

Midwestern Association of Graduate Schools

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
65th ANNUAL MEETING**

*Transitions in Graduate Education:
Leading Through Change*



April 1-3, 2009
Westin Crown Center
Kansas City, MO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Plenary I: Creating Our Future

Reflections from the positions of dean, academic vice president, university president, and member of governor's cabinet, and perspectives on the university's role in research and economic development of regions and states. Are we stewards of place, protectors of educational quality, or innovators?

Keynote Address Page 4
Karla Stroup, President, American Humanics

Plenary II: A Career and Professional Development Program for Master's and Doctoral Students (PREP)

Early career planning and strategic professional development for graduate students are essential for stemming attrition, improving completion, and helping students achieve a match between their goals and future career outcomes. This session is designed to demonstrate how Michigan State University's career and professional development program for graduate students, *PREP* (Planning, Resilience, Engagement, and Professionalism), was developed to meet the needs of students pursuing academic and non-academic career trajectories. (<http://grad.msu.edu/prep/index.htm>)

Presentation Page 9
Judith Stoddart, Assistant Dean, The Graduate School, Michigan State University
Henry (Rique) Campa III, Assistant Dean, The Graduate School, Michigan State University

Plenary III: Interdisciplinary Programs

A panel will explore the development of interdisciplinary programs. It will touch upon the barriers experienced, the structures that are utilized, the impact upon promotion and tenure, the joint research potential, and will give suggestions for best practice.

Coordinating Presenter

Hilary Ratner, Wayne State University

Panel Discussion

Robert Bolla

Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Bradley University

Samuel Attoh

Dean of the Graduate School, Loyola University, Chicago

Plenary IV: Key Considerations When Developing Ethics Training for Science and Science and Engineering Graduate Students

Given the various constraints that graduate departments encounter, it is not an easy challenge to determine what the best method is for introducing graduate science and engineering students to ethics. It is important to do but it is not obvious how the goal should be accomplished. Thus, there are considerations for those who seek to develop an ethics program.

Presentation Page 16
Jason Bornstein, Georgia Tech University

Workshop Sessions

KU-KUT Joint M.S. Degree Program Page 20
R.L. Dougherty and C.W. Luchies, Mechanical Engineering, University of Kansas

ProQuest Graduate Portal, Assisting Students from Application to Graduation

Fundraising for Graduate Education

Coordinating Presenter: William Wiener, Marquette University

Presenters: Donald J. Benson and Amy Balser Blumenthal, Marquette University

Professional Doctorates Page 28
Alan Rawitch, KU Medical Center and Donna Calvert, Rockhurst University

Rebuilding English: Kansas State University's Afghanistan Initiative Page 34
Robert Corum, Mary Copple, and Carol Shanklin, Kansas State University

Annual Business Meeting

Meeting Agenda Page 42

Treasurer's Report Page 43

Membership Committee Report Page 45

Distinguished Thesis Committee Report Page 47

Publications Committee Report Page 49

New Business Items

MAGS/ETS Award Page 52

Proposal for Electronic Review of Thesis Award Nominations Page 53

CREATING OUR FUTURE

Kala M. Stroup
President
American Humanics
1100 Walnut Street, Suite 1900
Kansas City, Missouri 64106
kstroup@humanics.org

ABSTRACT

The presentation centers on reflections from the positions of dean, academic vice president, university president, and member of governor's cabinet, and contains perspectives on the university's role in research and economic development of regions and states. Are we stewards of place, protectors of educational quality or innovators?

INTRODUCTION

This presentation is less of a keynote speech and more of a conversation with those of you who serve in Graduate Dean positions in our universities. My reflections and observations are from lessons learned from over four decades in the academy. All of my observations have been shaped by professional experiences as faculty/administrative staff member, Dean, Assistant to Chancellor, Provost, University President, State Commissioner of Higher Education, member of Governor's Cabinet, and national nonprofit leader. During the years I served on National Corporate Boards, President's Commission of NCAA, National Advisory Boards for SBA and HHS, Board member of AASCU, MHEC, AAHE, ACE, NHSA. Each new position and/or appointment yielded new insights and deeper layers of understandings about our universities and the role of the Graduate Dean.

OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE ROLE/POSITION OF THE GRADUATE DEAN

1) There is rarely any clear role or position description with common understandings for the Graduate Dean. Responsibilities are not universally understood and conflicting in purpose. They cross areas of authority and governance with Deans of Colleges and Schools with graduate programs, research centers and institutes. As a vice-president / provost and university president, I often negotiated tensions and territorial disagreements between Deans of Colleges and the Graduate office. Responsibilities were split in relationship to research, centers and institutes, graduate admissions, and responsibility for the quality of programs. Graduate Deans were often placed in the difficult positions of trying to standardize research protocols, monitor graduate admissions, and review grant submissions when these functions were performed by the Deans of the Schools or graduate committees.

2) The Graduate Dean position is rarely aligned with the mission of the university: metropolitan universities, state colleges and universities, private research universities, and large land grant institutions have widely differing missions in relationship to graduate education and research. Institutional needs and strategies in relationship to mission in these two areas are vastly different across universities and are rarely reflected in the title, position responsibilities and scope of authority for the graduate dean.

These two observations have led me to believe that there is an opportunity to create your future, the graduate dean role in the universities of the future. Where are the leadership vacuums in our universities?

To answer this question we need to reflect about the areas where we could be more effective, especially in graduate and professional education? If we agree that the role is murky, then there is potential for real development of a significant role for the Graduate Dean aligned with the university mission.

CREATING YOUR FUTURE IN GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Again I am sharing with you my observations and opinions based upon countless discussions and shared frustrations inside and outside our universities.

1) Most universities have been slow in utilizing technology and developing new forms of graduate and professional education. It is no secret that the University of Phoenix is successful because the traditional universities were slow in understanding the need and demand for graduate and professional education, delivered any time, any place. I remember most vividly how frustrated many of us were when we tried to urge the universities in MHEC (Midwest Higher Education Consortium) in the late 90's to jointly participate in the cooperative delivery of quality on-line graduate education. There is still a market demand for on-line graduate and professional education delivered by our traditional universities.

2) Today's workforce demands a different model for professional education. We know our graduates still see the universities as places to upgrade skills and competencies and prepare for career transitions. A good example of the need resides in the allied health fields where we have prepared skilled professionals in physical therapy and nursing who later want advanced preparation to be managers and leaders in their sector. We are often slow or unresponsive in meeting these needs and creating models of advanced preparation for these aspiring leaders. The MBA model does not always fit.

3) In addition to being students of our disciplines and fields, we need to pay attention to our regions and their characteristics and needs. For over twenty-five years we have been observing the difficulty of metropolitan universities to define their mission in relationship to their urban environments. When President Michael Crow of Arizona State University began using the term "embedded university" to describe their mission, leaders across the

country were impressed, but not sure how it could be done. ASU stands as a model of the 'new American university'. In order to jump start a similar concept, Kellogg Foundation funded a demonstration project with AASCU using the concept of "Stewards of Place". The purpose of this project was to provide models for in-depth relationships between universities and their communities. Regardless of our rhetoric, universities are not 'A' students in knowledge about our regions, cities, and/or states. We need to effectively utilize our talents to engage our communities collectively in addressing our societal challenges.

4) When I served on the Governor's Cabinet, I was continually surprised about the lack of connection to our universities and the overwhelming need for expertise, data collection, applied research, and data driven public policy analysis. Most states have young staff members in the Governor's office and transitory leadership in senior positions. For the most part, our states and their leaders need the expertise that resides in our universities and these connections are not solidly forged or maintained.

5) Many of today's challenges need cross disciplinary and interdisciplinary collaboration and research. The Graduate Dean must be empowered with the tools to encourage this work at the universities. The recent upsurge in interest in the Life Sciences is one good example of the leadership work that could come from our universities across disciplines and schools. We often create separate offices for moving faculty expertise and innovations into practice when our graduate offices should and could be routinely extending those services.

All of these examples are places where the graduate dean could and should be a leader in utilization of new technologies for delivery of graduate and professional education, a leader in searching for new models of professional education, a student of region or state and its needs, and in fostering interdisciplinary research and graduate education.

All of these examples are about vacuums, lack of connection to universities and their expertise. Instead of spending large sums of resources on lobbying staff in state capitals, may I suggest some areas to build connective tissue which would be truly valued by our state leaders and citizens. The Graduate Dean is the obvious leader for these areas.

GRADUATE DEAN AS UNIVERSITY LEADER

The Graduate Dean could be the university leader responsible for building the connective tissue between schools/colleges within and the larger sector externally. If this connection and set of relationships were solidly developed the university would probably need only one-half of its public relations staff. The public would readily see the connection between quality of life and the university.

Link to region: The graduate dean and staff should map employment trends, educational levels (both needed and actual) for major corporations in the region, know the trend data for professional groups and then use this data to drive knowledge of the region and program offerings. Deans need to know the GDP and economic and educational terrain of the region or state. While the College of Business Dean and the Engineering Dean will know related corporations and economic drivers, the total picture is often lost and the knowledge about many other employers and economic drivers such as educational levels is not. Someone at the university needs to know the workforce/educational needs of city or region. This knowledge is essential if public universities are to perform the roles the states and regions need.

Link to State: The graduate dean and staff should try to know Governor's Cabinet and the range of responsibilities of each major state department. We know from experience that the College of Education Dean often knows the Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education, but do we know the Secretary of Transportation or Mental Health. My experience with these departments is that there is always subcontract work for graduate students, consultancy contacts for expertise, and countless needs for data collection and research. Graduate Dean would be a natural connector.

Links to Graduates: While we often know the addresses of our graduates, we often do not analyze their careers and career paths. While we ask for contributions, we forget about the wealth of data that is available if we tracked their career progress and educational needs. We often know the location of graduates who take positions with other universities as faculty, however, we are less likely to know about the other graduates.

Connections: Graduate office could provide data that links research, not only to faculty expertise but state and regional and/or professional needs.

Entrepreneurial Leader: The graduate dean could inspire and be an advocate and a facilitator for innovations, product development, spin offs, and interdisciplinary work among faculty and schools. By bringing disciplines together around societal challenges, the dean could be the beacon and the inspiration for this work within the universities.

CLOSING THOUGHTS

In closing I want to utilize guest speaker privileges by using an example from the field and area of our society with which I now devote my energies. This nation has 1.8 million charitable organizations with combined assets of more than \$3 trillion and employ more than 12 million people. In this nation dedicated "to promote the general welfare" as stated in the preamble to our Constitution, nonprofit organizations play an indispensable role in all of our communities. The philanthropic, charitable sector with more than 12.9 million jobs and involves the equivalent of 5.7 million full time volunteers or 17.6 million citizens each year. This sector generates annual revenues exceeding \$1.6 trillion dollars

and has over \$3.4 trillion in assets which accounts for 8.1% of the economy's wages, 11% of the jobs and 7.5% of the Gross Domestic Product. According to the World Bank data, if the nonprofit/philanthropic sector were a country, it would be about the size of Australia in terms of GDP. Based on wages paid (not volunteer hours), the sector would be the 16th largest economy in the world. It is larger part of the American economy than transportation (2.9) and Agriculture (1.1) and only slightly smaller than finance and insurance (8.1).

As president of the only national organization that certifies graduates for work in this field, I devote a significant part of my time to teaching colleges and universities about this workforce, the career opportunities and the related fields of study. I use this example to illustrate the many areas of professional careers that do not have a natural 'home' in the academy. Only a few universities have devoted faculty and research to this large sector. The Center on Philanthropy at IUPUI is only 20 years old and offers the only doctorate dedicated to the study of philanthropy. There are only a few programs in the country that offer the field of nonprofit management through public administration programs at the masters/doctorate level and only 70 universities in the American Humanics network. This is an example of a large sector of our economy and quality of life and history that has fewer connections with universities than one would expect by its size.

