



Communicator

Council of Graduate Schools

www.cgsnet.org

Volume 42, Number 10 • December 2009

Ph.D. Completion Project: Policies and Practices Implemented by Partner Institutions to Promote Student Success

The Ph.D. Completion Project is a seven-year, two-phase project that addresses the issues surrounding Ph.D. completion and attrition. The Council of Graduate Schools (CGS), with generous support from Pfizer Inc and the Ford Foundation, has provided funding to 29 major U.S. and Canadian research universities to create intervention strategies and pilot projects, and to evaluate the impact of these projects on doctoral completion rates and attrition patterns. An additional 25 partner universities are participating in various aspects of this project.

One of the goals of the Ph.D. Completion Project is to produce the most comprehensive and useful data on attrition from doctoral study and completion of Ph.D. programs yet available. In 2008, CGS published the first two monographs in a new series based on this project. The first, *Ph.D. Completion and Attrition: Analysis of Baseline Program Data from the Ph.D. Completion Project* reported baseline program completion and attrition data from this project. The second, *Ph.D. Completion and Attrition: Analysis of Baseline Demographic Data* presented data on completion rates by gender, citizenship, and race/ethnicity. The third volume in the series, *Ph.D. Completion and Attrition: New Evidence from Exit Surveys of Ph.D. Completers*, published in 2009, painted a broad picture of the experiences and perceptions of graduate students as they went through their doctoral programs, as reported by Ph.D. completers. The fourth volume in the series—due to be published in early 2010—reports on policies and practices at participating institutions that aim to improve Ph.D. completion rates and reduce attrition in doctoral programs. Along with the other three volumes in this series, the monograph provides baseline data on the factors influencing Ph.D. completion and what institutions can do to recruit and retain a more diverse set of students and to encourage Ph.D. completion. This article provides an overview of some of the information presented in the monograph and previews the final publication of the project.

Data and Methodology

The report focuses on the 21 institutions participating as Research Partners in Phase II because the eventual goal of the project is to examine the relationship between the interventions and doctoral completion and attrition. Consistent and long-term data are available only for institutions who are currently

active participants in the project. Overall, 250 programs are participating in Phase II of the project. The Mathematics & Physical Sciences field accounts for about one-quarter (24.8%) of all participating programs; Engineering for about one-fifth (19.7%); Life Sciences and Humanities 18.7% each; and Social Sciences 17.7%.

The data sources for this report include the institutional proposals submitted in response to CGS's request for proposals; the two baseline assessment templates created by CGS that listed the policies and programs already in place at the department and institutions levels (although not all institutions provided these templates so the data on existing practices were incomplete); annual reports submitted by the institutions; the Ph.D. Completion Project website (www.phdcompletion.org); notes from CGS site visits; and data on selected characteristics of the institution and student body.

To facilitate analysis, data from the proposals and the annual reports were combined into spreadsheets that focused on different themes (for example, goals of the project; proposed interventions and rationale; implementation progress, successes, and challenges; and evidence of impact of the project). This helped highlight common themes across the set of institutions within these broad topics. The interventions themselves were coded into six separate "bins" or areas based on a framework for understanding Ph.D. completion. These six factors included: selection and admissions; mentoring and advising; financial support; research mode of the field; curricular and administrative processes and procedures; and program environment. Where appropriate, interventions were also grouped into subcategories under the broader headings. The monograph highlights selected examples

continued on next page

INSIDE

Highlights of the Sixth Biennial Meeting of PSM Program Leaders	4
McNair Memos	5
Data Sources	6
Welcome New Members	7

Ph.D. Completion Project

in these subcategories of interventions that seemed promising or interesting or a particularly good example of a particular intervention. The selections were meant to be broadly representative and illustrative and do not represent a ranking or judgment that policies and practices of other institutions not highlighted were somehow less interesting or innovative.

Overview of the Research Partners

Six out of 21 Research Partners in Phase II of the project are private institutions; the remaining 15 are public. The total number of doctoral programs offered by these universities ranged from 21 to 138. The percentage of women enrolled in doctoral programs at these institutions ranges from 40% to 63%. The majority of institutions (17 out of 21) reported that the percentage of U.S. minority students enrolled in doctoral programs was less than 20%. The percentage of international students enrolled in doctoral programs ranged from 14% to 50%.

