the genesis and caliber of education research. An Elusive Science: The Troubling History of Education Research (2000) addresses the historically separate paths of teacher education—which she describes as thoroughly feminized, and therefore accorded low intellectual and occupational status—and of education research as evolved in expanding universities in the late 1800s and early 1900s. She notes the “widespread skepticism” at the time “concerning the wisdom of trying to develop a science of education” and the “highly corrosive effect” of that skepticism on the scholarship that emerged.

She also finds that ambivalence reflected in society at large in what she has elsewhere described as Americans’ “anti-educationism”: their simultaneous reverence for education even as it is held in “persistent disdain.” Within schools of education, therefore, she has been concerned about overcoming the divide between the perceived “practical and technical” task of preparing teachers and the “intellectual” work of preparing administrators and conducting research. “Teaching and education research,” she has written, “have existed at much too great a remove from one another.”

In addition to analyzing that problem, Lagemann has recently been in a position to do something about it. From 1998 to 2002, she was president of the National Academy of Education, and from 2000 to 2001 she served on the National Academy of Sciences’ committee on the scientific principles of education research. In 2000, she became president of the Spencer Foundation, a major supporter of education research nationwide, succeeding Patricia Albjerg Graham, now Warren research professor of the history of American education (and herself GSE dean from 1982 to 1991).

In a subsequent interview, Lagemann amplified her priorities. She acknowledged that GSE’s teacher-education program is relatively small, but praised its quality and expressed interest in expanding it. In terms of the faculty members’ research skills, she said, “Every other education school is jealous.” She wants to enhance existing research on cognition and neuroscience, organization theory, and policy, and is “very interested in the possibilities of technology in education,” and hopes to secure badly needed additional financial aid for GSE students.

In the wake of federal legislation mandating widespread testing to assess performance, she worried, “We’ve gotten the accountability standards without the opportunity to learn.” The latter, she maintained, depends on strengthening teacher education; on stronger links between education and practice and policy; and on cultivating broad understanding “about the difficulties that are involved in education”—particularly in an era when society aspires to educate every child well even as all the parents in a household work, language barriers have risen, and social inequality and even homelessness hobble many students.

In all, it is an agenda meant to bring education into the center of the University’s interests. Drawing on her research, Lagemann explained, with a gesture out the window toward the Radcliffe Yard, that education and women’s education have been, “traditionally, a little bit on the margins,” intellectually and even physically. “It’s all about gender and not valuing the educational content of education.”

In making that point, and aiming to overcome it on GSE’s behalf, Lagemann’s new office seems especially well sited. As only the third woman dean in Harvard’s history, she finds herself just a few paces from the second: Drew Faust, of the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study. The two women have known each other since they began boarding school together at age 12, and Lagemann served on the ad hoc advisory committee that shaped Faust’s start-up agenda for the new institute. Those connections ought to ease Lagemann’s own learning process, and accelerate her efforts to bring education from the periphery to the core of Harvard’s twenty-first-century concerns.

Study Abroad, Honors at Home

The faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS) has made it easier for Harvard College students to study abroad, and more difficult to earn academic honors. FAS also adopted a new grading scale which, in concert with jawboning, may slow or even reverse grade inflation. The changes, adopted at May 7 and 21 faculty meetings, concluded a year of debate and data-gathering directed by professor of history Susan G. Pedersen, who stepped down as dean of undergraduate education June 30 (see “Undergraduate Upgrade,” January-February, page 58).

The policy on study out of residence simply states that students with satisfactory academic records “may earn degree credit for course work completed successfully out of residence ordinarily at accredited or similarly recognized degree-granting institutions of higher education or at study abroad programs established by such institutions,” subject to a Harvard committee’s prior approval (see “Changing the College Curriculum,” May-June, page 50).