The major point is there is so much opportunity for the graduate dean to create their future in universities in graduate education and research and provide valuable links and connections to the world of work and by meeting societal challenges through data collection and research. And lastly the academy could use a few more truly entrepreneurial leaders in research and cross disciplinary studies.

A CAREER AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR MASTER'S AND DOCTORAL STUDENTS: *PREP*

Judith Stoddart, Ph.D.
Assistant Dean, The Graduate School
Associate Professor, Department of English
Michigan State University
stoddart@msu.edu

Henry (Rique) Campa, III, Ph.D.
Assistant Dean, The Graduate School
Professor, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife
Michigan State University
campa@msu.edu

ABSTRACT

Early career planning and strategic professional development for graduate students are essential for stemming attrition, improving completion, and helping students achieve a match between their goals and future career outcomes. This session explored how *PREP*, Michigan State University's career and professional development framework, was developed to meet the needs of students pursuing academic and non-academic career trajectories. There were two components to this session: 1) an interactive workshop that introduced the foundations of *PREP*; 2) introduction of a research-based model for evaluating the cognitive and behavioral outcomes of professional development programs such as *PREP*.

INTRODUCTION

Over the last decade, the Michigan State University (MSU) Graduate School and its various campus partners offered a range of career and professional development programs for students with the overall goal of improving completion and retention rates. While there had been an improvement in those rates over that period, it was not clear whether our programs had played a role. We knew from qualitative surveys that students liked the various workshops, but did the programs they attended contribute to their professional development and job placement? When we conducted focus groups with students, we learned that "professional development" was a phrase that was new to them, even though we felt that concept had been the unifying thread of our programs since their inception. If we were not communicating effectively to students how our offerings fit into a professional development framework, how were they to make sense of them as more than a set of discrete experiences?

In response to these questions, a team in the Graduate School created the career and professional development model we call **PREP**, which is built around 4 key thematic areas (**P**lanning, **R**esilience, **E**ngagement, **P**rofessionalism), and 3 career stages (early, mid, late). Setting these areas and stages into a matrix, we created a career planning tool for students as well as a planning grid for all of our workshops and programs. To explain how this framework functions, we will take you through a short version of a workshop for first year graduate students, “The PREPed Ph.D.: Becoming Your Own Manager,” that helps them frame career and professional development issues through **PREP**. Then we discuss how we use this framework in our own planning and, just as importantly, in our assessment of the impact of our programs. Although most of our focus will be on doctoral students, the framework for planning and assessment can easily be adapted to include master’s students.

SUMMARY OF THE STUDENT WORKSHOP

Seventy-five percent of doctoral students will work in academic and non-academic environments in which other competencies are more important than research. Although nearly half of doctoral recipients will assume tenure track positions, most will be in an institution that does not award doctoral degrees. So while we often think of doctoral training as emphasizing one particular skill—research in a specialized field—the vast majority of those who complete doctoral programs will rely on a broader skill set in their future careers. Recognizing what some think of as a mismatch between doctoral training and future employment does not mean neglecting the research focus of doctoral programs. It does mean that students also need to be aware of the variety of skills they are gaining throughout their programs, and they need to learn how these skills translate into a variety of contexts. Our guiding assumption is, then, not that there is a mismatch, but that we need to help students to identify, reflect on, and use the full range of skills that they acquire during their doctoral experience.

PREP focuses on doctoral education as a stage in professional development: the process of socialization and integration into a professional context, and the continued process of learning and growth throughout a career. Thinking of graduate education not as a hurdle to pass over but as a stage in what is a long career trajectory helps students to focus on more than the next event (coursework, exams, proposal, etc.). **PREP** encourages students to recognize graduate education as the process of building a foundation for a successful, sustainable career, and it prompts them to become active participants in acquiring and developing key skills and habits. The **PREP** framework points students toward important transferable skills: practical abilities that are fundamental to success in graduate school and in a range of professional contexts, from academia to industry, corporations, agencies, and government. These skills are not add-ons to doctoral education. They are abilities that are developed in the process of that education: research; communication; collaboration; leadership and management; resiliency, balance, and integration; ethics and integrity. Becoming aware of and intentionally cultivating transferable skills helps students complete their programs and make a strong transition into a variety of careers.

Thematic Areas of Professional Development

PREP groups these skills into 4 key thematic areas. With *planning* from the first year of graduate school, students can anticipate career needs and identify professional goals and the opportunities that will meet them. Developing *resilience*—the ability to adapt effectively to adversity or change—helps students to meet continually changing professional and personal demands. Whereas undergraduate education can be relatively passive, graduate education demands *engagement* in a discipline and in personal and professional development; students will need to practice transferable skills, expand professional networks, and create partnerships and collaborations that will carry them into the next stage of their careers. Students also need to understand standards for *professionalism* in research, teaching, and service, reflecting on what they do in their disciplines and the types of attitudes, standards, and behaviors they demonstrate in their careers.

Graduate Career Stages

Students entering graduate school and those nearing completion have distinct goals and needs for developing or applying transferable skills. Our approach to the process of graduate student development is adapted from Stewart's (1995) conclusion that students' counseling needs vary according to certain stages of socialization and professionalization. Under **PREP** our workshops and programs target the 4 thematic skill areas through 3 stages of the doctoral degree: early (students are completing course work, taking qualifying exams, designing their research projects, and beginning to formulate career plans), mid (students are taking comprehensive exams, conducting research, and developing professional networks), and late (students are completing their dissertations and searching for academic or non-academic positions). To provide programs and workshops to meet such a diversity of needs for students, the Graduate School plans and partners with our Teaching Assistant Program, the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, Career Services, and a campus wellness network.

Using the PREP Matrix

Once partnerships were developed across campus and a needs assessment was completed, we populated the **PREP** matrix (Figure 1) with topics and programs that target transferable skills for academic or non-academic careers. In essence, the matrix helps graduate students select programs that will be beneficial to their professional development in their particular stages, strengthens the overall infrastructure for doctoral students at MSU, and serves as a gateway to career and professional development resources at MSU and nationally. (A fully interactive version of the PREP matrix is available online at: <http://grad.msu.edu/prep/index.htm>). On the Web site each cell of the **PREP** matrix is an interactive link that leads to resources relevant to the stage of graduate education and the thematic area highlighted in the particular cell.

	P LANNING	R ESILIENCE	E NGAGEMENT	P ROFESSIONALISM
EARLY STAGE				
MID STAGE				
LATE STAGE				

FIGURE 1: The *PREP* Matrix

In the workshop we encourage students to use a blank copy of the matrix as their individual “Professional Development Plan.” Our web resources as well as introductory material in the “*PREP*ed Ph.D.” provide them with examples of what competencies they can develop under each of the *PREP* thematic areas and which workshops focus on these competencies. In the coming year we will integrate a version of this workshop into the campus-wide graduate student orientation.

**ASSESSING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IMPACTS:
SUMMARY**

Partners and Diversity of Staff/Faculty

Assessing the needs of graduate students and graduate programs is a critical component for creating an effective career and professional development program. Knowing the types of preparation they get within their respective departments is essential for building university-wide programs that complement core unit activities, appeal to students, and have broad buy in from faculty. In developing *PREP* and its associated programs and workshops, we relied on 4 sources of information: (1) input from students attending previous career and professional development workshops, (2) university-wide survey data from graduate students, (3) student input from focus groups, and (4) input from Graduate School staff members, including graduate faculty with joint appointments between the Graduate School and academic departments representing a wide range of colleges across MSU (i.e., Arts and Letters, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, and Agriculture and Natural Resources), and career specialists with doctoral degrees who understand the process of graduate education and who advise students about their development needs. Capturing the diverse cultures of various disciplines and understanding the process of advising and placing graduate students is key to creating programs that work for students as well as for graduate faculty.

Following the development of **PREP**, a critical component to getting students engaged with the programs was disseminating materials to departments, participating partners, and students. To accomplish this task, we used 4 primary strategies:

- (1) A **PREP** flyer and brochures were developed and distributed to each unit on campus with a letter from the Dean of the Graduate School requesting that departments post materials for students to encourage their participation in programs.
- (2) All program partners used a common set of **PREP** PowerPoint slides to introduce their workshops, so that key concepts could be reinforced across activities, and students would understand how programs fit together to create a professional development network.
- (3) The interactive **PREP** website and resources were presented, marketed, and demonstrated in “The **PREP**ed Ph.D.” workshop.
- 4) A team of Graduate School partners met with all graduate program directors and graduate associate deans, presenting to them the results of the student needs assessments, explaining the foundations of our programs, and ensuring that our programs were being developed in coordination with existing activities and in response to diverse needs across campus.

Working With A Blank PREP Matrix To Plan Programs

The primary goal of **PREP** is to engage graduate students from the beginning of their programs by providing them with a framework that they can use to better understand professional development and to proactively plan to develop the skills and competencies will they need to meet their career goals. To initiate this conversation with students, we explicitly encourage them to “become your own manager” by:

- taking responsibility and ownership for their own success
- thinking ahead about what skills and competencies they will need in the future and how to acquire them
- making a career plan, but recognizing that plans can change as new opportunities develop
- identifying available resources that will help them meet their needs
- clarifying expectations and dealing with obstacles as they present themselves throughout their graduate career. Avoiding and accommodating obstacles and conflicts are not good strategies for professional success.

The **PREP** matrix also provides us with a structure for planning effective programs. In addition, we are now using the matrix to assess our programs. For each workshop we identify a general goal as well as cognitive, behavioral and affective objectives (or

knowledge, skills and attitudes) related to specific transferrable skills and career stages. Each objective is measurable either in the short term or in a longitudinal follow up. So for a recent day-long workshop, the goals, objectives and measures looked like the following:

WORKSHOP

“From Student to Professor: Stages of Professional Development”

Goal

Create awareness of the skills needed to successfully transition to a faculty position

Student learning objectives

- Name and describe the specific professional skills graduate students need to develop to be successful as faculty
- Describe the importance of each of the respective professional skills
- Describe where to acquire and how to develop these skills

Measures

- Pre- and post-workshop questionnaires on cognitive outcomes
 - Pre-workshop questionnaire and focus group follow up (6 months) on behavioral outcomes
-

The morning sessions in the workshop were designed to introduce students to the professional stages in the faculty experience and to highlight key skills for thriving in and transitioning from one stage to the next. Afternoon breakout sessions focused on practical experience, including panel presentations in which faculty at different stages talked about these skills, where they acquired them, and how they used them, as well as sessions in which students practiced some of these skills. In pre- and post-workshop surveys, we saw significant shifts in students’ understanding of the faculty experience and of individual skills. In future focus groups we will see how this knowledge affected students’ own choices and behaviors, and to what extent they used or developed key skills.

For each workshop, we follow a similar evaluation process: identifying objectives, designing instruments to measure these objectives, administering a pre-workshop as well as post-workshop survey, using data from surveys to develop focus group protocols, conducting focus groups, using the information to plan future programs. We have also developed an evaluation team of colleagues representing several university offices and different disciplinary backgrounds.

As a group we have developed planning and assessment goals for the all **PREP** programs.

This year our goal was to develop transferable skills in a consistent way across all of our programs; this included objectives such as using a common language when talking about professional development and transferable skills, ensuring that each program focused on and explained the applications of skills presented, and helping students to develop strategies for implementing those skills in multiple contexts. We now think of our programs as a coherent “curriculum” addressing all of the transferable skills across various stages. Next year we will develop a database that will allow us to track workshop participants’ completion and job placement, helping us to answer the question of what impact our programs have on our overall goals of improving retention and completion and promoting successful transitions to a range of careers.