Following CGS's overarching goal for the project, all the institutions set as the overall goal for their individual projects a reduced attrition rate and improved completion rate in the doctoral programs participating in the project, with a special emphasis on improved outcomes of underrepresented minority and women students.

The sections below are organized around the six factors listed earlier although we note that these are not mutually exclusive categories and interventions often address several different facets of the doctoral experience and go across categories. Each section illustrates some policies and practices implemented by the institutions.

Promising Practices: Student Selection and Admissions

Universities participating in the Ph.D. Completion Project have developed a variety of mechanisms for integrating into the doctoral admissions process a greater attention to the "fit" or "match" between a particular student and a specific program, alongside considerations of traditional measures of student quality. A consistent theme across each of these areas of intervention in selection and admissions is the recruitment, retention and success of underrepresented students.

Recruitment: Offer pre-admission and pre-enrollment campus visits; use early research opportunities as a recruitment tool; improve efforts to recruit underrepresented students.

Transparency: Improve department websites to ensure that each includes additional data, information, and resources necessary for prospective students to make informed decisions; increase transparency in the selection processes and clarify expectations for students in their doctoral programs, including assessment milestones.

Admissions: Develop workshops for admissions committees; select students based on "fit" to program; survey applicants to determine why admissions offers are accepted or declined.

Promising Practices: Mentoring and Advising

Success in achieving a Ph.D. depends upon a close and effective working relationship with one's advisor and mentor.

Mentoring is also an area that can pose unique challenges to universities seeking to implement program-level or university-wide improvements because mentoring is practiced and valued unevenly in doctoral programs. Improvements in mentoring and advising outnumber improvements in any other area of activity and innovation in the Ph.D. Completion Project. Promising practices identified by participating universities in the area of mentoring and advising include:

Resources for students: Provide a comprehensive orientation to prepare students for graduate school; develop/revise graduate student handbooks; clearly articulate program expectations/academic milestones; develop/enhance online mechanisms so students and faculty can track progress and communicate with one another; implement online milestone tracking systems, "dissertation checklists," electronic portfolios, and annual progress report systems that integrate graduate school records, student input, and evaluative comments from faculty.

Regularity and uniformity of progress review: Implement regular advisor/advisee meetings and progress reports; encourage programs to set up annual student performance review systems.

Early advising: Require each first-year student to have an advisor or advisory structure; conduct regular evaluations of progress; encourage women and minority students to participate in programs that offer mentorship outside the department; create ombud position to support first-year students.

Resources for faculty: Offer workshops for faculty on mentoring; offer mini-grants to help faculty develop initiatives aimed at improving the quality of mentoring; recognize excellence in mentoring through faculty awards.

Other mentors: Train peer mentors and ensure that all new students are assigned a trained peer mentor; provide students with external mentors.

Promising Practices: Financial Support

Students and researchers often cite financial support as being among the most influential factors on Ph.D. completion and attrition but there is evidence showing that not all forms of student support are equally beneficial. Thus, financial support needs to be structured to optimize completion and enhance academic and social integration. Promising practices in the area of financial support and structure include:

Increased student support: Increase stipend levels to be comparable to peers; increase the number of selective university fellowship awards; increase the number of summer research awards in the humanities and social sciences; provide health insurance premium coverage; explore higher stipends and more one-quarter releases from teaching for dissertating students; change graduate assistantship allocation to a "Ph.D. preferred" model, whereby 80% of doctoral students and 20% of master's students will be funded; address potential IRS tax inequities within graduate student population.

Incentives to departments: Link departmental allocations and performance indicators of student completion.

Promising Practices: Program Environment

The academic "environment" of a Ph.D. program is shaped

by department-led and university-wide efforts to create the conditions for high expectations, high performance, and strong student support. Informal opportunities to participate in department events, regular social gatherings, or team sports may also prove to be important components of a graduate student's socialization to their academic discipline. Promising practices include:

Support networks and support services: Initiate campus-wide efforts to bring students together across disciplines and within the department for academic and social interaction; encourage graduate student organizations in all programs/departments to explore community building activities; promote involvement of graduate students as members of campus-wide or department-wide committees; highlight achievements and accomplishments of graduate students through newsletters, dinners, or other venues; develop a network for support; outreach to and integration of fellows.

Family accommodation policies: Implement a parental accommodation policy and institution-wide policy on family and medical leave for graduate assistants.

