



Communicator

Council of Graduate Schools

www.cgsnet.org

Volume 41, Number 8 • October 2008

Assessment and Strategic Planning in Graduate Programs: A View from Fordham University and The Ohio State University

This article recaps the presentations made by the graduate deans of Fordham University and The Ohio State University during a session on strategic assessment of graduate programs at the CGS Summer Workshop in Vail, Colorado, in July 2008. The graduate studies dean of SUNY Brockport, Susan Stites-Doe, also presented during that session.

Introduction

Increasingly, graduate program assessment and strategic planning are essential activities being undertaken by the great range of institutional members of the Council of Graduate Schools. Fordham and Ohio State represent that full spectrum. Each institution engaged in an assessment and strategic planning process that was unique to its institutional mission and particular circumstances. Fordham's and Ohio State's processes were complementary: Ohio State's assessment of its doctoral programs has become an essential part of the provost's strategic planning process for each college while Fordham's initial emphasis on strategic planning, which was focused on enhancing programs with a potential for prominence, has led into assessment activities.

The primary motivation for this report is to provide an overview of these two processes for those CGS member institutions that are considering such an undertaking. While there are no one-size-fits-all templates for graduate program assessment and strategic planning, the projects undertaken by Fordham and Ohio State do share several features that were critical to success: each institution set its own goals for the process; each process was mindful of institutional cultures, and stakeholders were brought into the process early.

Fordham University

Fordham is an independent Catholic university in the Jesuit tradition. It enrolls approximately 15,000, with approximately half of them graduate students. Fordham has graduate schools in arts and sciences, business, education, law, religion and religious education, and social service. Each of these graduate schools is separate from the undergraduate colleges; there is not one overall graduate school. The majority of the graduate students are at the master's level, mostly in social service, education, and business. Fordham offers the Ph.D. in 15

disciplines across four schools, the Doctor of Education in two areas, and the Doctor of Ministry. The largest doctoral program is the juris doctor, or J.D. Befitting the Jesuit tradition, the emphasis in doctoral education is in the humanities.

As a university dependent on tuition and donors, Fordham is very student-centered. This focus on students is also expected to lead to satisfied alumni, which make up Fordham's largest group of donors. When the Rev. Joseph McShane, S.J., became Fordham's 33rd president in 2003, he brought with him a new vision for the institution and an emphasis on strategic planning. He integrated a strategic planning process with preparation for a capital campaign, and the faculty, departments, and centers were encouraged to "dream big."

The process started in spring 2004 at the trustee level, and faculty involvement began in fall 2004. The university strategic plan was approved in December 2005, and since then, the university has been working on implementation and making necessary updates.

Within the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, strategic planning occurred first within a task force composed of faculty from all programs and all academic ranks, from newly hired assistant professors to distinguished professors. A major benefit of such diverse involvement was the identification of new opportunities, new niches that probably would not have emerged if Fordham had begun with hard data and the evaluation of existing programs.

Fordham's strategic planning process yielded a number of "diamonds in the rough," several programs that cut across disciplines and are at the heart of the university's mission. For example, Fordham is capitalizing on newly identified opportunities in urban environmental science and ethics, value, and social justice. However, to develop the resources necessary to move such programs forward, Fordham must make decisions about allocations of resources. To do so,

continued on next page

INSIDE

Survey Reminder	3
Data Sources	4
Welcome New Members	6

continued from front page

Assessment and Strategic Planning in Graduate Programs

Fordham is using the data collection processes from the National Research Council (NRC) study to develop ongoing, internal assessments of its doctoral programs and is developing similar assessments for its master's programs.

One outcome of Fordham's approach to strategic planning was to raise expectations that faculty involved in doctoral level education would receive lower teaching loads. Fordham since has made the decision to lower its teaching load for all faculty from 3-3 to 3-2, and the university continues to work on identifying resources to cover the teaching responsibilities associated with its full academic program.

Not surprisingly, other difficult questions resulted from the process. While the focus of strategic planning was on enhancing programs with the most potential for prominence, incremental improvements were needed in several areas just to maintain the status quo. Many departments could make a strong case for achieving prominence within specific niches, so who was to decide which programs had potential? These issues highlight the importance of hard data, such as that developed for the NRC, for decision making and the need for additional discussion of strategic initiatives.