Acknowledgements

We want to acknowledge K. Klomparens, M. Helm, K. Johnston, T. Nunez, and J. Brockman for their input and insights in the development of *PREP*.

Literature Cited

Stewart, Donald W. 1995. Developmental Considerations in Counselling Graduate Students. *Guidance & Counseling*, 10, 3, 21-24.

SOME KEY CONSIDERATIONS WHEN DEVELOPING ETHICS TRAINING FOR SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING GRADUATE STUDENTS

Jason Borenstein, PhD
Director, Graduate Research Ethics Programs
School of Public Policy
Georgia Tech University
borenstein@gatech.edu

INTRODUCTION

Given the various constraints that graduate departments encounter, it is not an easy challenge to determine what the best method is for introducing graduate science and engineering students to ethics. It is important to do but it is not obvious how the goal should be accomplished. Thus, the aim here is to highlight some considerations for those who seek to develop an ethics program.

THE CONTENT OF AN ETHICS PROGRAM

To begin, an overarching concern is the subject matter on which a graduate ethics program should focus. For example, the primary emphasis could be on professionalism or it could be on research ethics. Although these topics are not mutually exclusive, the content of the instruction might differ depending on which option is preferred. For instance, if teaching professionalism is the main goal, then one might spend more time on professional codes of conduct, the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, or organizational ethics. On the other hand, if instruction on research ethics is the main goal, then who is entitled to be an author on a manuscript and the respective ordering strategy will become more pressing issues.

A related matter is whether compliance is the paramount aim or whether it is to introduce students to ethical issues more generally. Since it is rather difficult to find “free time” in a graduate science or engineering student’s curriculum, one could argue that if they are going to learn about ethics, it should encompass the rules and regulations (compliance). However, a key drawback is that the rules and regulations do not always specifically and directly speak to every ethical issue that a graduate student will confront. For instance, there is not a uniform rule that requires students to consider the “dual use” implications of their work but this is something that they should be encouraged to do so that harmful acts can hopefully be prevented.

POTENTIAL GOALS

An overlapping issue is what the primary goals of an ethics program are or should be. One already alluded to is that students could become more familiar with the rules and regulations governing their work. But other goals include gaining increased knowledge of ethical issues (beyond those relating to compliance matters) and of ethical theory. Another goal, although perhaps a lofty one, is improving a graduate student's ability to apply ethical reasoning. Thus if confronted with a difficult situation, ideally the student would be reflective and approach the situation in a rational manner.

Improving communication in academic and research environments is also a potential goal, which could diffuse conflicts, about authorship or use of shared equipment for example, before they intensify. And of course a goal, which is hard to ignore, is reducing incidents of misconduct whether it be in the classroom, laboratory, or later when graduate students enter the workplace.

WHY RESEARCH ETHICS

A compelling reason why a graduate educational program might go in the direction of research ethics is due to federal mandates. Ethics requirements for NIH training grants have been around for some time but adding to this momentum is NSF's Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) policy, which is being crafted in response to the America Competes Act of 2007. NSF's RCR policy is scheduled to be put in place later this year. Yet as the Institute of Medicine (IOM) states:¹

...the responsible conduct of research need not be driven by federal mandates, for it derives from a premise fundamental to doing science: the responsible conduct of research is not distinct from research; on the contrary, competency in research *encompasses* the responsible conduct of that research and the capacity for ethical decision making.

The IOM and other organizations astutely recognize that ethics is intertwined with the practice of research. Science and engineering research is infused with ethical considerations, such as whether it is appropriate to test a given device on a human being. Thus it follows that training a student to be a good science or engineering researcher should involve instruction on how to do their work responsibly and with integrity.

THE FORMAT OF ETHICS TRAINING

Given that different graduate degree programs have different structures, there is probably not a singular, uniform strategy that can be used to introduce graduate students to ethics. But several approaches will be delineated here, each having its associated share of strengths and weaknesses. The first approach is creating a "standalone" graduate course in ethics. A virtue of this approach is that it would explore the relevant issues in depth

but of course it is not easy to allocate enough of the students' time for a course of this type. Further, this approach might send the wrong message by not integrating ethical considerations more directly into the students' core courses.

Alternatively, ethics content could be placed in existing core courses. This might address the integration issue but a potential drawback is not having enough science and engineering faculty with the relevant expertise in ethics to discuss the subject matter competently. In general, ethical issues have also not traditionally been talked about in science and engineering graduate courses so it may take some time to figure out how to modify lesson plans and raise these issues appropriately.

Other options include having ethics workshops or colloquiums, which could bring together large collections of students and faculty, perhaps across different fields. Yet they can be difficult to sustain without some form of financial support and ensuring that individuals attend is a non-trivial problem. Online training has the benefit that it can potentially be done at a time that is convenient for students and depending on the format, it can be scalable, reaching a large population. However it can run the risk of being "too static" in that meaningful conversations and interactions about ethics might not actually occur.

Some institutions, including Arizona State University, are examining the merits of an "ethics in the lab" approach whereby ethical issues are raised in the research environment. For example, during a weekly laboratory meeting, a faculty member could mention what "export control" is and its relevance to graduate students. The virtue of this type of approach is that the instruction might more strongly resonate with students because it occurs in a place where they will be spending months or even years of their time.

AVAILABLE RESOURCES

For simplicity sake, the focus here will be on resources in the realm of research ethics, although other ethics resources are available to scientists and engineers. A good starting point is "clearinghouse" websites that group together readings, cases, and links for instructors and students alike. For instance, the Office of Research Integrity² and the National Institutes of Health³ provide numerous links to RCR resources. Also, National Academy of Engineering is the home for Onlineethics.org and the Council of Graduate Schools hosts the *Project for Scholarly Integrity* website.⁴ Online training programs in ethics are also an option, including courses offered by the Collaboration Institutional Training Initiative (CITI).⁵

With regard to printed materials, the National Academy of Sciences recently released the third edition of *On Being a Scientist*, which addresses many issues relating to research ethics. Further, the Association for Practical and Professional Ethics (APPE) offers a collection of cases entitled *Research Ethics: Cases and Commentaries*.

In conclusion, many factors must be taken into consideration when developing an ethics program for graduate science and engineering students. Hopefully, this brief outline of considerations will help to provide structure and guidance in the effort to move the process forward. It is essential that a systematic and meaningful approach is used to introduce the next generation of scientists and engineers to ethical issues relating to their work.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Daniel Vasgird for his helpful guidance when developing the presentation on which this article is based and MAGS for inviting me to speak at its 2009 annual meeting.

¹ Institute of Medicine, Integrity in Scientific Research: Creating an Environment That Promotes Responsible Conduct, National Academy Press, 2002, page 9.

² U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Research Integrity, RCR Educational Resources, http://ori.dhhs.gov/education/rcr_resources.shtml (last visited May 6, 2009).

³ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, Training in the Responsible Conduct of Research, <http://grants.nih.gov/training/responsibleconduct.htm> (last visited May 6, 2009).

⁴ <http://www.scholarlyintegrity.org/> (last visited May 6, 2009).

⁵ In the interest of disclosure, the author would like to reveal that he is as a non-paid developer on some of CITI's ethics training courses.

KU-KUT JOINT M.S. DEGREE PROGRAM

Ronald L. Dougherty, Ph.D.
Chairperson and Professor
Mechanical Engineering
University of Kansas
doughrty@ku.edu

Carl W. Luchies, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Mechanical Engineering
University of Kansas
luchies@ku.edu

ABSTRACT

A case study is provided describing the development and implementation of the Joint MS Degree Program between the Kansas University's Mechanical Engineering Department (KU-ME) and Korea University of Technology and Education's Mechatronics Department (KUT-Mechatronics). The Joint Program, first discussed in 2005 with a formal agreement finalized in 2007, is a 30 semester credit hour MS Program, with the hours equally split between the two universities and the final MS degree awarded by the institution at which the thesis work is performed. Several challenges and issues, which were addressed when working out Program details, included: number of hours required for the Degree, acceptance of a significant number of transfer hours from either institution for the Degree, inconsistent requirements for admission and procedures between the two institutions, how to attract and support high quality students, how the students would be advised at each institution, administration of the Program at each institution and coordination of the two administrative structures, documenting the degree on the students' transcripts from the institutions, residency requirements, English proficiency, thesis publication allowances/requirements, composition of the MS Committees, and timing for virtual meetings of MS Committees at the two institutions.

INTRODUCTION

KU and KUT began to develop this collaborative venture in early 2005 through the efforts of Dr. Kwang Sun Kim, a 1986 doctoral alumnus of KU's Mechanical Engineering Department and a KUT-Mechatronics faculty member. Dr. Kim proposed to KU-ME professors Louis Burmeister and Ronald Dougherty that KU-ME and KUT-Mechatronics produce a collaborative Graduate MS Degree Program wherein both institutions could derive great benefits which were not available to each institution individually. The major benefits for KU-ME was that KUT could provide KU students with unique educational and international experiences in the mechatronics field, along with interaction with Samsung Corporation, a world leader in the electronics industry. The benefits for KUT-Mechatronics was that KU-ME could provide KUT students unique educational, research

and international background in biomechanical engineering, due to the fact that KU-ME has eight faculty involved in various areas of biomechanics and bioengineering. Based upon this arrangement, the collaborative research foreseen to thrive in the resulting environment were projects wherein the two faculties would develop the fundamentals needed to eventually produce high-tech medical and biomaterial devices. Dr. Kim proposed that the 30 course credit hours be halved between the two universities. Upon completion of the Program, a student would then be awarded a full MS degree by each of KU and KUT. The faculty and graduate divisions at the two universities began discussing the possibilities and ramifications of the proposed Program, determining what each university could allow and how much each faculty was willing to break with the traditional mindset. Initially, a 30 hour Degree Program was proposed by KUT, while KU proposed nearly 50 credit hours for the two degrees, allowing for some overlap in credits. KUT felt that it would be very difficult to recruit students for a 50 hour MS Program, so eventually, the institutions realized an agreement which did not allow for granting two [Dual] MS degrees, but a single [Joint] degree. This provided the strong collaborative atmosphere of the two institutions working together, while refraining from giving two separate degrees for the same work.

After the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) was signed by KUT and KU officials in the spring of 2007, the first KU-ME student went to KUT in the fall of 2007, followed shortly by the first KUT-Mechatronics student arriving at KU in the spring of 2008. Although both institutions thought that the agreement had been finalized, the next one and one-half years showed that many details remained to be worked out; and many lessons were learned [and are still being learned] by the students and faculty from both institutions. These experiences have served to strengthen and improve the Program. Several of these later issues are covered in the “Challenges Faced” section. Continued persistence of the faculty from both institutions in addressing and overcoming these challenges will result in the graduation of both students by June of 2009.

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Herein information is provided on a single ‘case study’ regarding Joint International MS Degree Programs. Cross (2008), Council of Graduate Studies (2007), Denecke (2008 & 2009), and Godfrey (2008) provide much broader studies of US and international institutions who’ve participated in similar program.

Throughout the approximately two-year process, the Program had various forms and scenarios, but the final result was a joint program, such that the institution at which the student performs his/her research confers the official degree [citing the Joint Degree and the other institution on the transcript], and the other institution issues a certificate. The KU-KUT Joint MS Degree Program is a standard 30 [semester] credit hour process, including 6 credit hours for Thesis research. Fifteen credit hours are taken in the Mechanical Engineering Department at KU and fifteen hours are taken in the Mechatronics Department at KUT, with the Thesis credit hours taken at the institution conferring the degree.