Promising Practices: Research Experience

Researchers often note that the degree of social interaction characteristic of the sciences, where an apprenticeship model, research teams, and a laboratory setting prevail, can provide a more supportive environment than the solitary, individual research with often extended periods without advisor feedback that is often characteristic of the humanities. Interventions in this area focus both on pre-program research experiences (prior to starting the doctoral program) and early research experiences.

Pre-program research experiences: Identify top undergraduates and invite them to participate in a research institute late in their sophomore year to prepare and recruit these students to pursue doctoral studies; offer summer pre-doctoral institute for underrepresented students.

Early research experiences: Encourage lab rotations prior to choosing a mentor/research area; provide opportunities and funding for humanities and social sciences students to participate in research in the early stages of their programs and to attend professional meetings; provide students with a catalog of research opportunities and facilitate matching of research interests between advisors and students; streamline course requirements to allow students the opportunity to engage early in research.

Promising Practices: Curricular and Administrative Processes and Procedures

This is a broad category encompassing the more traditional curricular and administrative processes and procedures as well as new initiatives aimed at providing support for writing during the dissertation stage (or earlier stages) or offering various types of professional development opportunities. These types of workshops and supports inhere in the programmatic/institutional structure and are a fundamental aspect of program quality. Promising practices include the following:

Administrative/curricular processes and procedures: Create/enhance institutional database on students via a web-based system to track student aid; monitor and track all

students who leave; introduce a continuous enrollment policy to serve as the impetus for students to stay on track; refine policies and practices for matriculation and track and report on Ph.D. student degree progress; revise program review process to examine quality of each graduate program in terms of quality inputs, outcomes, and operational practice; streamline the sequencing of courses.

Writing assistance for graduate students: Offer a writing assistance program for graduate students at all stages through trained writing coaches or writing consultants (senior-level graduate students trained in writing); offer writing assistance to groups of students from several disciplines so they can appreciate the commonality of writing difficulties.

Support During the Dissertation Phase: Offer a Dissertation Retreat/Dissertation Boot Camp/Dissertation House/Dissertation Writing Institute for students who are stalled in their progress that offers uninterrupted time to focus on the dissertation, writing strategies, receive feedback, and build peer support; establish a Doctoral Student Writing Room, where doctoral students could engage in project development, research and writing and collaborate with others; offer a summer Dissertation Writing Residency Fellowship for students who are not making progress (especially students from underrepresented groups).

Professional Development of Graduate Students: Offer a safe, hospitable space in which graduate students engage in micro-teaching activities, videotape themselves teaching, and engage in the peer review of teaching to develop skills in constructive peer teaching review; offer a University Graduate Certification in College Teaching, requiring workshop experiences in five competency areas as well as a mentored teaching experience; offer a Graduate Teaching Fellowship Program to provide mentored teaching experiences for qualified students who might not normally have such an opportunity in their own discipline; offer enrichment events aimed at preparing students for job applications and interviews or preparing them for careers in other sectors.

Impact of the Ph.D. Completion Project on Institutions: Early Findings

While it is still too early to expect hard evidence linking the project activities to improved completion and reduced attrition rates in the doctoral programs participating in the project, there are a number of important changes that institutions attributed to the project. These included improved tracking of doctoral students; development of a "culture of evidence;" improved understanding of factors affecting doctoral completion and attrition through research projects; increased sensitivity to issues facing students from underrepresented groups; improved coordination and collaboration across the different departments and offices across campus, and in a few cases improved completion rates or progress towards completion.

Future Plans

As the project continues and additional data are collected and analyzed, CGS will study the impact of groups of interventions designed to improve completion rates. The culminating publication in this series, scheduled for release in 2010, will include a comprehensive analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data submitted by the

continued on page 5

Highlights of the Sixth Biennial Meeting of Professional Science Master's Program Leaders

Over 200 Professional Science Master's (PSM) program directors, graduate deans, association and education administrators, alumni, and federal and state policymakers, gathered in Washington D.C. on November 4-6, 2009 for the Sixth PSM Biennial Meeting: Advancing the Nation's

Competitiveness and Innovation Agenda, hosted by the Council of Graduate Schools with support from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. The program agenda included the PSM's role in addressing challenges of maintaining U.S. competitiveness in the face of globalization, increased federal and state accountability, increased competition for students, and demographic changes in the composition of graduate students.