Ohio State

Ohio State is the nation's largest university in terms of enrollment on its main campus, with 52,000 students, 10,000 of whom are graduate students. Ohio State is a comprehensive, public, land-grant university with a large academic medical center and has 92 doctoral programs spanning the arts and sciences, health sciences, and professional colleges. The doctoral programs are spread across 17 colleges and one school; in addition there are six interdisciplinary programs overseen by a council of deans drawn mostly from the life sciences.

Patrick Osmer became vice provost for graduate studies and dean of the Graduate School in September 2006 with the charge from the provost to strengthen graduate education, particularly at the doctoral level. In the previous decade, Ohio State had achieved a remarkable improvement in the academic level of its undergraduate students and in the amount of external funding for its research programs. The senior administration realized that the next important step was to achieve a similar improvement in its graduate programs.

The first step in this process was to assess the existing doctoral programs. The charge from the provost was to identify high-quality programs that would enhance the reputation of the university and provide them with increased support and to identify weak, non-core graduate programs that do not enhance the reputation of the university and develop a mechanism for disinvesting in them. The assessment project, which was led by the Graduate School, spanned approximately 10 months and has been incorporated into the provost's strategic planning process for each college.

Ohio State's doctoral assessment process was a three-way

partnership of the Graduate School, Academic Affairs, and the colleges. While the Graduate School had overall responsibility for developing and carrying out the process and formulating the eventual findings and recommendations to the Provost, it did so in light of the Office of Academic Affairs' overall responsibility for academic programs at Ohio State. Because the doctoral programs are embedded in the comprehensive teaching, research, and service activities of each college, each college was made responsible for conducting an internal assessment of its programs. Under Ohio State's budget system, the colleges also have the bulk of the financial resources.

The assessment process built on the efforts Ohio State had undertaken in compiling data for the NRC study as well as on a report by an ad hoc subcommittee of the university senate's fiscal committee. In summer 2007, each college received available institutional data for its doctoral programs, and the Graduate School developed the criteria and steps for assessing the doctoral programs and communicated them to the university community. In autumn 2007, the colleges conducted internal assessments of their doctoral programs and prepared recommendations for the Graduate School. In winter 2008, the Graduate School compiled the college reports and constituted a committee of 13 distinguished faculty (11 from Ohio State, 2 external graduate deans) to review the reports and provide recommendations. In spring 2008, the final report of findings and recommendations was released to the public in April, along with the data and the college reports. The colleges provided their initial responses to the report in May. In summer 2008, the colleges wrote their strategic plans, which included action plans for their doctoral programs.

The Graduate School asked the colleges to base their internal assessments on the centrally provided data and the following factors: overall program quality and centrality to Ohio State's mission; identification of new or emerging opportunities where Ohio State could excel; how a program could gain a competitive edge; improvements in addressing diversity in the doctoral program; new approaches to recruiting high-quality graduate students; and commitment of the department and college to strengthening the doctoral program. The Graduate School intended these guidelines to help the colleges to be forward-thinking in their assessment.

The faculty committee that reviewed the central data and college assessments worked with the Graduate School in classifying Ohio State's graduate programs into six groups: high quality; strong; good; new and/or developing; reassess and/or restructure; and disinvest or eliminate. The assessment process was not formulaic; no ultimate numerical score was developed and used as a governing measure of program quality. Rather, the Graduate School's opinion was, and is, that the data were very important factors but in the end considered judgment had to be applied to determine the final assessments. The strongest and the weakest programs were readily identifiable according to several indicators. These indicators included GRE scores for entering students, placement of doctoral graduates, times to candidacy and to degree, completion rates, and student diversity. It is also important to note that the classifications reflected the criteria and priorities of the colleges.