In order to keep students “on track” at both institutions, there is a major advisor (in mechatronics at KUT and in biomechanics at KU) on each campus. The student and the advisors must agree on a topic which fits the student’s needs and yet can benefit the research activities of both advisors, extending the breadth and/or depth of their experiences. There is a minimum three-faculty-member Committee for each student; with the Committee being composed of at least one faculty member from KUT-Mechatronics (i.e., the KUT faculty advisor), one faculty member from KU-ME (i.e., the KU faculty advisor), and at least one additional faculty member from the institution conferring the degree . The Committee must confirm that the student’s plan of study is adequate/acceptable; and, as is typical of single-location Committees, it is helpful for the Committee to interact as a whole two or three times while the student is working on his/her degree. Such meetings are currently conducted by email or “virtually”. However, due to the fourteen hour time difference, there is difficulty in scheduling meetings which are convenient for people in both countries.

Per the MOA, KU-KUT courses are taught in English at both institutions. Since not all courses at KUT are taught in English, this limits the course options of KU-ME students in Korea. In addition, students must satisfy the entrance requirements of both institutions. These include: type of background (BS) degree, prerequisite courses, minimum GPA, acceptable GRE and TOEFL scores, English proficiency, and various entrance exams. KU-ME has had reasonably strict requirements on BS courses needed, but has been more flexible for the Joint Program. KUT-Mechatronics has required a formal oral exam prior to admission to the MS program, and has also been more flexible with regard to this requirement.

In order to have courses on the opposite campus certified as acceptable in content and level of difficulty, the faculty from each Department (institution) have exchanged their curriculum vitae so that the KU-ME faculty can assess the quality of the KUT-Mechatronics faculty and KUT-Mechatronics faculty can make similar assessments of the KU-ME faculty. Thus, the two groups of faculty have taken the point-of-view that they will ascertain the quality of individual faculty members from the other institution, then rely on them to teach appropriate courses to the KU-KUT students. Currently, this procedure has worked well, and has required less time from the two sets of faculty members. Each set of faculty then certifies and maintains the quality of specific courses which are used for KU-KUT degrees at their own institutions.

Financial support for students was and remains a significant issue for Program success. If students could not be adequately supported, even though there is an attraction of an international degree, recruiting would be difficult. According to the MOA, each institution is responsible for developing innovative methods for supporting its students. Thus, the students [or their institutions of origin] must cover tuition and housing at either location [be it KU or KUT]. This was considered to be quite workable when the original MOA was signed. However, this arrangement has proven to cause the students considerable concern. Modifications have been made and are discussed in the “Challenges Faced” section of the paper.

To date, one student [with east Indian heritage] has gone from KU to KUT, and one student [with Chinese heritage] has gone from KUT to KU. US and Korean student citizens have not yet participated in the Program. Additional efforts are being made to recruit meet the needs of US and Korean citizens.

PROCESS TIMELINE ON THE KU CAMPUS

The sequence of events for approval of a new graduate curriculum is very probably consistent across the US. In order to provide a sense of the time and process required, the following timeline is shown:

Spring of 2005 Dr. Kim Initiated KU-KUT MS Degree Program Discussion with Drs. Burmeister and Dougherty
May '05 - Feb. '06 Dr. Burmeister and Dr. Kim Developed Program Description
Feb. '06 Approved by Curriculum Committee of Mechanical Engineering
Mar. '06 Approved by Full Mechanical Engineering Faculty
Apr. '06 Approved by Curriculum Committee of Engineering Senate
Sept. '06 Approved by Full Engineering Senate
Sept. '06 Forwarded to University Graduate Council by Engineering Dean's Office
Nov. '06 Approved by University Committee on New Degrees and Degree Programs
Nov. '06 Approved by University Executive Committee of the Graduate Council
Dec. '06 Approved by Full University Graduate Council
Dec. '06 Forwarded to Provost by Graduate Dean Carlin
Dec. '06 Approved by Provost's Office
Mar. '07 Approved by Kansas Board of Regents

CHALLENGES FACED

The main issue that had to be addressed by both institutions was the transfer of credit hours between universities and what type(s) of degree(s) would be conferred. Initially, KUT appeared to be willing to accept "double counting" of the hours and thus provide two separate MS degrees for one 30-hour set of courses. However, such "double counting" of credit hours was not acceptable to the KU faculty. After negotiation and compromise on both sides, the result is the Joint Degree Program described herein. In addition, there was little precedent at KU for allowing more than six credit hours to be transferred for MS credit; and, at KUT, all credit hours had previously been taken "in residence". The two sets of faculty at the institutions thoroughly discussed this situation among themselves and eventually agreed to allow more credit hours to be transferred from another institution than they ever had before. As stated in the previous section, this came essentially by the faculty at one institution certifying the faculty [through reviewing curriculum vitae] at the other institution. This was a major concession for each university, but came from developing trust in each institution's ability to evaluate the faculty which were in residence, and then depending on local faculty to "police" local course quality.

Regarding English proficiency, there has been added difficulty for Korean students who come to KU with English skills which are below acceptable levels. If their English needs to be improved, they may need to spend one to three semesters in KU's Applied English Center before being allowed to take technical courses. The result is that, even though only fifteen [technical] credit hours (the equivalent of approximately one and one-half semesters) are required at KU, KUT students may be required to spend three or more semesters at KU in order to finish those fifteen credit hours and the courses required to improve his/her English skills. For KU students taking courses at KUT, KU students have found that even though KUT courses are taught in English, the question/answer sessions between instructor and students may be in Korean, thus leaving the non-Korean speaking students missing out on valuable information.

The fall semesters in Korea and the US start and end within a few days of each other, which makes coordination and transition relatively easy in the fall. However, the spring semesters are shifted in time by about two months. KU's spring semester starts in mid-January (ending in early May) and KUT's spring semester starts in mid-March (ending in late June). These shifted semesters have provided challenges and have had to be considered when sending students back/forth between campuses. In addition, due to the shifted semesters, the two institutions have similarly shifted application deadlines. These have not been insurmountable difficulties, but need to be worked out when recruiting students into the Joint Program, because each institution must admit the other institution's students according to institutional requirements, and each university must have enough time to process the applications.

Another example of different admission procedures is that KUT requires its MS applicants to go through an oral entrance examination; but KUT has waived that requirement for KU students who are members of the Joint MS Program. In contrast, KU-ME has previously had strict course [prerequisite] requirements for entering the MS Program, while KUT has been more flexible. KU-ME has typically required the equivalent of most BS-ME courses in order for a student to be accepted into its MS Program. For the KU-KUT Degree Program, KU-ME has become much more flexible in these prerequisite requirements, examining what each student actually needs to learn and know in order to be productive in the Program and in his/her research project. This has streamlined the KU-KUT Program for students while assuring that they are well-prepared for their research activities.

As mentioned in the Program Overview section, the source of financial support for the students was originally planned to be the institution from which the students originated. However, in practice, this segment of the arrangements has not been as workable for the students as originally thought – obviously because of the added expenses that an international joint program would include. Thus, for KU students, KUT has provided a tuition reduction and has provided some financial support. In addition, KU-ME has given its students additional support for travel and some expenses in Korea; and KU-ME has also provided some financial support for KUT students in the US. Thus, additional support

from both universities has helped the students considerably; and we have determined that a much improved method for financially assisting the students is needed – a future modification which is being addressed.

As stated in the Program Overview section, the fourteen hour time difference has caused some difficulty in scheduling meetings which are convenient for people in both countries; but this is being successfully addressed. In addition, future plans are to deliver web-based courses to students in both the US and Korea simultaneously. Although it will be possible for lectures to be saved and watched at any time, the goal will be to have the lectures viewed by the students “live”, so that real-time interaction can be achieved. Obviously, scheduling of these courses will be another challenge which should be carefully addressed.

From the time spent in developing and maintaining this Joint Program, it is obvious that such innovative programs require at least one champion at each university. This person must keep the process moving, even when the situation appears to be overwhelming and extremely difficult. At KUT, this person has been Dr. Kwang Sun Kim; and at KU, two people, Dr. Lou Burmeister of the KU-ME Department and Dr. Diana Carlin (Dean of KU’s Graduate School at the time) were the champions and main “drivers”/supporters of the Program.

Just as a champion was needed for initiating the Program, an advocate is needed for continuation of the Program. Thus, a Graduate Director for the Program has been assigned at each institution. At KU, Dr. Carl Luchies is the Graduate Director of the Joint Program; and, at KUT, Dr. Kwang Sun Kim is the Director. These Directors have made the coordination of the two Departments easier and more transparent to the students and faculty, helping us to more quickly identify any problems between the two institutions and then resolve those issues in a timely mutually beneficial manner.

FUTURE ASPECTS

For the KU-KUT Joint MS Program to be successful, it is necessary that more students move between the two institutions each year. Our target is from six to eight students per institution participating at any given time - - with each student being at different stages of progression through the Program. In furthering interactions and collaborations, additional faculty need to move between institutions. KUT currently has one Mechatronics faculty member (Dr. J.Y. Huh) at KU on sabbatical; and Dr. K.S. Kim travels between the two universities yearly. Thus, it is important that at least one KU-ME faculty member per year travels to KUT, helping to solidify the relationship between the two universities. In addition to travel between the universities, it will be necessary to establish regular electronic exchanges of information between the universities and among the respective faculty. These are planned to be seminars, research discussions, and courses transmitted for both students and faculty at KU and KUT.

In expanding the Program, within five years, KU and KUT would like to develop the PhD side of this Program so that it will be a Joint MS & PhD Program. This will take considerable effort and represents a major step, since both institutions have quite different requirements for PhDs. Furthermore, the Joint Program is only between KU-ME and KUT-Mechatronics. KU-ME has plans to expand the Joint Program to include the newly formed KU-Bioengineering graduate program; and KUT will likewise want to expand beyond its Mechatronics Department.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As indicated previously, it is critical to have a champion [or champions] for such an ambitious program as described herein. At KUT, this was Dr. K.S. Kim.

At KU, Dr. Lou Burmeister was the Departmental champion and Dr. Diana Carlin was the campus champion. Dr. Burmeister was extremely persistent in working to find the processes through which the Department and the School of Engineering could develop and approve the Program.

Dr. Carlin was Dean of the KU Graduate School during the 2005 through 2007 time period, when the Program was going through the various phases of approvals and revisions. Dr. Carlin was instrumental in promoting the qualities of the internationalization of the KU-ME Department as well as that of the KUT-Mechatronics Department.

The authors are most grateful for the assistance, foresight, and vision of Drs. Burmeister and Carlin. Without their work and guidance, this Joint MS Degree Program would not have been possible.

REFERENCES

Cross, J.P. (2008), "Graduate Education in a Global Context, Dual and Joint Degrees," CGS 48th Annual Meeting, December 3, 2008, JW Marriott, Washington, DC, USA (http://www.cgsnet.org/portals/0/pdf/mtg_am08Cross.pdf).

Council of Graduate Schools (2007), "Findings from the 2007 CGS International Graduate Admissions Survey: Phase II: Final Applications and Initial Offers of Admission, August, 2007, Washington, DC, USA (http://www.cgsnet.org/portals/0/pdf/R_IntlAdm08_II.pdf).

Denecke, Daniel (2009), Presentation on Dual and Joint Graduate Degree Programs, 65th Annual Meeting Midwestern Association of Graduate Schools, April 1-3, 2009, Westin Crown Center, Kansas City, Missouri, USA.

Denecke, Daniel (2008), "Dual and Joint Degrees: A Workshop," CGS 48th Annual Meeting, December 3, 2008, JW Marriott, Washington, DC, USA (http://www.cgsnet.org/portals/0/pdf/mtg_am08Denecke.pdf).

Godfrey, J.B. (2008), "Joint and Dual Degrees, Points of Departure," CGS 48th Annual Meeting, December 3, 2008, JW Marriott, Washington, DC, USA (http://www.cgsnet.org/portals/0/pdf/mtg_am08Godfrey.pdf).