Debra Stewart, CGS President, and Don Langenberg, Chair of the CGS PSM Advisory Board and Chancellor Emeritus, University of Maryland, set the stage for the meeting with a welcome and introductory remarks. The first plenary session, titled "Enhancement and Expansion of the PSM: National Perspectives," stressed the role of the PSM in facilitating innovation and the necessity of collaboration among stakeholders—policymakers, universities, and employers. The Honorable David Wu, U.S. House of Representatives, iterated the need to recognize the pivotal role the PSM can play in maintaining our nation's competitiveness. Speakers included Rita Colwell, Distinguished University Professor, University of Maryland, College Park and The Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg School of Public Health; Bill Valdez, Director, Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Sciences, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science; and Cornelius Kerwin, President, American University.

In a session focused on state perspectives, Nancy Zimpher, Chancellor, State University of New York; Mohammad Qayoumi, President, California State University, East Bay; and Richard Devlin, Senate Majority Leader, Oregon State Legislature, shared their perspectives regarding the PSM as a key component of their states' workforce development strategy, emphasizing the need to enhance competitiveness in the global economy.

David Chapman, University of Utah, and Jung Choi, Georgia Institute of Technology, discussed the topic of "Financial Models for Program Sustainability" in a session moderated by Greg Buck, Virginia Commonwealth University. Strategies such as tuition surcharges and program fees were described.

In a session titled, "Ethics and the PSM," Cliff Chancey and Donna Wood, University of Northern Iowa, and Ching-Hua Wang and Karol Pessin, California State University, Channel Islands, considered what type of ethics instruction can best prepare PSM graduates to cope with the immense pressures associated with professional scientific positions in business and industry and how to introduce this instruction into an



existing program. Julie Funk, Director, Michigan State University, moderated the session.

Linda Strausbaugh, Lee Aggison, and Elaine Mirkin, University of Connecticut, and Saeed Foroudastan, Kristina Hulsey, and Sandra Hollis-Hyde, Middle Tennessee State

University, discussed their approaches to recruiting students and marketing the PSM with a particular emphasis on recruiting underrepresented students. The session was introduced by Ursula Bechert, Oregon State University and National Professional Science Master's Association (NPSMA) President, who presented an overview of how innovations such as the PSM follow a curvilinear path as they are adopted and adapted over time.

The Distinguished Alumni panel was widely regarded as one of the most valuable sessions. Todd Bridgeman, NOAA Commissioned Officer Corps, Sally Sakelaris, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Chris Fennig, Odin Technologies, Inc., Hutch Humphreys, Amylin Pharmaceuticals, and Cheril Lin Abeel, Urban Science, graduates of five different PSM programs, described how the PSM impacted their career pathways. A related session, "PSM Graduates and Those Who Hire Them," was organized by the NPSMA and also featured graduates of PSM programs who discussed how the PSM prepared them for employment, and an employer who highlighted the special skills a PSM graduate brings to the workplace. These two sessions provided real illustrations of how PSM graduates are making valuable contributions to the nation's prosperity through innovation and leadership.

A new feature of the meeting was a best practice poster session with 25 posters selected for presentation. The posters addressed issues such as the internship, external advisory boards, an online mentoring program, guidelines for PSM program recognition, how PSM programs can serve veterans, ethics, state and system-wide initiatives, student perspectives on the PSM, initiatives of NPSMA, and unique features of several PSM programs.

Special guest speaker, Arden Bement, Director, National Science Foundation, closed the meeting by sharing his perspective on the future of the science master's program as well as what he hopes this program will achieve for the nation.

Proceedings of the PSM Biennial will be available early 2010 on www.sciencemasters.com. The complete program can be viewed now at <http://www.sciencemasters.com/PSMBiennialMeeting/tabid/99/Default.aspx>.

Contacts: Eleanor Babco, Sally Francis, Carol Lynch, Joshua Mahler, and Nancy Vincent

McNair Memos: Revisiting GRE Scores

Now that we are nearing the time when graduate program officers are reviewing applications, it seems appropriate to revisit the appropriate use of GRE scores. The community of McNair directors and staff hope that students will neither be discouraged from applying nor have their entire application rejected because of a sub-standard GRE score.