The final report on the assessment of doctoral programs at

Ohio State contained individual reports with specific findings and recommendations for each college or suite of programs. In addition, a number of university-wide findings emerged from the assessment process that would not have been apparent in normal, one-at-a-time department reviews. Main findings at the university-level were:

- There are critical issues about the organizational structure and administration of the 21 doctoral programs in the biological and life sciences. More than 500 faculty members from 12 colleges and schools participate in the interdisciplinary programs alone, and it is important to assess how Ohio State can optimize its activities in these areas.
- A similar effort is needed for the earth and environmental sciences, which are spread across eight colleges.
- Advanced practice doctoral degrees should be explored by some professional and health programs so that their Ph.D. programs can focus on preparing students to carry out independent research or scholarship.
- Increased stipends and more multi-year funding packages are needed to attract the most highly qualified graduate students.

The initial outcomes of Ohio State's doctoral program assessment are the enhancement of centrally funded fellowship stipends and multi-year support packages for the top 29 programs and the formation of task forces to address the structure and organization of the programs in the biological and life sciences and of the programs in the earth and environmental sciences. Finally, the college deans are expected to report annually on the progress of their doctoral programs and the entire process will be repeated every four to five years. Overall, the doctoral assessment initiative at Ohio State is regarded as an important step for the university to reach its overall strategic goals. Simply causing the colleges to review the data for and critically assess their programs was a valuable first step in their planning for how to improve their doctoral programs. Ohio State's process was successful in identifying its strongest programs and allocating additional resources to them, but it was not as successful in identifying "new or emerging opportunities." However, the specific findings and recommendations of the overall report have already stimulated

significant efforts towards restructuring and review of individual programs.

Conclusions

Despite the differences in size and mission of the two institutions, the assessment and strategic planning activities undertaken by Fordham and Ohio State highlight commonalities likely to be applicable to other CGS member institutions:

- Assessment is a critical feature of strategic planning, and vice versa. Ohio State started its strategic planning with doctoral program assessment. Fordham started with strategic planning and then turned its attention to assessment.
- Involvement of key stakeholders leads to credibility of the process. At Fordham, faculty members were critical in identifying new opportunities for graduate programs. At Ohio State, the college deans were essential to assessing the doctoral programs at the college level and the faculty members and the two external graduate deans who participated in the doctoral program assessment committee increased the acceptance of the findings across the institution.
- Academic units, which customarily emphasize strengths to compete for resources, were supported for making candid and critical appraisals of the programs in assessment and planning when the process respects the mission, criteria and priorities of the units.
- A focus on common, already available data (such as the data submitted for the NRC study) goes a long way toward improving quality.
- The process of stepping back and identifying strengths and emerging opportunities is more of a strategic planning activity than it is an assessment activity. Such a longer view is also facilitated by the involvement of the whole community, including faculty, students, and administrators.

By Nancy A. Busch, Dean, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Fordham University and Patrick S. Osmer, Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Dean of the Graduate School, The Ohio State University

Reminder to Graduate Deans

The deadline to complete the **2008 International Graduate Admissions Survey Phase III: Enrollment** is Friday, October 10, 2008. This survey collects final admittances and enrollment data for international graduate students at U.S. institutions.

If you need a copy of the Phase III survey questionnaire, or if you have questions, please contact Nathan Bell, Interim Director, Research and Policy Analysis, at nbell@cgs.nche.edu or (202) 223-3791.

As always, we greatly appreciate your support of this important project.

Data Sources: International Graduate Programs—2007 & 2008

In 2006, the University of Kansas School of Business established a dual MBA/Master's in Management degree program with the Groupe ESC Claremont Graduate School of Management in Claremont-Ferrand Cedex, France. The MBA-MIM dual degree program aims to develop managers who have the training, language, and cultural capabilities that are increasingly necessary to begin and advance careers in today's global economy (for more information, see the KU Web site at http://www.business.ku.edu/International-IIB_MBA-MIM).

The KU program is just one example of the many collaborative graduate educational programs that U.S. universities have established with international higher education institutions. These collaborative programs go by a variety of names, and it is important to note that there is no single, standard definition for them. Generally speaking, however, they are programs developed by two or more colleges or universities in two or more countries (O'Brien and Proctor, 2007). The participating programs generally award two types of degrees or diplomas: dual (also referred to as double) degrees (through which students take courses and receive a degree or diploma from each participating college or university in the collaborative partnership) and joint degrees. Under joint degree programs, graduating students receive one degree or diploma that typically contains either the names and official seals of all participating institutions (a double-seal or double-badge diploma), or the student's transcript, a separately awarded certificate, or other document may indicate that he or she participated in a collaborative degree program.