PROFESSIONAL DOCTORATES

Donna J. Calvert, Ph. D.
Interim Dean
School of Graduate and Professional Studies
Rockhurst University
donna.calvert@rockhurst.edu

ABSTRACT

This portion of the presentation on professional doctorates highlights the practice transitions that resulted in the movement to the Doctor of Physical Therapy. In addition, key success factors are identified for masters-level institutions considering moving to their first clinical doctorate. The presentation concludes with a comparison of entry-level and post-professional doctorates in the PT discipline, leading to the entreaty to differentiate between these two levels in continued conversations.

INTRODUCTION

At this point, we will turn our attention to the task confronting Master's level institutions who are interested in developing professional doctorates and then conclude with the need to differentiate between entry-level and post-professional doctorate degrees.

BACKGROUND

Some background information may be helpful before I begin. While I am an interim dean, I am also a physical therapist (PT). I joined Rockhurst University in 1983 with two other clinical physical therapists to start the PT program there. At that time, the entry level degree for PT practice was a bachelor's degree, so our program was a bachelor's program. In 1993 we began offering a Master's in Physical Therapy, also an entry level degree and no longer offered the bachelor's degree. In 2004, we accepted our first class of students in the clinical doctorate in Physical Therapy or the DPT, also an entry-level degree. I taught for 20 years in the Physical Therapy Education Department and have directly experienced the changes that the evolution in the practice of PT has precipitated. In addition to teaching, I have continued to practice clinically as a physical therapist until two years ago.

For comparison purposes, the following information on Rockhurst University may be helpful. Rockhurst is a private university with approx. 2,000 undergraduates and 850 graduate students. Our Carnegie classification is as a master's comprehensive or Post-baccalaureate professional/business school. Fifty-five percent of the graduate students are within the School of Graduate and Professional Studies (GPS), while 45% are in the

business school. Within GPS, our faculty offers four graduate degrees: a Masters in Occupational Therapy, a Master of Science in, Communication Sciences and Disorders, and the Master of Education. The DPT is the first and only clinical doctorate, or doctorate of any kind, offered at RU.

THE DOCTOR OF PHYSICAL THERAPY DEGREE

To begin this discussion, I will provide some background on the movement in my profession that was the impetus for this change in degree.

The American Physical Therapy Association (APTA) is the professional organization for physical therapists. According to the website, today there are 211 PT programs in the US with 196 (92%) offering the DPT and 15 continuing to offer the Master of Science or Master of Physical Therapy as the entry-level degree. (<http://www.apta.org>) What was the impetus for this move? The answer to that question is two words: direct access.

Direct access is also known as “services without referral”. Very simply it means that a person does not need a medical doctor’s referral or prescription to be seen by a physical therapist in 44 of 50 states. People can seek PT treatment without a referral, thus having “direct access” to services. Direct access results in decreased medical costs and improved functional outcomes for patients/clients due to more rapid entry into medical services.

To be able to be an entry point for patient care, the physical therapist’s preparation required more education and clinical experiences. For example, consider the area of differential diagnosis or being able to determine if someone needed referral to a different health professional. To become better skilled in that area, additional educational experiences were needed and added to curricula. Therefore, direct access and the resultant need for increased abilities to evaluate and manage patients was a primary factor in moving the professional entry level degree to the clinical doctorate level.

In addition, the APTA set forth a Vision Statement in June of 2000 stating that by 2020, “physical therapy will be provided by physical therapists who are doctors of physical therapy.” (<http://www.apta.org>) So, the factors of direct access and the Vision Statement led to a transformation of practice.

ACCEPTANCE OF A DOCTORATE AT A MASTER’S INSTITUTION

So, how did we get the first clinical doctorate accepted? While the information below relates to the clinical doctorate in PT, it can be regarded as information for any clinical doctorate, with some ideas re: improving the success rate of acceptance.

Listed below is the timeline for the process with key activities noted:

1998-99: Discussions in PT faculty to develop consensus on movement to DPT

1999- 2000: Associate dean and PT chair visited a similar sized school, who had just instituted a DPT and was the 1st doctoral program for the institution to obtain their guidance and input.

2001: Obtained permission from dean and president to develop a DPT curriculum proposal. A University wide advisory committee was formed in Fall 2001, composed of a few supportive faculty but mostly senior faculty who were respected in their disciplines but were known “naysayers.” The chair of the PT department chaired the committee. Primary discussion concerned the difference between a clinical and academic doctorate and the chair provided members with readings from the APTA. The “buy in” was expected to be one year but it took only 6 months to decide to go to the DPT rather than lose the PT program altogether.

2001-2002: PT faculty developed curriculum. The Advisory Committee held 3 informational sessions inviting all faculty, staff and administrators to attend with questions.

2002-2003: Internal approvals acquired such as Grad Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate approval and the Board of Trustees approval. In addition, a self-study was submitted to North Central Association with a request for focused site visit regarding Physical Therapy. Rockhurst was to have a NCA site visit in March, 2003 and a focused visit was requested to coincided with that larger site visit.

2003-2004: Received NCA approved institutional change to offer entry-level clinical doctorate. Application made to Commission on Accreditation of Physical Therapy Education (PT program accrediting body) for substantive change to degree with approval received in March 2004.

June 2004: First DPT class began

May, 2007: First DPT class graduated

I would identify the following key factors that led to this success at Rockhurst:

1. Early visit to a like program by dean and chair
2. Advisory Committee with inclusion of naysayers
3. Information sessions for campus community
4. Assurance that proposed program is mission based
5. Articulate and respected department chair who championed the degree; respected PT faculty members

DIFFERENTIATING DOCTORATES

As you note, I continue to emphasize the term “*entry-level*” clinical doctorate. It is crucial that we look at differentiating these degrees from other clinical doctorates and from the academic/research terminal doctoral degree of the Ph.D.

My main thesis is that in further discussions on professional doctorates, it is imperative to make distinctions about the actual degree being discussed because these degrees may be *very* different.

I will use the degrees in physical therapy to illustrate my point. Listed below are various degrees in PT that are at the doctorate level. Please note the differences in the bulleted descriptors.

1. “Entry level” professional degree – DPT or MS/MPT (<http://www.apta.org>)
 - the minimal degree needed in order to enter the profession
 - per APTA website: involves mastering a body of knowledge in the particular field of study and is considered a clinical or applied doctorate similar to MD, DDS, etc.
 - students have a completed undergraduate degree, at a minimum, as admission criteria; so are post-baccalaureate degree-seekers
 - students do not hold any prior license to practice physical therapy
 - most programs require a capstone research project; some require that it be submitted for presentation at professional conference and/or submitted as manuscript to professional publication
 - education takes place on campus and is intensive training; may have on-line components in courses but training cannot be done on-line due to heavy laboratory component for psychomotor skill development
 - graduation from accredited program allows students to sit for the state licensure exam
2. Post-professional DPT or transitional (tDPT) clinical doctorate (<http://www.apta.org>)
 - APTA website: “a transitional DPT does not reflect the acquisition of advanced clinical skills (specialization); rather, it reflects an augmentation in the physical therapist professional body of knowledge and practice”
 - available for practicing therapists who have BS or MS degrees in PT and desire augmentation of their knowledge to be consistent with the current entry-level standards; not required to remain employed as PT because they are already licensed to practice
 - allows a licensed PT to obtain “degree parity”
 - often a hybrid delivery of on-line and concentrated on-ground experiences
 - most likely will be eliminated in 10-11 years per Vision 2020

3. Post-professional Advanced Clinical Doctorate (<http://www.apta.org>)
 - APTA website: “reflects the acquisition of advanced level knowledge and skills associated with specialization, certification, clinical residencies, fellowships, etc.”
 - not an entry-level degree; an advanced degree with emphasis in a specialization such as manual therapy, hand therapy etc.
 - students are licensed PT practitioners seeking advanced training in a specialized area

4. Doctor of Philosophy
 - APTA website: “an academic degree that reflects, in addition to the mastering of a body of knowledge in the particular field of study, completion of an original scholarly work that adds to the body of knowledge in the discipline” (<http://www.apta.org>)

These examples in this particular profession delineate between clinical/professional doctorates at the entry and advanced level as well as the traditionally recognized terminal research degree of the Ph.D. Other professions or disciplines may have similar delineations or other configurations as well.

SUMMARY

My point is not to confuse or frustrate people but to show how clinical doctorates cannot be spoken of as one similar group. Again, I reiterate my earlier point that, at a minimum, we need to differentiate between entry- level and advanced professional doctorates as we continue these conversations and particularly when considering the development of policies related to them.

References

1. *CGS Task Force Report on the Professional Doctorate*. Council of Graduate Schools Web site. Washington, DC: Council of Graduate Schools, 2008. Available at: <http://cgsnet.org>.

2. *APTA Vision Statement for Physical Therapy 2020 (HOD P06-00-24-35)*. House of Delegates policy. American Physical Therapy Association Web site. Alexandria, VA: American Physical Therapy Association, 2000. Available at: <http://www.apta.org>.

PANEL DISCUSSION

At this point in the presentation Dr. Allen Rawitch of the University of Kansas Medical Center stepped up to the podium and directed a panel discussion with the attendees on the following questions:

1. Can we define core characteristics of professional doctorate in a general way as CGS has done for research doctorates and professional master's degrees? If so, who should define these core characteristics?
2. How can graduate schools ensure that some students are being trained for research if students are attracted in large numbers to the professional doctorate rather than the research-based doctorate (PhD)?
3. Who should determine whether a doctorate is the appropriate practice degree for a particular discipline? Universities, regional accrediting agencies, specialized accrediting agencies, state licensing boards, professional societies?
4. What should be the role of graduate schools and graduate deans in overseeing professional doctorates on university campuses? If professional doctorate programs are not in the graduate school, who is responsible for program review and assurance of quality?
5. Should faculty with professional doctorates be recognized for full membership on the graduate faculty or granted full privileges including supervising PhD's in their discipline?
6. In state or other governed systems of higher education, some institutions are currently authorized to grant only master's degrees in the several areas that have developed professional doctorates. Should these institutions be authorized to grant professional doctorates when they are not authorized to grant the PhD degree?
7. What do we do in institutions which are masters-level and currently provide a master's degree which qualifies an individual for professional licensure and/or practice if the accrediting or licensing body now requires a clinical doctorate?
8. What are some of the key challenges for such institutions?

REBUILDING ENGLISH: THE K-STATE / AFGHANISTAN INITIATIVE

Robert Corum, Ph.D.
Professor of French and Department Head
Department of Modern Languages
Kansas State University
corum@ksu.edu

Mary T. Copple, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Spanish
Department of Modern Languages
Kansas State University
mcopple@ksu.edu

ABSTRACT

The World Bank partnerships between Kansas State University and Kabul and Balkh Universities have resulted in innovative program development on all three campuses. This article profiles K-State's partnership with the Kabul University English Department. The grant's multi-faceted approach on the Afghan campuses targets the restructuring of the undergraduate English degree program and development of university-wide English language classes, along with the supporting infrastructure and faculty development in both teaching and research. At K-State, the partnership has led to the development of a new track in the Department of Modern Languages' M.A. program, Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). The management of the partnership requires interdisciplinary coordination on-campus and continual monitoring of ever-emerging activities on-site in Kabul.

“SOFT POWER”

Coined in Joseph Nye's 1990 book *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*, the term “soft power” is now commonly used to refer to a nation's systematic use of non-military means, not violent coercion, to gain political and social ends in the arena of global relationships. While hard power derives purely from economic and military might, soft power uses persuasion to attract troubled nations to the convictions and values of another. We often hear about how the sustained application of soft power will in the long run create stability in such troubled areas of the world as the Middle East and South Asia. Although hard power is still essential in today's far from perfect world, soft power appears to provide a means of preventing the spread of hatred and escalating violence among nations. Increased application of soft power to procure political stability, economic advancement, improved education and educational

opportunity, and ultimately, instilling in a nation's people a conviction that life can and will be better for future generations, promises to promote international peace and prosperity.