Following is an abbreviated version of the GRE's Board Statement Regarding the Fair and Appropriate Use of GRE Scores:¹

- Scores are appropriately used as one factor in the selection of graduate students or fellowship recipients, etc.;
- Scores are most effectively used when validation evidence is available to document the relationship of scores to graduate program success;
- Test scores should always be used along with other sources of information such as course grades, letters of recommendation, personal statements, and samples of academic or other work experience;
- Cut-off scores should not be used as the sole criterion for making a decision about admission, financial aid, etc.;
- Verbal, Quantitative and Analytical Writing scores should be treated as three separate and independent pieces of information and should not generally be combined into a single score;
- Decisions about applicants should not be made on the basis of small score differences. See the *GRE Guide to the Use of Scores* on <http://www.ets.org> for information on standard errors of measurement;
- Although our biggest concern is the use of the GRE General Test scores, departments that use GRE subject tests should periodically review test content to verify its appropriateness for their particular programs.

The GRE Board statement that is excerpted above was adopted unanimously by the Board on May 4, 2004, and endorsed by the Council of Graduate Schools' Advisory Committee on Minorities in Graduate Education on April 4, 2004. More detailed information is offered in the Guide at the website above.

Because McNair scholars are either low-income and first college generation individuals and/or members of groups underrepresented in higher education, the test may be relatively less predictive of their potential in graduate school. The following statement can be found in the *Guide to the Use of Scores, Minority Examinees*:²

GRE scores, like those on similar standardized tests, cannot completely represent the potential of any person, nor can they alone reflect an individual's chances of long-term success in an academic environment. It should be remembered that the GRE tests provide measures of certain types of developed abilities and achievement, reflecting educational and cultural experience over a long period. Special care is required in interpreting the GRE scores of

students who may have had educational and cultural experiences somewhat different from those of the traditional majority.

Research indicates that GRE scores are valid predictors of success in the first year of graduate school for all students. Available samples of minority students, however, have been very small. Information about specific research regarding test scores and minority groups can be found in the publication entitled *Factors that Can Influence Performance on the GRE General Test* on the GRE website at www.ets.org/gre/factors.

In conclusion, as a representative of the McNair community, I would emphasize that the developers and marketers of the GRE test share a number of the same concerns as our program staff. Although many institutions and departments use the test in a fair and appropriate way, which is as a part of a holistic admissions process, our concern is those graduate programs that establish cut-off or minimum scores or that weigh test scores too heavily relative to other admissions credentials.

By Priscilla Fortier, Assistant Dean and Associate Director, Minority Student Affairs, Interim Director, Student Support Services and McNair Scholars, Adjunct Professor, Educational Policy Studies, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

End Notes:

¹The complete version is located at:
<http://www.ets.org/portal/site/ets/menuitem.1488512ecfd5b8849a77b13bc3921509/?vgnnextoid=efb42d3631df4010VgnVCM1000022f95190RCRD&vgnnextchannel=b3ce46f1674f4010VgnVCM1000022f95190RCRD>

²http://www.ets.org/Media/Tests/GRE/pdf/gre_0910_guide.pdf

continued from page 3

Ph.D. Completion Project

partnering universities in Phases I and II of the Ph.D. Completion Project, as well as a description of those policies and practices that appear to have had a demonstrated effect on completion rates and attrition patterns over time. It is our hope that the findings of the Ph.D. Completion Project will transform our understanding of the factors that contribute to higher Ph.D. completion rates nationwide, particularly for women and minorities.

More detailed information about the project, including a full list of research and project partners for both phases, is available on the Ph.D. Completion Project website at www.phdcompletion.org.

Contacts: Robert Sowell and Nathan Bell

Data Sources: Non-Traditional Students in Graduate Education

In recent years, a number of colleges and universities have developed graduate programs specifically designed for older students returning to school, often part-time or online programs that offer the flexibility non-traditional students require. Institutions cite the increase in the numbers of non-traditional graduate students on their campuses as the impetus for these new programs, but is this population truly growing? This article uses three data sources to explore the changes in the participation of older students in graduate education over time.

Graduate Students by Age Group

Data from the U.S. Department of Education's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) reveal that there has been only a small shift over time in the age distribution of graduate students in the United States. In fall 2007, 22% of all graduate students were 40 years of age and over, compared with 23% in fall 1997, and 18% in fall 1987 (Table 1). While the percentage of graduate students 40 years of age and over increased over the past two decades, the percentage 30 to 39 years of age declined, from 35% in 1987 to 28% in 2007. Combining the two categories reveals a slight overall decline in the percentage of graduate students 30 years of age and over, from 53% in 1987 to 50% in 2007 (Snyder, et al., 2009, and earlier editions).