Last year, due to the growing interest in the graduate community, CGS's International Graduate Admissions Phase II: Final Applications and Initial Offers of Admission survey collected baseline data on the establishment of collaborative master's and doctoral degree programs between U.S. and international universities.

The first part of the 2007 Phase II survey asked graduate deans to report on the types of collaborative degree and certificate programs their institutions have developed, the countries with which these programs have been developed, and their plans for establishing new programs within the next two years.

Due to the continuing need for more information about the use and expansion

of collaborative graduate activities between U.S. and non-U.S. higher education institutions, this year's Phase II survey also focused on collecting and updating information on these programs. While the definitions of collaborative programs used in this year's survey differ slightly from those used in 2007, there is evidence that the use of international collaborative graduate degree programs has increased over the past year.

Roughly 36% of the survey population provided usable responses in both the 2007 and 2008 surveys. The response rates among certain types of institutions were even higher: in both years, at least nine of the institutions with the largest international graduate student enrollments, 80% of the largest 25, and 68% of the largest 50 provided usable survey responses. The high participation rate among the campuses with the largest international enrollment is important because collectively the 50 largest institutions enroll more than 41% of the total international graduate student population (NCES, 2006). The high response rate among these institutions suggests that the survey results closely reflect the recent trends in the establishment of international collaborative degree programs at U.S. graduate schools.

Growth in International Collaborative Graduate Programs

Based on the Phase II responses, it appears that there has been growth in the establishment of international collaborative graduate degree, certificate, and other programs over the past year. As Table 1 indicates, the share of American universities with at least one graduate degree, certificate, or other collaborative arrangement with one or more international universities grew from about 29% last year to 38% this year. (The results of last year's survey were adjusted as best as possible to be comparable with the 2007 survey. However, because of the different definitions of

Table 1. Percentage of U.S. Colleges and Universities That Have Established Collaborative Graduate Degree Programs with One or More International Universities, 2007 and 2008, by International Graduate Student Enrollment Size

	Dual/Double Degree		Joint Degree		Certificate or Other		One or More Programs	
	2007	2008	2007	2008	2007	2008	2007	2008
All Respondents	14%	21%	10%	10%	8%	8%	29%	38%
International Graduate Student Enrollment Size								
Largest 10	44%	60%	0%	10%	11%	20%	56%	60%
Largest 25	38%	48%	10%	14%	5%	19%	48%	62%
Largest 50	41%	51%	12%	14%	12%	17%	56%	60%
All Others	7%	14%	9%	9%	7%	7%	22%	33%

Source: 2007 CGS International Graduate Admissions Survey II: Final Applications and Initial Offers of Admission, August 2007; and 2008 CGS International Graduate Admissions Survey II: Final Applications and Initial Offers of Admission, August 2008.

Note: Due to changes in the collaborative degree survey questions and definitions, comparisons between the 2007 and 2008 survey results should be interpreted cautiously.

collaborative degree/certificate types reported in the 2007 and 2008 surveys, the results for the two surveys may not be completely comparable.) Growth in collaborative degree programs varied by the size of the survey respondents' international graduate student enrollment. The share of the largest 25 institutions one or more collaborative degree arrangements increased the fastest (rising from 48% in 2007 to 62% in 2008), followed by institutions with enrollments outside the largest 50 (from 22% to 33%).

Dual/double degree programs have accounted for the majority of the growth in collaborative arrangements, especially at larger universities. The share of the largest 25 institutions with at least one dual or double program increased from 38% to 48%; and grew from 41% to 51% at the largest 50 schools. Joint degree programs appear to be much less common and have had very little growth. The share of survey respondents with at least one joint degree collaborative arrangement remained at 10% in both 2007 and 2008. Of the institutions with one or more joint collaborative degree programs in 2008, 33% awarded a "double-badge" or "double-seal" diploma and 50% awarded a diploma with only the seal of the recipient's home university. (The 2007 survey did not ask questions regarding the use of "double-badge" diplomas.)