As such, it takes study abroad “beyond its originally conceived role” in promoting advanced language study, according to the legislation’s principal champion, William L. Fash, Bowditch professor of Central American and Mexican archaeology and ethnology—the rationale being that “the best place to study tropical-forest ecology is in tropical forests,” as he put it. Thus, the faculty encourages, but no longer requires, language study; shifts the presumption away from insisting that foreign study be a
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Such discussion might well be warranted. In its May 24 issue, published on the last day of final exams, the Crimson’s “Roving Reporter” asked, “How will Harvard’s changes to grading and honors policies affect your study habits?” Among

Before then, however, grading may be debated further. While endorsing the change, Summers noted that he hoped for more work to address concerns about “compression” (the usefulness of grades to distinguish among students in a class) and equity (Pedersen’s data uncovered marked differences in grading among the academic divisions today).

Adjudicating Sexual-Assault Cases

Stymied in its attempts to resolve certain student peer complaints—most seriously those alleging sexual assault—the College’s Administrative Board sought, and the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS) on May 7 granted, a new procedure for handling such disputes. Rather than ending the matter, the legislation set off a sharp discussion among faculty members and students (organized as the Coalition Against Sexual Violence) about what Harvard does, and ought to do, to prevent such abuses and respond to them when they occur. As a result, a new University-wide committee was commissioned May 21 to review the problem and recommend better policies.

Dean of Harvard College Harry R. Lewis signaled the procedural change in January, in his annual report on undergraduate life during the prior academic year. The Administrative Board, which he chairs, had been “asked to investigate a sharply increased number of complaints of sexual assault.” (There were seven in 2000-2001, compared to 13 during the prior decade.) Several cases involved neither police nor courts, leaving the board to gather “detailed testimony about sexual acts and their context.” That usually meant relying on “he-said-she-said” accounts where the principals “more often than not had been drinking and admit to having only vague or partial recollections of what happened.” Delays in presenting the allegations further attenuated the evidentiary trail. Based on its experience during 2000-2001, Lewis concluded, “it is predictable in no way changed the substance of...”

Within days, on campus, it became something else. Some faculty members said they had not been fully informed on the substance of the issue before their vote. Students protested that the College was

Available cases from those it could resolve, the board sought advice from an ad hoc faculty committee appointed by FAS dean Jeremy R. Knowles. Its members—Peter T. Ellison, dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences; Kathleen M. Coleman, professor of Latin; and William A. Graham Jr., Albertson professor of Middle Eastern studies and master of Currier House—also reported in January. Drawing on their own experiences as past Administrative Board members and their examination of recent cases, the committee distinguished adversarial legal proceedings for the prosecution of rape and sexual assault from the College’s internal disciplinary processes. It also noted a third possibility—professional mediation—which might be used to achieve “an acknowledgment of responsibility and a real change in behavior in a serious dispute” for at least some peer cases.

In dealing with peer disputes—where the board essentially weighs conflicting statements presented by two undergraduates—the committee recommended that procedure be changed to a presumption that it “ordinarily will not consider a case unless the allegations presented by the complaining student are supported by sufficient independent corroboration which, if true, would likely permit the Board to decide the case.” To that end, before formally initiating a charge, the Board would use a screening process to gather evidence, such as e-mails or photographs, and lists of witnesses. Based on these submissions from both sides, the dean and the Board would then determine whether to pursue the case. The committee made clear that it in no way changed the substance of the faculty’s 1993 policy on rape, sexual assault, and other sexual misconduct.

It was this procedural recommendation that Lewis presented to the faculty May 7, when it was quickly adopted. The New York Times reported the new procedure as a kind of “legal triage” for sorting out date-rape cases, bringing College disciplinary procedure more in line with the rules obtaining in courts.

Within days, on campus, it became something else. Some faculty members said they had not been fully informed on the substance of the issue before their vote. Students protested that the College was

the respondents, Daniel B. Tomlinson ’03 replied, “Well, if I had study habits...” and Timothy M. Coleman ’02 offered, “My current 3.0 on a 15-point scale GPA could be perceived as a B.”
unique opportunity beyond Harvard offerings; and moves from custom-crafted programs toward approved ones in which a student could enroll as of right. The intent, Fash said, is to make study abroad “an invaluable part of undergraduate education for all Harvard College students.”