Numerous soft power projects have been undertaken in such countries as Iraq and Afghanistan. In the case of Afghanistan, one such example is the Kansas State University initiative to rebuild the Departments of English at two key universities in this war-ravaged country, Kabul University, and Balkh University, in the northern city of Mazar-e-Sharif. Financed primarily by the World Bank, this multi-million dollar endeavor aims to do its part in restoring the former regional prestige of Afghan higher education. After more than thirty years of hard power, i.e., the violent Soviet occupation, the rise of the mujahidin resistance, and a Taliban regime that dismissed secular higher education as ungodly, Afghan universities were in shambles.

BEGINNINGS

In November 2006, as Department Head of Modern Languages, I (Corum) was privileged to accompany a group of Kansas State University faculty from Engineering, English, and Modern Languages on a two-week fact-finding mission to Kabul University, to see firsthand what was required to rebuild two branches of learning vital to the future of Afghanistan, Engineering and English. In effect, we found that the Department of English needed everything, from adequate classrooms to a modern curriculum incorporating the latest in second language acquisition and pedagogy. We found a motivated faculty and a highly intelligent student body eager to embrace up-to-date teaching techniques and materials. Rebuilding English meant retraining a talented faculty, most of whom held Bachelor's degrees in their discipline. From the beginning, we considered this relationship to be a partnership among equals, since new curricula must meet the needs and goals of the country in which they are implemented.

Wherever we looked, the problems seemed insurmountable. Few computers and personnel able to use them, textbooks essentially non-existent, a curriculum that was anchored in an outmoded grammar-translation methodology, abysmally low faculty salaries that required professors to take part- or even full-time jobs off campus, English language classes with well over a hundred students enrolled, these and numerous other difficulties presented a daunting picture. Formulating a plan that would meet the many needs of Kabul University's English Department was above all going to be a team effort. The group met frequently to discuss our ongoing impressions of what we observed and the implications in terms of how to tackle the results of thirty years of turmoil. After determining that we would indeed apply for a multi-million dollar World Bank grant, we set to work immediately on our return to Manhattan.

A NEW MASTER'S IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

For the English initiative, our first concern was for Kansas State University to develop and implement a high-quality Master's degree in the area of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). Being from a languages department that teaches foreign languages to our English-speaking American students, I knew that we would need to collaborate with the English Department and the English Language Program to create a degree that would meet the needs of our Afghan colleagues, but at the same time be a sustainable university program for future graduate students from all over the world. As a consequence, the TEFL program provides benefits to K-State beyond the original goal of fulfilling the deliverables of the partnerships since it has now begun to attract students from outside the partnership and enrollment growth is anticipated in the future.

One of the academic priorities of the Department of Modern Languages, training future language teachers in the theory and practice of second language acquisition, was an ideal fit for this program. With its huge array of courses in literature and language, the English Department contributed its considerable expertise and skill. The English Language Program, a large unit that offers instruction in English language skills to foreign students at K-State, is an integral part of the degree as well, contributing practicum courses that allow degree candidates to practice and to hone their craft.

The TEFL degree program thus emerged as a direct response to the needs of the Afghanistan partnerships. Additionally, students may take a limited number of elective courses from the College of Education, the Department of Women Studies, or the Communication Studies, Theatre, and Dance Department, among others. The final requirements for the thirty-hour degree are the completion and defense of a thesis (either second language acquisition or pedagogical in nature) and written and oral comprehensive exams.

OVERVIEW OF THE FOUR-PRONGED KU ENGLISH PROJECT

The partnerships that K-State has formed with Kabul University and the University of Balkh in Mazar-e-Sharif involve three projects: 1) the English project at Balkh, 2) the Engineering project at Kabul, and 3) the partnership profiled here with the English department at Kabul. The initial phase of the partnerships is for three years (2007-2010), but may continue for additional years if funding is available and there are additional goals for the partnerships to achieve. Funding for this initial phase of all three projects, totaling \$7.996 million (the KU English project is funded for \$2.46 million), is provided by the World Bank and K-State; funding requests for project deliverables filter through the Afghan Ministry of Higher Education and the Afghan Strengthening Higher Education Projects (SHEP) offices, as well as other appropriate Afghan governmental entities and the various universities' institutional requirements.

In general, all three projects have the same three primary goals of curriculum development, training of faculty, and establishment of appropriate departmental and college infrastructure to implement the new curriculum.

The English Department at Kabul University is one of ten departments in the Faculty of Languages and Literature. Other departments in the faculty include the Dari and Pashto Departments (both official languages of Afghanistan), as well as French, Spanish, German and Chinese, among others. The English Department is the largest of the ten departments in the faculty, with approximately 500 undergraduate majors. In addition to its undergraduate program, the English Department plays a unique and important role in the university's future goals. English was recently deemed the language of instruction for all programs of study (e.g. engineering, pharmacy, psychology, journalism, etc.); thus, the English department is also responsible for delivery of English language classes in these various programs. The English partnership has been instrumental in setting up English "sub-departments" in the different university faculties (colleges) in order to provide English instruction to all students in these very diverse fields. Due to these different instructional demands, the scope of the English project at KU is quite broad, involving four main branches.

The first of these branches, the restructuring and development of curriculum for the English four-year undergraduate major, is considered key to the partnership's long-term success as it provides a future candidate pool for English faculty positions. The English faculty have worked closely with K-State's on-site English project director, Suzanne E. Donnelly, in order to develop an eight-semester sequence of classes that will adequately prepare KU English graduates for future employment in Afghanistan. This new curriculum focuses on strengthening English language proficiency, while simultaneously developing a skills base in translation, linguistics, technical writing, pedagogy, and knowledge of English-language literature (American, British and world literatures). Curriculum development is complete for the freshman and sophomore years and ongoing for the junior and senior years. In addition to the development of this curriculum (implemented one year at a time), the department has begun using a standardized English-entrance exam in order to select the strongest candidates for the undergraduate degree program, which is delivered entirely in English. Approximately 20% of those taking the entrance exam are accepted into the program, yielding 100-120 majors per year. This placement process has resulted in more manageable class sizes for a stretched faculty, and has added credibility to the degree program.

Along with the re-structuring of the English undergraduate curriculum, the partnership has developed extensive programs in English for the different degree programs on campus. These programs are quite different from the undergraduate English major as they consist mainly of beginning and intermediate English classes for freshman and sophomore students in the various faculties with the ultimate goal of making the students professionally competent in English. Currently, English "sub-

departments” are established in ten of the fourteen faculties and serve approximately 5,000 students. This goal of the partnership has stretched the teaching resources of the English department; many of the faculty working in the sub-departments have up to 500 students per semester and teach demanding schedules. The establishment of these sub-departments has resulted in the rapid growth of the English faculty: the department has tripled in size in the last two years. These new faculty are often young and inexperienced, but highly motivated and enthusiastic.

A third branch of the project concerns facilities and supporting infrastructure development, including the renovation of classrooms, and the establishment of the English library and English language lab. When the partnership began, the university had sporadic access to electricity, no functioning heating or air conditioning system, heavily damaged classrooms, and limited teaching materials that did not reflect current pedagogical practice. Although much work remains, equipment to facilitate the daily running of classes (e.g. copy machines, printers) is now in place. Textbooks for the new curriculum are arriving and being catalogued so that they may be distributed to students. A new wing to the existing building is underway which will house the language lab, an auditorium, and additional classroom and faculty office space. The classrooms currently in use are receiving an extensive facelift, including wireless internet access, updated electrical and heating work, and general repair (new paint, flooring, windows, etc.). Amidst all this construction (and destruction), classes continue on schedule and teachers implement their new curriculum.

The last goal of the K-State/Kabul English partnership is faculty development both on-site in Kabul and at K-State. A priority of the partnership is advanced education for the faculty (the grant provides for Master’s and a limited numbers of Doctorates) as well as professional development in course design and pedagogy. Training on every aspect of course delivery from syllabus design to lesson planning to assessment as well as workshops on second language acquisition and pedagogy have been offered on the KU campus by members of the partnership team and K-State faculty and staff.

In the fall of 2008, I (Copple) made my first trip to Kabul as a visiting faculty member to teach two graduate-level workshops to the English faculty during an intensive six-week session. Due to the faculty members’ heavy workload, we generally met at 7:00 a.m. or for long 4-6 hour sessions on Fridays, their only day off. I was continually impressed by their work ethic and inquisitive minds. It was a rare, truly once-in-a-lifetime, opportunity—to teach courses and assist with other professional development while experiencing Afghan culture and hospitality firsthand. Although Kabul is a challenging environment in which to live and teach, I have rarely had more motivated, engaged students.

In summer 2009, I returned to Kabul (twice-in-a-lifetime!) and for the first time traveled to Mazar-e-Sharif to present another series of workshops. The warm welcome from the KU English faculty (and the Balkh faculty) I received on my return trip

reflects one of the most important, yet intangible, benefits of the partnership: the human relationships, built over time, which promote the exchange of professional knowledge and the establishment of trust and deeper cross-cultural understanding. This extensive personal contact between the K-State campus community and the KU faculty is rewarding to all involved as it further strengthens the partnership, provides professional models for the KU faculty, and helps build awareness at K-State of the teaching context in which the KU faculty function. This awareness is crucial since nine KU English faculty have come to Manhattan, and have completed or are currently enrolled in the TEFL M.A. degree program at K-State.

NEW FACES AT K-STATE

Upon arriving as graduate students in the TEFL program, the KU English faculty wrestled with issues common to international students, such as homesickness and culture shock, and some difficulties resulting from having experienced wartime conditions, including post-traumatic stress syndrome, educational gaps, and socio-political concerns. Because of these varied concerns, much personal contact with the students was needed as were regular meetings of the partnership advisory council. Faculty held informal workshops on computer skills and offered listening ears; librarians met with the students to teach them modern research methods and how to use the Library of Congress system; the partnership advisory council held group meetings about graduate and program policies and individual sessions to discuss course selection and living in the residence halls or off-campus.

Gaps in reading comprehension with academic research, summarizing and paraphrasing skills, critical thinking, and academic writing were noted in most of the TEFL students. Additional coursework at the undergraduate level was designed and implemented in summer semesters to allow for development of those skills. Those students who needed additional support were set up with tutors (native-English-speaking second language acquisition graduate students) and a writing course to provide support to those beginning work on their theses was also offered. These courses, while not intended to be permanent or required offerings in the TEFL degree program, do remain as options if students should require them, thus establishing some support structure for future TEFL students with similar academic weaknesses.

LIFE AND WORK IN AFGHANISTAN

In order to manage the myriad activities in Manhattan and Kabul, regular contact is made between the personnel on-site at Kabul and those at K-State, as well as the aforementioned visits by K-State faculty and staff to the KU campus. This communication is made more difficult by differing academic calendars (Afghanistan's academic year runs from March to December), differing work weeks (Afghanistan's work week runs Saturday to Thursday), a nine and one-half hour time zone difference, and sometimes undependable telecommunication systems. However, without the

constant involvement of these on-site personnel, the partnership could easily stagnate as there is substantial bureaucracy to navigate (on both campuses!), in addition to the mentoring and training that occur daily. The on-site project directors (for both English and Engineering) live together in the “K-State house” close to campus. Due to the obvious security concerns in Afghanistan, strict measures are in place to offer as much protection as possible while allowing the K-State personnel to do their jobs.