As the KU Business School program illustrates, American universities are more likely to have established international collaborative graduate degree programs with higher education institutions in Europe than with any other country or region, and the collaborative programs are more likely to award master's degrees. As Table 2 shows, about 36% of the responding institutions with at least one collaborative degree program have master's degree programs with universities in Europe (including the United Kingdom), while 17% have doctoral programs with European higher education institutions (the responses were not mutually exclusive; some institutions

Table 2. Country/Regional Locations at Which U.S. Colleges and Universities Have Established Collaborative Degree Programs in 2008

	Master's	Doctoral	Certificate
Europe (including the U.K.)	36%	17%	0%
China (People's Republic)	18%	3%	0%
India	14%	0%	0%
South Korea	12%	5%	0%
Taiwan	8%	0%	0%
Middle East*	5%	0%	2%
Australia	3%	0%	0%
Other	26%	8%	2%

Source: 2008 CGS International Graduate Admissions Survey II: Final Applications and Initial Offers of Admission, August 2008.

Note: Percentages are based on respondents who indicated that they had established one or more graduate dual/double, joint, or other degree or certificate program with an international (non-U.S.) university. The responses are not mutually exclusive (respondents may have had collaborative degree programs with universities in more than one country or region).

*Middle East includes: Bahrain, Cyprus, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Palestinian Authority, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, and Yemen.

may have established both master's and doctoral programs with European universities, or programs with universities from other countries or regions). While Europe is the most common region for collaborative degree arrangements, China, India, and South Korea are also very important countries for the establishment of these programs. Nearly one-fifth of CGS survey respondents with collaborative degree programs said they have master's programs with Chinese colleges and universities, and 14% have master's programs with institutions in India.

Very few respondents said they have begun collaborative doctoral programs outside of Europe, China, and South Korea. About 26% of the institutions with collaborative programs have been established with such programs that lead to master's degrees with institutions in countries or regions not specifically listed in Table 2, including Latin America, Singapore, Turkey, Russia, and several others.

Table 3. Percentage of U.S. Universities that Plan to Establish One or More New Graduate Collaborate Degree Programs with International Universities Within the Next Two Years, by International Graduate Student Enrollment Size

	Dual/Double Degree	Joint Degree	Certificate or Other	One or More Degrees
All Respondents	22%	13%	9%	31%
International Graduate Student Enrollment Size				
Largest 10	30%	10%	0%	40%
Largest 25	30%	10%	0%	33%
Largest 50	33%	11%	3%	41%
All Others	19%	14%	11%	28%

Note: The responses are not mutually exclusive (some respondents may plan to establish collaborative more than one degree program with international (non-U.S.) universities).

Prospects for Future Growth

To get an idea of the type of growth that might occur in the near future, the CGS survey asked respondents to indicate what types of new collaborative graduate programs, if any, their institutions plan to establish with international colleges or universities over the next two years. Table 3 displays these results.

In total, about 31% of all American graduate schools plan to establish new collaborative degree arrangements with non-U.S. universities within the next two years. Last year, only 24% of survey respondents planned to establish new programs with international partners. Dual/double degree programs at larger American universities will account for much of the growth over the next two years; roughly one-third of the 50 largest institutions plan to begin such programs. On the other hand, only about 10% of the largest 10 and largest 25 institutions plan to begin new joint degree programs, and none are planning to establish new certificate or other types of programs.

While institutions with larger enrollments are more likely to have reported plans to begin new collaborative degrees, some smaller-sized institutions said they do plan to initiate

continued on page 6

continued from page 5

Data Sources

these programs. About 19% of the institutions outside the largest 50 plan to launch dual/double degree programs, 14% plan new joint degree programs, and 11% plan to institute new certificate or other programs.

These survey results suggest that collaborative degree programs will continue to grow. Future CGS surveys will continue to document this important trend between American graduate schools and international colleges and universities.

By *Kenneth E. Redd, former Director, Research and Policy Analysis*

References

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Fall Enrollment Survey. Dataset. On-line. Available: <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/>.

O'Brien, C. & Proctor, D. 2007. *Challenging Innovation: A Consideration of International Joint Degree Programs for Australia*. On-line. Available: <http://www.idp.com/aiec/program/O'Brien%20&%20Proctor.pdf>

Communicator is published 10 times a year and is distributed by the Council of Graduate Schools as a regular member service. Subscriptions for nonmembers are available for \$110 per year.

