American research university community is wearing out. The university campus is, ironically, the victim of its own success. Invoking the metaphor of the "city of intellect" can reduce as well as elevate our image of the multiversity. It makes the campus comparable to the infrastructure problems of any city. Over-crowding, lack of parking, and neglected neighborhoods can refer to Harvard University as well as to Newark or Detroit. For all the excitement of technological innovations, the sad fact is that architectural lag forces most students, professors, and administrators to live in the worn-out environment of the 1960s. The "city of intellect" that Kerr described in 1963 had the excitement of novelty. But in the 21st century, the persistence of clunky window-box air conditioning units, elevators that stall, and obsolete lab equipment means that the future of the "city of intellect" could be that of Soviet apartment buildings. This prospect, along with sobering analyses by Roger Geiger, Patricia Gumpert, and Sheila Slaughter, take the luster off the multiversity of the 21st century as necessarily a great place to work.

Another theme that percolates from several of the chapters is that the university as a "city of intellect" seems to be facing serious zoning problems. The ascent of the "knowledge industry" means that lines between scholarship and commerce are blurring in ways that are less to the benefit of the academic ethos and more to the gain of industry. It creates a peculiar conundrum: the American multi-versity is trying to sell its soul, even though it may never have had a soul to sell. Richard Chait's reconsideration of Jencks and Riesman's "Academic Revolution" provides a resolution to this puzzle: The contemporary university is forfeiting control of itself to myriad "external forces." And although a significant minority of enterprising professors may profit (literally) from this blurring of campus and industry, the academic profession as a distinct group with rights and responsibilities is a shrinking, if not endangered, species. One hopes the provocative essays in this volume will promote sorely needed urban renewal for the city of intellect.

Trudy W. Banta and Associates. *Building a Scholarship of Assessment*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass/John Wiley & Sons, 2002. 368 pp. Cloth: \$33.00. ISBN 0-7879-5945-6.

REVIEWED BY DON F. WESTERHEIJDEN, SENIOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATE, CENTER FOR HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY STUDIES (CHEPS), UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE, THE NETHERLANDS

Since Ernest Boyer introduced the idea of different types of scholarship in 1990, types have proliferated. Trudy Banta, this volume's editor, maintains that in 1999 "scholarship of assessment" spontaneously joined that list. This book, written by her and twenty associates from diverse positions in the U.S. higher education system, aims to give a state of the art report on this new branch of scholarship, underpin it by showing different theoretical contributions to it, and finally convince the skeptics of its worth. The book therefore has theoretical as well as practical aims and is targeted mainly to faculty and administrators in assessment (p. xi).

What does "scholarship of assessment" mean? Banta defines it as systematic enquiry about assessment (p. x), in the words of Barbara Wright "sophisticated *thinking about* assessment" (p. 242; italics Wright's). Assessment has received much attention for at least a decade from higher education institutions, from state and federal policymakers, and from accreditation agencies. As a result, U.S. higher education has seen many developments in assessment, much data-collection, and therefore fertile ground for this developing area of scholarship. Victor Borden (Chapter 9) makes the point that we know more than we know: institutional research offices often collect assessment-related data that could be used in a sophisticated, scholarly way.

Scholarship of assessment builds upon scholarly assessment, i.e., sophisticated "practice of assessment" (p. 242). Therefore, the first of this volume's five parts gives a history and an overview of the current status of assessment. Peter Ewell concludes that assessment has not (yet) shown the usual fate of "movements," which is, in Lewis Carroll's memorable phrase about the usual fate of snark hunters "to softly and suddenly vanish away" or to become institutionalized in mainstream practices (p. 21). Assessment practice is "broad," but not "deep."

Part 2, "Theoretical Foundations of Assessment," consists of four chapters, each approaching the issue of theoretical deepening through different "lenses" (ranging from objectivist versus subjectivist epistemologies), a critique of indicator practices, and an overview of lessons learnt about assessment in Alverno College. At the end of this section and the next, readers find a plethora of methods of assessment, among others, Web-based techniques. This volume is not a handbook, and the descriptions stop short of that, yet they do provide readers with a feeling for their strengths. Because the writers are proponents, readers have to find the weaknesses themselves. Also, further readings and Web-sites are given for those looking for handbooks.

Part 4 surveys actual experiences with scholarly assessment, beginning with classroom assessment, and continuing on through assessment capturing the essence of students' experiences (capstones, portfolios), to assessment of whole programs and institutions. External assessment, especially by professional and regional accreditation agencies, progressively enters the scene, a motif that makes me, a non-U.S. resident, ask again what is meant by assessment? The term covers a lot, and so does its scholarship.

In Part 5, Banta summarizes this book's findings and arguments in two chapters. First, from a survey of higher education institutions across the United States, she identifies 17 characteristics of effective outcomes assessment from planning and implementation to "improving and sustaining" in the assessment process. Her final chapter is an eight-page agenda for strategies toward transformation in institutions, based on the previous chapters of the book.

The book does, in fact, largely deliver what it promised. If I had to start a job involving student assessment, program review, or accreditation, I would keep this volume at hand to check on the field's status and underlying principles. Yet if I, as a "scholar of assessment," had the higher ambitions of assuring that my school practiced scholarly assessment, I would feel a bit disappointed by the final chapters, humming softly along with Peggy Lee, "Is that all there is?" In the end, it all seems to come down to commonsense

precepts based on obtaining faculty engagement and—to be honest—three further areas: developing good methods of assessment, aligning assessment with other organizational processes, and developing a reflective practitioner attitude. But there is nothing new in that: Schön published his "reflective practitioner" volume in 1983, while Patton's "utilization-focused evaluation" (a useful method for engaging faculty) was quoted in this volume in a 1997 printing, but dates from 1978. A similar feeling of scantiness may overcome readers if they see that Banta's 17 characteristics are drawn from only nine higher education institutions. On the other hand, the chapters do cover an impressive amount of intellectual approaches, literature, cases, and research outcomes. And that is why, ultimately, I will keep this book close at hand for my practical work. For the theoretically minded half of my brain, the book was also stimulating. It may be the first formal focus on "scholarship of assessment"; but with the richness of materials and ideas presented, it will not be the last word.

REFERENCES

- Patton, M. Q. (1978). *Utilization-focused evaluation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.