Although there has been little change in the age distribution of graduate students over the past 20 years, there has been a large increase in the sheer numbers of non-traditional students. Between 1987 and 2007, the number of graduate students 40 years of age and over increased 87%, from about 267,000 to 500,000, and the number of graduate students 30 to 39 years of age increased 28%, from 507,000 to 649,000. These figures compare with a 58% overall increase in graduate enrollment in the same time period.

Projections suggest that the number of non-traditional students will continue to increase over the next decade, but these older students will comprise about the same share of all students in ten years as they do today. Projections data by age are not broken out by level (undergraduate vs. graduate), but they indicate that about 3.4 million students 35 years of age and over will be enrolled in higher education in 2018, up from about 3.0 million in 2007. Students in this age group are expected to account for 16.4% of all students in higher education in 2018 compared to 16.5% in 2007 (Hussar and Bailey, 2009).

Average Age of Graduate Students

Age data are also collected as part of the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS), a sample survey conducted every four years by the National Center for Education Statistics. Data from the survey show that there has been little change in the average age of graduate students in recent years. As of December 31, 2007, the average age of graduate students was 32.4 years old, while four years earlier in 2003, the average age of graduate students was 32.5 years old. Both figures are nearly identical to those for 1999 and 1995, when the average ages of graduate students were 32.6 and 32.4, respectively (NCES, various years).

The NPSAS dataset also includes age data by degree program and field of study. By degree program, the average age of students in 2007 was highest in Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) programs (42.3) and lowest in Doctor of Psychology (Psy.D.) programs (28.3). In all other master's degree and doctoral programs, the average age ranged from a low of 31.1 in Master of Public Health (MPH) programs to a high of 33.2 in Master of Education or Teaching programs. The average age of students in post-baccalaureate certificate programs was 36.8. By field of study, the average age of graduate students was highest in family and consumer sciences (38.4); theology and religious vocations (37.1); and library science (36.6), and lowest in architecture (27.5); parks, recreation, and fitness studies (28.4); and biological and biomedical sciences (28.5).

Median Age at Receipt of Doctorate

A third source, the Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED), collects data on the median age of individuals at the time they earn a research doctorate in the United States. While the median age of new doctorate recipients increased gradually in the late 1980s and early 1990s, this figure has actually declined over the past decade. In 2006, the latest year for which data are currently available, the median age of new doctorate recipients was 32.7 years old. In 2001, the median age was 33.3 years old, and in 1996, it was 34.1 years old. The median age of new doctorate recipients today is nearly identical to the median age at receipt of the doctorate in 1983 (32.8), and only one year older than the median age in 1978 (31.7) (Hoffer, et al., 2007, and earlier editions).

continued on page 8

Table 1. Graduate Enrollment by Age, Fall 1987, Fall 1997, and Fall 2007

	Fall 1987		Fall 1997		Fall 2007	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
All Students	1,452,075	100%	1,753,489	100%	2,293,593	100%
Under 18	767	0%	312	0%	215	0%
18 and 19	566	0%	406	0%	931	0%
20 and 21	9,371	1%	13,071	1%	18,751	1%
22 to 24	201,505	14%	254,702	15%	401,589	18%
25 to 29	416,707	29%	544,030	31%	701,462	31%
30 to 34	288,114	20%	301,834	17%	390,025	17%
35 to 39	219,008	15%	202,236	12%	258,480	11%
40 to 49	208,215	14%	300,486	17%	318,074	14%
50 to 64	51,591	4%	96,936	6%	175,838	8%
65 and over	7,494	1%	5,753	0%	6,483	0%
Age unknown	48,737	3%	33,723	2%	21,745	1%
29 and under	628,916	43%	812,521	46%	1,122,948	49%
30 to 39	507,122	35%	504,070	29%	648,505	28%
40 and over	267,300	18%	403,175	23%	500,395	22%