Implementation will depend upon identifying accepted programs, concentration by concentration—a possibly time-consuming task. One partisan who will keep the heat on is President Lawrence H. Summers, who told a March panel on globalization, “I look forward to the day when essentially every undergraduate student has a meaningful foreign experience during their time in college”—and the remoter and less developed the foreign country, the better. Another will be FAS’s new dean, William C. Kirby (see page 75), who led the faculty along with Fash. He is enthusiastic about new courses being taught abroad by faculty members and language instructors in summer school this year—part of a “culture of experimentation on study abroad he intends to encourage.

## Honor Roll

### Prized Professors
The Faculty of Arts and Sciences has recognized four of its senior members for excellence in teaching, awarding them five-year appointments as Harvard College Professors—a distinction that brings a semester of paid leave, commensurate summer salary, or funds in support of their scholarly work. They are professor of geophysics Jeremy Bloxham; professor of psychology Marc David Hauser; Stephen P. Rosen, Kaneb professor of national security and military affairs and director of the Olin Institute; and William Millis Todd III, Reisinger professor of Slavic languages and literatures and professor of comparative literature—and a former dean of undergraduate education....Two junior faculty members were singled out for their devotion to teaching undergraduates: Eileen Chow, assistant professor of Chinese literary and cultural studies, and J. Russell Muirhead Jr., assistant professor of government, received the Abramson Award.

### Students’ Teachers
The Undergraduate Council conferred its annual Levenson Awards for outstanding teaching at the senior and junior faculty and graduate student levels on professor of history James T. Kloppenberg; lecturer on the study of religion Brian C.W. Palmer; and Kathleen Holbrook, assistant senior tutor in Leverett House and a teaching fellow in one of Palmer’s courses....The Phi Beta Kappans singled out James Engell, Gurney professor of English literature and professor of comparative literature; Howard Georgi, Mallinckrodt professor of physics (and master of Leverett House); and Peter A. Hall, Thomson professor of government, director of the Center for European studies, and a Harvard College Professor.

The Graduate Student Council bestowed excellence in mentoring awards upon professor of cell biology Joan S. Brugge (Medical School); assistant professor of biology Gonzalo Giribet; Cahner-Rabb professor of social and organizational psychology J. Richard Hackman; Christopher Jencks, Wiener professor of social policy (Kennedy School); and Michael J. Puett, Loeb associate professor of the humanities.

### Communications Consultants
A team of four Harvard Business School students—Lisa D. Bourne, Tjada P. D’Oyen, Sitella A. Glenn, and Panya Lei Yarber—won a competition sponsored by Goldman, Sachs & Company to advise the new chief executive of AOL Time Warner on how to run his company. They defeated teams from Dartmouth and Yale. The advice? Forget synergy, and run each division as its own tub.

### Political Prize
Pforzheimer University Professor Sidney Verba, director of the Harvard University Library, received the Skytte Foundation’s prize in political science from Sweden’s Uppsal University for his empirical studies of political participation and its role in the functioning of democracy.

### Hoarding Honors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of 2001</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summa</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magna</td>
<td>35.81%</td>
<td>15.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum</td>
<td>24.01%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum laude in general studies</td>
<td>25.57%</td>
<td>2.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No honors</td>
<td>10.06%</td>
<td>47.37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of students earning each class of honors, actual and assuming the standards adopted May 21 had applied to last year’s seniors.

While away, the students had better study instead of play. At its May 21 meeting, the faculty—annoyed that 90 percent of College students currently graduate with Latin honors—imposed a new percentage-based regimen. Qualification for honors in a subject will still depend on nomination by the concentration and high grades overall (demonstrating a student’s general education). But along with existing limits on the number of summa cum laude honors (up to 5 percent of the class), there will now be effectively a limit of 15 percent on magnas, and another 30 percent for cums. The existing cum laude status for overall
grades, where a student does not pursue or is not recommended for concentration honors, will persist, but at the magna grade average, and will be restricted to no more than 10 percent of graduates. The new rules apply to the class of 2005.