These security measures, while somewhat limiting, reflect the reality of living in wartime Afghanistan. The house is surrounded by a tall wall with razor wire. The resulting compound (like many throughout Afghanistan) allows minimal access and all traffic through the compound gate is monitored by Afghan guards. All partnership personnel (whether full-time or visiting short-term) carry cell phones with the contact information for all partnership personnel as well as the Afghan staff. Information about possible security threats and incidents is shared immediately, and lockdowns are ordered if necessary. All excursions outside of the house compound are conducted by vehicle with the accompaniment of Afghan drivers and guards. Walking is allowed only on campus (which is accessed via gates with armed guards); car traffic on campus is not generally allowed. K-State personnel have limited access to high traffic areas (e.g. the bazaar) and are accompanied by the house guards, who also serve as interpreters.

The K-State partnership team includes both women and men; the women carefully observe Islamic dress when leaving the compound (e.g. hair and neck covered with veil, long outer garment used). This careful observance of appropriate dress also allows the partnership personnel to show respect for the cultural norms of Afghanistan. As we daily work alongside numerous Afghans, this is an important component to maintaining positive relationships both with the KU campus community and the citizens of Kabul with whom we have contact.

FINAL THOUGHTS

Although the K-State/Kabul partnership comes with many challenges, the rewards of working on the partnership are great. The growth, enthusiasm, and industrious activity in the KU English Department inspire the K-State team to continue this work. The chance for K-State faculty and staff to experience firsthand a part of the world that is often poorly understood is invaluable. The importance of the cross-cultural exchange between the two campuses and the development of lasting friendships cannot be underestimated.

Seen for many centuries as the touchstone for national influence and might, hard power has a long and tragic history. Recent history has shown that soft power is absolutely indispensable if the world is to advance toward a better, more peaceful future. The K-State / Afghanistan partnership is a signal example of the exercise of soft power. International partnerships that work for the betterment of education at all

levels are a worthy goal for the global mission of American higher education. I (Corum) was struck by a comment of one of the younger English faculty members during one of our many discussions in my initial visit. He asked: “How do we know that you are not profiteers with empty promises, as so many others have proven to be in Afghanistan?” Our only response was (and is) that we are above all else academics who believe passionately in the power of education to effect fundamental and lasting change. It is this idealism that has guided K-State in this complex and challenging enterprise.

Acknowledgement

The authors gratefully acknowledge the helpful comments of Suzanne E. Donnelly, In-Country Director for the KU English project, and Marvin R. Schlatter, World Bank Projects Manager for the K-State/KU partnership.

Reference

Nye, Joseph. 1990. *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*. Basic Books. New York.

MAGS BUSINESS MEETING

Friday, April 3, 2009

8:00 - 9:30 a.m.

AGENDA

- I. Welcome
- II. Chair's Report - Diana Carlin
- III. Treasurer's Report - Dennis Nunes
- IV. Committee Reports
 - a. Auditing Committee - Phillip Pope
 - b. Membership Committee - Pamela Benoit
 - c. Nominating Committee - Maria DiStefano
 - d. Distinguished Master's Thesis Committee - Peggy Harrel
 - d. Publications Committee - Frank Einhellig
- V. Old Business
 - a. MAGS Bylaws
- VI. New Business
 - a. ETS Award
 - b. Distinguished Thesis Submission Process
 - c. Excellence in Teaching Award
- VII. Leadership Transition
- VIII. Announcements

TREASURER'S REPORT 2008

Period Covered: 1/1/08 to 12/31/08

FY 2007 1/1/07 to 12/31/07:

CURRENT ASSETS (as of 12/31/07)

Checking Account (12/31/07) \$ 29,610.88
Investment Account Balance, \$20k + \$2405.05 (09/10/07) \$ 22,405.05

TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS (12/31/07) \$ 52,015.92

FY 2008 01/01/08-12/31/08:

REVENUE (1/1/08 to 12/31/08)

Membership Dues 2008 \$ 12,200.00
Membership Dues 2009 \$ 600.00
Conference Registration \$ 23,460.00
Conference Sponsorships \$ 5,250.00
Interest \$ 672.15
Encumbered Assets \$ 555.46

SUBTOTAL REVENUE \$ 42,632.05

DISBURSEMENTS/EXPENSES (1/1/08 to 11/30/08)

2008 Conference Expenses \$ 41,298.93
Site Visit (\$ 538.50)
Hotel (\$38,300.34)
Exec Dinner (\$ 2,025.64)
Speaker Travel (\$ 407.50)
Gavel (\$ 26.95)

2008 Conference Refunds \$ 770.00
2007 Proceedings \$ 1,537.00
MAGS Thesis Award (Travel Expenses) \$ 921.09
Distinguished Thesis Mailing \$ 380.80
St. Cloud State University (MAGS printer) \$ 221.10
Diana Carlin (Dean in Residence Expenses) \$ 500.00
Summer Meeting Expenses \$ 3,942.66
CGS Exec Meeting \$ 313.42
Exec Meeting Copies (Melanie Guentzel) \$ 25.91

SUBTOTAL DISBURSEMENTS/EXPENSES \$ 49,910.91

CURRENT ASSETS (as of 12/31/08)

Checking Account (12/31/08) \$ 21,769.42
Investment Account Balance, \$20k + \$3077.20 (09/10/08) \$ 23,077.20

TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS (12/31/08) \$ 44,842.62

TREASURER'S REPORT 2009

Period Covered: 1/1/09 to 3/23/09

CURRENT ASSETS (as of 12/31/08)

Checking Account (12/31/08)	\$ 21,769.42
Investment Account Balance, \$20k + \$3077.20 (09/10/08)	\$ 23,077.20

TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS (12/31/08) **\$44,842.62**

FY 2009 01/01/09-3/23/09:

REVENUE (1/1/09 to 3/23/09)

Membership Dues 2009	\$ 21,400.00
Conference Registration	\$ 13,375.00
Conference Sponsorships	\$ 6,000.00
Encumbered Assets	\$ 554.10

SUBTOTAL REVENUE **\$ 40,329.10**

DISBURSEMENTS/EXPENSES (1/1/09 to 3/23/09)

2010 Site Visit	\$ 845.65
-----------------	-----------

SUBTOTAL DISBURSEMENTS/EXPENSES **\$ 845.65**

CURRENT ASSETS (as of 12/31/08)

Checking Account (12/31/08)	\$ 61,248.87
Investment Account Balance, \$20k + \$3077.20 (09/10/08)	\$ 23,077.20

TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS (12/31/08) **\$84,326.07**

Submitted by MAGS Secretary/Treasurer: Dennis Nunes, St. Cloud State University

Reviewed by MAGS Auditing Committee: Phillip Pope, Purdue University (Chair)

APPROVED BY VOTE OF MEMBERSHIP

MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE REPORT

The following institutions were approved for MAGS membership in 2009:

Spring Arbor University is located in Spring Arbor, Michigan. It is a Christian, liberal arts institution. It is accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. It granted 383 master's degrees in 2007-08.

Indiana Wesleyan University is located in Marion, Indiana. It is a Christian, liberal arts institution related to the Wesleyan Church. It is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission and is a member of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. It granted 1,877 graduate degrees in 2007-08 and grants both the EdD and several master's degrees.

University of Michigan - Dearborn is located in Dearborn, Michigan. It is one of the three campuses of the University of Michigan and is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission and a member of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. It granted 164 graduate degrees in 2007-08 and this includes two PhD programs and several master's programs.

Lourdes College is located in Sylvania, Ohio and is a liberal arts college sponsored by the Sisters of St. Francis. It is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. It granted 50 degrees in 2007-08 and offers master's degree programs in Education, Organizational Leadership, and Nursing.

University of Michigan-Flint is located in Flint, Michigan. It is one of the three campuses of the University of Michigan and is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission and a member of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. It granted 337 graduate degrees and certificates including the DPT and 11 master's degree programs.

Franklin University is located in Columbus, OH. It is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools and offers the Master of Business Administration, Master of Science in Marketing and Communication, and Master of Science in Computer Science. Over 400 degrees were granted in 2007-08.

University of Central Oklahoma is located in Edmond, Oklahoma. It is accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools and offers 6 master's degree programs. It granted over 400 graduate degrees in 2006-07.

Viterbo University is located in La Crosse, Wisconsin. It is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission and the North Central Association. It grants master's degrees in Nursing, Education, Business, and Servant Leadership as well as licensure and certificate programs. It graduated over 500 students in 2006-07 in various graduate programs.

University of Wisconsin - Superior has renewed their membership.

2008-2009 Membership Committee Members

Pam Benoit, University of Missouri - Columbia (Chair)
Byron Clark, Southeast Oklahoma State University
Linda Schoen, Ohio Dominican University
Kevin Kephart, South Dakota State University
Deborah Richie, University of Illinois - Chicago
Carol Shanklin, Kansas State University
Shelly Martinez, University of Michigan

MAGS Membership State Representatives:

Indiana

Phil Pope, Purdue University
Gita Ramaswamy, Purdue University

Illinois

Deborah Richie, University of Illinois - Chicago
Robert Augustine, Eastern Illinois University

Michigan

Priscilla Kimboko, Grand Valley State University

Missouri

Maria DeStefano, Truman State University

Ohio

Linda Schoen, Ohio Dominican University
Bruce Cochrane, Miami University
Paul Wolf, Air force Institute of Technology

Oklahoma

Byron Clark, Southeast Oklahoma State University

South Dakota

Kevin Kephart, South Dakota State University

DISTINGUISHED MASTER'S THESIS COMMITTEE REPORT

MAGS/UMI Distinguished Thesis Awards 2009

*Presented by the Midwestern Association of Graduate Schools and
ProQuest UMI Dissertation Publishing*

There were a total of 43 theses submitted for the 2009 MAGS/UMI Distinguished Thesis Awards. Nominated theses were sent to the members of the selection committee for review at their respective institutions. All theses received multiple reviews. Again this year, reviewer comments indicated high-quality work on the part of the nominated students. Committee members discussed the reviewers' scores and comments for the highest rated manuscripts and selected the following award two recipients. These students were honored at an evening banquet held during the 2009 Annual MAGS Meeting Wednesday, April 1, 2009.

MARY JO LAWS

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Thesis Advisor: Professor Indrani C. Bagchi

Ablation of Connexin 43 Expression in Uterine Stromal Cells Reveals a Novel Role of Gap Junction in Angiogenesis and Implantation

In most mammalian tissues gap junction proteins, such as Connexin 43 (Cx43), connect cells by creating intercellular cytoplasmic channels clustered in the plasma membrane that allow for communication between the cells. Our studies indicated that Cx43 is induced in the mouse uterus during implantation and is localized in proliferating as well as decidualized stromal cells surrounding the implanted embryo. To address the functional role of Cx43 in the uterus during pregnancy, we created a conditional knockout mouse model by crossing transgenic mice harboring a "floxed" Cx43 gene (Cx43^{fl/fl}) with progesterone receptor (PR) Cre knockin mice. The conditional knockout animal will not have Cx43 in cells expressing PR. These mice will be referred to as Cx43^{d/d} mice. Our study revealed that Cx43^{d/d} mice exhibited more than 60% reduction in birth rate when compared to the Cx43^{fl/fl} (control) mice. Both Cx43^{fl/fl} and Cx43^{d/d} animals respond similarly to gonadotropin-induced superovulation, suggesting that the reduced fertility in Cx43^{d/d} mice is not due to a functional defect of the ovary. Further reproductive analyses indicated that the Cx43^{d/d} mice were able to initiate embryo implantation, but by Day 8 of gestation the implanted embryos in Cx43^{d/d} mice undergo resorption. Histological analysis of uterine sections of the Cx43^{d/d} mice on Day 8 of gestation revealed a striking decrease in the development of an angiogenic network surrounding the embryo. Furthermore, in both the mouse and human model systems, ablation of Cx43 within the stromal cells leads to a dramatic reduction in VEGF, a well known regulator of angiogenesis. Collectively, our studies indicated that Cx43 gap junctions in the stromal compartment play an essential role in the development of vasculature during early pregnancy.