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics*, 1990, 1999, and 2008

Welcome New Corresponding Associate Members

Academic Analytics iParadigms, LLC



Assistant/Associate Faculty Position

The Center for Psychological Studies anticipates an opening at the Assistant/Associate level. Applicants will be reviewed for rank and salary commensurate with experience. The position requires an earned doctorate in clinical psychology with credentials or strong background and training in one or more of the following areas: Applied statistics and/or research design and evaluation. The successful candidate will teach graduate courses in statistics and research methodology and provide supervision and methodological and statistical consultation for dissertations and other research activities. The Center for Psychological Studies is a graduate center that offers APA-accredited Ph.D. and Psy.D. programs in clinical psychology and a pre-doctoral internship program. Also part of the center is a consortium internship program (APPIC member), master of science programs in mental health counseling, school counseling, and clinical psychopharmacology, a specialist program in school psychology, and a behavioral sciences track in the university's master's program in criminal justice. The center trains students at its Psychology Services Center that serves children, adolescents, and adults through its outpatient and thirteen faculty specialty clinical training programs.

Applications will be reviewed until position is filled. Please apply on line to Position #998719 www.nsujobs.com.

Visit our website: www.nova.edu

*Nova Southeastern University is an Equal Opportunity/
Affirmative Action Employer.*



Position Announcement - Oklahoma State University PROVOST AND SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT

Oklahoma State University invites applications and nominations for the position of Provost and Senior Vice President. OSU is a comprehensive land-grant institution that is internationally recognized for its instruction, research, and outreach programs. System-wide enrollment exceeds 33,000 students, with nearly 21,000 enrolled at the OSU-Stillwater campus. For additional information on OSU and the search, please go to the website: provost.search.okstate.edu.

Responsibilities: The Provost, serving as the Chief Academic Officer, is expected to: plan, develop, and coordinate academic programs; foster the academic growth and development of faculty, staff, and students; plan and execute academic policies; and budget and administer academic programs and related activities. The Provost reports directly to the President of the OSU System.

Qualifications: OSU is seeking an individual with an earned doctorate, a distinguished record of scholarly professional accomplishments, and academic credentials that merit a tenured appointment at the rank of professor. The successful candidate will have a demonstrated capacity to develop a comprehensive vision and to take bold action that reflects innovation, wisdom, and foresight. The Provost will be highly motivated to work with OSU's System President, faculty, staff, and students to shape a comprehensive strategic vision that continues to elevate OSU into the ranks of premier land grant institutions.

Application/Nomination Procedures: Applications should consist of an academic resume, a letter of interest, and the names, addresses (including e-mail addresses), and telephone numbers of four references. (References will not be contacted without prior approval of the candidate.) Nominations should include the complete name, address, and telephone number as well as a brief description of the nominee. While applications and nominations will be accepted until a successful candidate has been identified, interested parties are encouraged to submit their materials by December 18, 2009, to receive optimal consideration.

Please send applications and nominations by e-mail to: provost.search@okstate.edu; Regents Professor John Mowen, Chair; Provost Search Committee, Spears School of Business, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK 74078; Office phone: (405) 744-2690 FAX: (405) 744-4399.

*Oklahoma State University is an Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity E-Verify
Employer committed to diversity. OSU is a tobacco-free campus.*

Data Sources

Conclusions

Data from these sources indicate that the number of non-traditional graduate students has increased in the United States over the past two decades, but their share of all graduate students has changed only slightly. However, two of these sources (IPEDS and the SED) do not capture any data on graduate certificate-level and master's-level students enrolled part-time only in the summer, populations that might include larger numbers of non-traditional students. While the NPSAS data may include these students, it is likely that they are underrepresented in the survey data. Therefore, it is possible that the current sources of data on student age fail to capture the true change in this population over time.

Even if current data sources are unable to provide a full picture of the participation of non-traditional students in graduate education, it is clear that the population is growing in sheer numbers and that this growth will likely persist for at least the next decade. To serve this growing population, U.S. graduate schools will need to continue to offer flexible programs, delivered in a variety of formats, to meet the needs of these older students.

By Nathan E. Bell, Director, Research and Policy Analysis

References:

- Hoffer, T., Hess, M., Welch, V., and Williams, K. 2007. *Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities: Summary Report 2006*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.
- Hussar, W., and Bailey, T. 2009. *Projections of Education Statistics to 2018*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). National Postsecondary Student Aid Study. Dataset.
- Snyder, T., Dillow, S., and Hoffman, C. 2009. *Digest of Education Statistics 2008*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Communicator

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