment and feedback, when a mixed-methods design would have been stronger. The use of concrete, quantitative evidence to inform data-driven decision making is a hallmark of the standards-based reform movement.

As a narrative describing the complexities of the important QUE initiative, this book excels. Indeed, this volume may emerge as the definitive example of standards-based reform in undergraduate curriculum from the time period. The key for readers interested in transforming curriculum is to embrace the parts of this story that work for their unique situation and look to additional sources to ensure the best fit for a particular institution.

REFERENCES

- Hersek, M., Gross, N., Mason, E., & Bansil, A. (2006). ELMO Project. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 35(4), 52–56.
- Jones, E. A. (2002). *Transforming the curriculum: Preparing students for a changing world*: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 29, No. 3. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, B. L., MacGregor, J., Matthews, R., & Gabelnick, F. (2004). *Learning communities: Reforming undergraduate education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Daniel Golden. *The Price of Admission: How America's Ruling Class Buys Its Way into Elite Colleges—and Who Gets Left Outside the Gates*. New York: Crown Publishing Group, 2006. 323 pp. Cloth: \$25.95. ISBN: 978-1-4000-9796-8.

REVIEWED BY GREG DUBROW, DIRECTOR OF POLICY, PLANNING, AND ANALYSIS, OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS AND ENROLLMENT, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY

The first thing that strikes the reader about Daniel Golden's *The Price of Admission* is the populist stance taken by, of all people, the *Wall Street Journal's* Boston bureau chief. Golden's central premise is that the admissions process at selective colleges and universities has been corrupted by preferences for children of wealthy families. Golden's populist argument against admissions preference for legacies and the wealthy underscores a major contradiction for wealthy American conservatives.

Conservatism's professed belief in self-reliance and meritocracy over aristocracy runs counter to the practice of doing whatever is necessary to preserve a family's money, honor, and name. Golden even goes so far as to compare the relationship between the British nobility and the House of Lords to that of wealthy American families and selective private higher education.

Of the book's 10 chapters, six take on a specific element of preferential admissions. Golden's targets are: big-donor legacy students at Harvard; big-donor non-legacy students at Duke; children-of-celebrity admits at Brown; the strong legacy culture at Notre Dame; athletic admits at a variety of schools; and breaks for children of faculty, most of whom receive substantial tuition discounts as a job benefit.

Other chapters include an explanation of how this litany of pernicious practices discriminates mostly against Asian students (he calls Asians "the new Jews," in reference to the documented discrimination against Jewish students practiced by the Ivies during the first few decades of the 20th century); a chapter recounting attempts by Congress to scale back legacy admits; and examples of "pure" meritocratic admissions processes. In one chapter, Golden proposes some fixes for the system. The *modus operandi* is to introduce deserving but denied applicants and contrast these cases with examples of students who benefited from whichever preference is the subject of the chapter. Much of the book draws on a series of articles Golden has written for the *Wall Street Journal*, augmented with more research and reporting.

Whatever the practice, Golden claims that the usual result is to favor the rich and connected but undeserving over those students whose academic preparation leaves them more deserving of admission to the top schools in the country. For legacy admits, especially legacies from wealthy families or the "development admits" who are not children of alums, it is obvious how wealth is favored. For athletics Golden finesses the point to center on the so-called "country club" sports such as crew and equestrian teams. Golden writes that these sports, as well as sports such as golf and squash, are played mostly by rich kids. Thus, reserving spaces in freshman classes for "country-club" athletes with lesser academic credentials favors children of means over more deserving middle- and working-class students. Golden claims that Title IX, well-meaning though it is as an gender equity measure, has had the unintended consequence of exacerbating the class equity dilemma, moving colleges to establish more women's crew squads and equestrian teams as a means of achieving gender equity in college athletics.

Golden's argument leads to some intriguing questions. Why doesn't a private institution, even