KRISTEL MARIE HAWKINS

Miami University (OH)

Thesis Advisor: Dr. Carla Gardina Pestana

Suffering and Early Quaker Identity: Ellis Hookes and the “Great Book of Sufferings”

Early Quakers formed group awareness and identification through patient suffering. The developing Quaker bureaucracy encouraged them to witness to their faith according to sanctioned practices and to have reports recorded into the “Great Book of Sufferings.” Using Lancashire as an example, this thesis examines the structure, contents, and overall purpose of the suffering accounts. The Society of Friends initially used its members’ sufferings as a public advocacy tool to end religious persecution. By the late 1680s, the focus shifted as persecution lessened. Friends subsequently sent in their reports as part of a ritual that built internal solidarity through joyful suffering and created a quasi-martyrological tradition. Beginning around 1660, Ellis Hookes, clerk to the Quakers, copied countless accounts into two volumes of the “Great Book of Sufferings.” He began a practice, which lasted over a century and filled another forty-two volumes, of linking Quakers together through their suffering accounts.

Students Receiving Honorable Mention:

Emily Catherine Egan

University of Cincinnati

Krista Lynn Hebel

University of Wisconsin Eau Claire

Molly Christine Jud

Central Michigan University

2008-2009 Distinguished Master’s Thesis Award Committee Members

Peggy Harrel, University of Southern Indiana (Chair)

Richard Adler, Minnesota State University - Moorhead

Priscilla Kimboko, Grand Valley State University

Edward Mykyta, University of Dayton

Sara Rosen, University of Kansas

David Wilson, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

John Karkheck, Marquette University

Salina Shrofel, Northern Kentucky University

Bruce Cochrane, Miami University (OH)

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

A major responsibility of the Publication Committee since the April, 2008 meeting was to prepare and publish the 2008 *Proceedings of the Midwestern Association of Graduate Schools* annual meeting. All individuals presenting at the 2008 meeting were contacted and asked to provide a formal manuscript of their presentation following the guidelines in the Instructions for Contributors to the MAGS Proceedings. In the case of Workshop sessions, a summary of the presentation and any subsequent interactive discussion was requested.

A good percentage of those presenting at the 2008 meeting were able to contribute to the *Proceedings*. A total of 14 manuscripts were received, including the write up on five Workshop presentations. Four MAGS Committee reports also were received. The submissions for the *Proceedings* were edited, organized, and formatted as the 2008 *Proceedings of the Midwestern Association of Graduate Schools*. The 2008 *Proceedings* was then posted on the MAGS website. In the years since 2001 the *Proceedings* were published in both print and an online version. However, based on a vote of the membership, the 2008 publication was limited to the online version.

The MAGS website includes the meeting programs, membership list, and other issues related to the organization. This website has been hosted by Missouri State University. Publication committee member Carla Coorts has been the MAGS webmaster during the past year, as she has been for a number of years. MAGS is now in the process of moving the website to an independent -host provider, and Melanie Guentzel, Director of Graduate Student Services, St. Cloud State University has agreed to be the webmaster for the immediate future.

It has been increasingly difficult to sustain the *Proceedings* publication because of the intense time pressures on presenters and others associated with the process. The online-only format also allows for more flexibility in formatting of the annual *Proceedings*. Hence, the MAGS Executive Committee has determined that submissions to the *Proceedings* can take various approaches, including the possibility of inclusion of power-point slides with an introduction or summary discussion. The overall intent is to try and provide the MAGS membership -and other interested parties- reasonable access to information and perspectives shared at the annual meeting.

The Publication Committee looks forward to receiving the presentations from the 2009 annual meeting.

Frank Einhellig, Missouri State University (Chair)

2009 INSTRUCTIONS TO MAGS ANNUAL MEETING PROCEEDINGS CONTRIBUTORS

Introduction. The instructions and timelines that follow ensure appropriate continuity and timely publication and distribution of the Annual Meeting Proceedings of the Midwestern Association of Graduate Schools. These guidelines achieve the goal of consistency but allow freedom for the presentation of the array of topics that constitutes the Proceedings. The Proceedings include the text of keynote and plenary sessions, summaries of workshops, panel presentations and small group discussions, the Association's committee reports, and other items of concern as appropriate to support the goals of the organization. Authors should be aware that the text of oral presentations may need some modifications for clear communication as a publication in the proceedings. They should revise the presentation to make it suitable for publication.

All Manuscripts. All manuscripts must be submitted electronically in Microsoft Word format (.doc) or rich text format (.rtf). PowerPoint or similar presentations are not acceptable. The Publications Committee may edit the manuscript for clarity and formatting.

Keynote and Plenary Manuscripts. Manuscripts for traditionally delivered keynote and plenary presentations should be prepared using these guidelines:

Title: Use the title published in the Meeting Brochure, typically ten or fewer words.

Authorship: Provide your name, title, institution, address, and email address.

Abstract: The first section should be an abstract of no more than 100 words.

Line Spacing: Single spaced.

Paragraphs: Double space between paragraphs; do not indent.

Headings: Use of headings to identify main topics is encouraged. Justify headings to the left and in bold.

Citations: Use the author and date system; i.e., "Jones (2008) reported that..." or "MAGS is a growing organization (Jones, 2008)." Use et al. for three or more authors.

References: Provide full citations in a “Reference” section as the last section of the text, listing things alphabetically by the author’s name.

The form for journal references should be as shown in these examples:
Jones, A.S. 2008. Planning for the future of graduate education. *Journal of Graduate Education* 28: 1-10. (28 is the volume and 1-10 is the page sequence.)

For two or more authors, the respective format would be:
Jones, A.S. and H.L. Smith; or, Jones, A.S., H.L. Smith and B.J. Zang.

References for books should be by author:
Jones, A.S. 2008. *Book Title Capitalizing The First Letters*. Publisher, City, State abbreviated.

Listing of a chapter in a edited book would be by the author of that chapter, according to the format:
Jones, A.S. 2008. Title of article. Pp. xx-xy. *In* Smith, J.A. (ed.). *Title of Book*. Publisher, City, State.

Length: Limit the manuscript to ten or fewer single-spaced pages.

Figures/artwork: Limit graphs and figures to those supported by Microsoft Office.

Workshop and Panelist Presentations. Manuscripts for workshops and panelist presentations that were delivered as a traditional keynote or plenary session presentations should be prepared according to the Keynote and Plenary Manuscript guidelines outlined above. These manuscripts may include a summary of relevant discussion when a discussion option was included in the presentation. Manuscripts for Workshop or Panel Presentations that used a discussion format should be prepared according to the guidelines for Small Group Discussion Manuscripts outlined below.

Small Group Discussion Manuscripts. The following guidelines apply to interactive meeting sections that are under the direction of a facilitator, who is responsible for formulating key questions for discussion, moderating the discussion session, and providing a written summary for the *Proceedings*. After the title and authorship (facilitator), the manuscript presented to the *Proceedings* should start with a statement of the topic and a bulleted list of questions that served as the focus of the discussion. These elements should be followed by a concise summary (250-500 words) inclusive of the salient points, comments, or questions that arose during the group discussion. If desired, references can be included in a standard reference list according to the format specified for other manuscripts in the *Proceedings*.

Manuscripts are due **by June 15, 2009**.

Submit all materials for publication electronically as specified above to FrankEinhellig@missouristate.edu or CarlaCoorts@missouristate.edu.

NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

MAGS/ETS Award for Excellence and Innovation in Graduate Admissions

The Midwestern Association of Graduate Schools (MAGS) and Educational Testing Service (ETS) are pleased to announce the 2009-2010 MAGS/ETS Awards for Excellence and Innovation in Graduate Admissions. Presented by the GRE® and TOEFL® programs, the award will be distributed to a MAGS member schools in recognition of outstanding contributions in graduate admissions practices.

The purpose of the award is to encourage, recognize and reward excellence and innovation in domestic and international graduate admissions at both the graduate school and program level. Applications may relate to any facet of the admissions process, from outreach and recruitment through selection and admission, e.g.:

- increasing the diversity of applicants to graduate programs in the STEM disciplines
- using technology to communicate with and attract prospective applicants in new and effective ways
- increasing the number of international students who seek an education at your institution
- demonstrating success in enhancing the quality of the entering class.

Only one application will be accepted from a given graduate school. The internal institutional selection processes are the responsibility of the Dean of the Graduate School or comparable official.

MAGS DISTINGUISHED MASTER'S THESIS AWARD: PROPOSAL FOR ELECTRONIC REVIEW

Submitted by Peggy Harrel, Chair, Distinguished Master's Thesis Committee

The current thesis review process has a couple of problems that can be solved by electronic submission. Currently the system involves two rounds: Dec-Jan & Jan-Feb. The problems result from difficulties finding a reviewer for selected theses, having to send theses overnight to enlist a reviewer from another institution, and lack of time to get the theses to reviewers. Benefits to electronic submission are that it will:

- save time and frustration for the Review Committee (lengthen time to find reviewers & time reviewers have to review the theses & enable Committee Chair to reassign theses from institutions that are unable to review them),
- increase the number of theses that are fully reviewed (4 reviewers),
- save money for both the nominating institutions & MAGS (submitting and returning theses by mail or overnight carrier & sending to other institutions to review),
- increase time for the selection conference call so all committee members can participate, and
- result in more time (and possibly save money for award institution) for recipients to make travel arrangements to the MAGS conference.

The proposed electronic process will require the nominators to email their nomination form (PDF) and abstract (Word or PDF) and thesis (PDF) electronically by Nov. 10. They send their original signed nomination form by surface mail no later than Nov. 13. The thesis must be in one continuous document in PDF. Any institution experiencing difficulties & unable to submit the thesis electronically on Nov. 10 would have a few days to burn it to CD and send it by surface carrier by Nov. 13 .

The only major drawback to electronic submission is that some institutions may not have the capability to submit electronically. I propose that those institutions self-identify early and arrange to send me one photocopy of their nominated thesis by the Nov. deadline. My office will scan photocopied theses to PDF next year on a trial basis. We anticipate few institutions will need this service, and we have the capability.

Once I have received the abstracts, I'll send all approx 48 to the 8 reviewers. (Each thesis is reviewed by 4 reviewers.) I'll burn the theses to CDs and mail the CDs to the committee members in early Dec. Committee Members will have two months to have the approx 24 theses reviewed (one continuous round). The rating sheets will be due back by Feb. 1, 2010. The CDs will be destroyed by reviewing institutions.

The timing is still tight in November, but it's important that it occur as late as possible to allow campuses to complete their own competitions, and it's also important to distribute them to the reviewers in December before the end of the semester.

Getting the information out to member institutions will be critical for the success of the project. Graduate deans are often not responsible for the thesis competition on their campus, so we must ensure that the change in requirements is publicized as broadly and as early as possible.

APPROVED BY VOTE OF MEMBERSHIP

2008-2009 MAGS Executive Committee

Diana Carlin, Chair
University of Kansas

Hilary Ratner, Chair-Elect
Wayne State University

William Wiener, Member-at-Large
Marquette University

Gail Scukanec, Past Chair
University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire

Dennis Nunes, Secretary/Treasurer
St. Cloud State University

Published 2009, Midwestern Association of Graduate Schools

Editor

Frank A. Einhellig
Associate Provost and
Dean of the Graduate College
Missouri State University
Springfield, MO 65897

Co-Editor

Carla Coorts
Assistant to the Dean, Graduate College
Missouri State University
Springfield, Missouri 65897