The effect, Pedersen said, will be to restore the “pyramidal” structure of honors, which had become misshapen (magna became the most commonly conferred honor), and to “cascade” the awarding of honors downward. Were the new standards applied to the scholars graduating in 2001, nearly half would have commenced without benefit of any Harvard Latin honors (see chart on page 79).

Finally, in an initial response to perceived grade inflation, the faculty tossed out the 15-point grade scale and adopted the more common 4.0 scale, ranging from A and A- (4.00, 3.67) through D- and E (0.67, 0.00). The change may influence grading practices, in that the current scale has an odd gap (A- is 1.4, for instance, but B+ is 1.2, and so on), which may make some professors reluctant to award the lower grade. But it is not accompanied by a mandatory curve or other constraints on faculty practices. Pedersen’s office will circulate information on exemplary grading practices to all departments, and will monitor the grades actually awarded by departments and individuals as a sort of anti-inflationary presence.

Why would Harvard do something so prosaic as to adopt a grading system in common use? Because, Pedersen said, she was persuaded it would be stupid to “replace one untransparent, idiosyncratic Harvard scale with another untransparent, idiosyncratic scale.” Now students will even be able to apply for graduate school without having their transcripts translated first. The new system goes into effect for the 2003-2004 academic year.

The President and Fellows of Harvard College—as the seven-member, self-perpetuating Corporation, the University’s senior governing board, is formally known—is in the midst of unusually swift and extensive change. On April 7, Robert E. Rubin ’60, LL.D. ’01, became the newest Fellow, with the consent of the Board of Overseers; he will fill the opening created by the retirement of Robert G. Stone Jr. ’45, then Senior Fellow, at the end of June (see “First Fellow’s Farewell,” March-April, page 66). The responsibilities of Senior Fellow will pass to James R. Houghton ’58, M.B.A. ’62, recently renamed CEO of Corning Glass, who joined the Corporation in 1995.

Two days before Rubin’s appointment was announced, a new vacancy was created when Herbert S. Winokur Jr. ’65, Ph.D. ’67, announced his resignation as a Fellow, also effective at the end of the academic year. Winokur, who is chairman and chief executive officer of Capricorn Holdings Inc., an investment firm based in Greenwich, Connecticut, has been much in the news because of his service as a director of Enron Corporation since the firm was created in 1985. A member of Enron’s finance committee, he was also one of three members of an internal investigative committee of Enron directors who documented the use of off-the-books partnerships and irregular accounting practices that inflated the company’s reported earnings—subjects on which he was called to testify before Congress in February.

Winokur joined the Harvard Corporation in July 2000, one of two new members who began service then (see “Refreshing the Fellows,” May-June 2000, page 64). He notified President Lawrence H. Summers by letter that he was “concerned that my Enron involvement is in some ways diverting attention from your agenda for Harvard” and stressed that he “[did] not wish to be a distraction in any way from your efforts.” Summers responded that he was “saddened by the circumstances that have prompted [Winokur’s] decision to step down” and thanked him for serving Harvard “with devotion and intelligence.”

Rubin’s appointment represents something of a reunion. When he was U.S. Secretary of the Treasury from 1995 to 1999, Summers served as his deputy. After Rubin left the government, Summers was appointed his successor. (The working relationship formed between Rubin and Summers was reported in the magazine’s profile of Summers upon his selection as Harvard’s president; see May-June 2001, page 30.)

Rubin has had and maintains a career at the very pinnacle of world finance. A summa cum laude economics student at Harvard, he subsequently studied at the London School of Economics and received an LL.B. from Yale Law School in 1964. After practicing law for two years, he joined Goldman, Sachs & Company, where he rose to vice chairman and co-chief operating officer from 1987 to 1990, and then to co-senior partner and co-chairman from 1990 to 1992. During the first two years of the Clinton administration, he headed the National Economic Council, before moving across the street to the Treasury Department. After resigning from the cabinet, he joined Citigroup Inc., where he is chairman of the executive committee and a member of the office of the chairman.

A reserved speaker known for his dry wit, Rubin has been visibly involved in Harvard affairs of late. He delivered the Commencement afternoon address last year, speaking about decisionmaking in a complex world and the value of public-service careers. This April, at the end of...