Communicator encourages and welcomes members to submit articles of interest for inclusion in the newsletter. Current research, hot topics in graduate education, new legislation, and other pertinent information are desired. All manuscripts will be reviewed by a small group of graduate deans and if selected for publication will be scheduled for publication at the editor's discretion. Articles will be edited to conform to style. Inquiries about proper formatting for submissions and comments about *Communicator* may be directed to the Council of Graduate Schools.

No endorsement by CGS of any product or service named herein may be implied.

Editor: Heidi Miller, Director, Meetings and Member Services

Want to Reach Today's Students? Make Sure You're on GradSchools.com

Today's students are online. And the leading online resource for graduate school has been completely redesigned to offer:

- **Improved** ad placements
- **Comprehensive** program information
- **Advanced** student interaction



GradSchools.com



Contact advertise@gradschools.com or 484-766-2910 to start reaching millions of targeted prospects online with GradSchools.com.

GradSchools.com is part of the Prospecting Services Division of EducationDynamics.



EducationDynamics
Chart Your Course

Welcome New Members

Institutional Members
College of St. Catherine
Grand Canyon University
Shepherd University

Corresponding Associate
Member
Elsevier

Vice Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School

The University of Arkansas at Little Rock (UALR) is accepting nominations and applications for the position of Vice Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. Starting date for the Vice Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School is negotiable. The position could commence as soon as January 1, 2009. The review of applications will begin on September 15th and will continue until the position is filled. Salary is commensurate with experience and qualifications; competitive benefits package. Information on UALR is available at www.ualr.edu. A full position description is available at www.ualr.edu/gradschool/deansearch.

To apply: submit a letter of application (reference req #: 528) containing a statement of interest, current curriculum vitae, and a list of five references including names, addresses, e-mail and telephone contact information; indicate clearly how each reference is familiar with your career. Supplementary material will not be considered. Electronic submission of materials as PDF files is preferred, reference req#:528 in the subject line, to Kathy Oliverio at kmoliverio@ualr.edu

For questions concerning the search contact: Dr. Angela Brenton, Chair, Search/Screen Committee for Vice Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School, 2801 South University Avenue, Little Rock, AR, 72204. Phone: 501-569-3244 or e-mail albrenton@ualr.edu

The University of Arkansas at Little Rock is an equal opportunity affirmative action employer and actively seeks the candidacy of minorities, women, and persons with disabilities. Under Arkansas law, all applications are subject to disclosure. The person hired must have proof of legal authority to work in the United States.



Dean of the Graduate School-New Brunswick

Website: <http://www.rutgers.edu/>

THE POSITION: Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, invites nominations and applications for the position of Dean of the Graduate School-New Brunswick.

The University seeks a distinguished scholar and executive whose visionary leadership will promote educational and research excellence. As the senior academic and administrative officer of the Graduate School-New Brunswick, the Dean will provide strategic leadership for the School to maintain and enhance the stature of its programs and to meet new demands. Working closely with the Vice President for Research and Graduate and Professional Education, the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, and other University executives and leaders, the Dean will play a key intellectual role in developing strong academic programs and in fostering growth and excellence in interdisciplinary and inter-institutional collaborations. A dozen full-time staff members support the Graduate Dean's mission, and additional support is provided by the Office of Graduate and Professional Admissions.

QUALIFICATIONS: For a complete position description and additional information regarding this position, please check our website at: <http://www.president.rutgers.edu/appointments.shtml>

APPLICATION PROCESS: Qualified applicants should provide a cover letter, a resume or curriculum vitae, and names and contact information of three references. All nominations, applications, and inquiries should be sent, in confidence, to: Graduate Dean Search Committee; c/o Dr. Linda G. Schulze; Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey; Office of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs; 83 Somerset Street, Room 302; New Brunswick, N.J. 08901 or electronically to lschulze@rci.rutgers.edu.

An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer

COUNCIL OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS



Annual Meeting

DECEMBER 3-6, 2008

Communicator

Council of Graduate Schools
One Dupont Circle NW, Suite 230
Washington, DC 20036-1173