The Death of the Doctorate and Other Stories
Charles Caramello, Dean-in-Residence, Council of Graduate Schools; Professor of English, University of Maryland

I. It lives!

Literary critics have been predicting the death of the novel for well over two centuries, and yet, to repurpose Colin Clive’s iconic line from the great James Whale Frankenstein, “it lives!” Academic pundits, analogously, have been contemplating the death of the doctorate for well over three decades, offering numerous plans to ensure that it not only lives, but also thrives.

The diagnosis has focused on four issues: 1) PhD students in large numbers either fail to complete the degree or take too long to complete it; 2) PhD graduates in all fields face an academic job market that busts more often than booms; 3) PhD students and graduates in the humanities find those two problems worse than do peers in STEM; and therefore, 4) the PhD, particularly in the humanities, must be “re-structured” or “re-envisioned.” I offer these general responses:

1) Appropriate goals for degree completion and time to degree would seem obvious: the more students who complete the degree, and the fewer years they take to do it, the better. The most urgent and vexing problem, however, may be neither high attrition nor long time to degree in and of itself, but, rather, high attrition in the later phases of the degree. Solving that problem will improve return on investment for institutions and individuals.

2) At low points in the academic job cycle, we advise students to prepare for “non-academic careers” and supplement their training with relevant programming. We must take the next steps, however, integrating transferable or “soft” skills into core curricula, and helping faculty, generally lacking experience in non-academic careers, to develop the knowledge necessary to advise students on those opportunities.

3) Humanities students average longer time-to-degree than STEM peers largely because humanities scholarship differs from STEM research, and humanities disciplines have tended to view dissertations as book drafts (a tendency, happily, that seems to be fading). While all students find academic jobs to be scarce, moreover, humanities students find other opportunities less obvious, abundant, and, perhaps, desirable.

4) “Re-structuring” and “re-envisioning” have great appeal. They appeal to the endemic optimism in American thought, and align with our faith in innovation and technology: all people and things can be perfected—or re-created—with enough innovative thinking and technical skill. That optimism has led to better doctoral programs; whether it will lead to a transformed doctoral degree remains to be seen.
On the whole, we should be wary of glum pessimism at one extreme or blind optimism at the other. Decades of talk on these issues have produced clear and evident progress, if not always dramatic progress, in ensuring the vitality of the PhD. Embracing three basic principles, I would suggest, might lead to even further progress:

1) While the PhD provides specialized training in many disciplines, it is one degree with one necessary and sufficient condition: the rigorous application of philosophical and methodological principles to original research or scholarly questions. The discipline is variable in doctoral education; learning to apply abstract principles and to frame concrete questions is integral and essential.

2) While the PhD prepares students for “multiple career paths,” it also prepares them, and arguably more important, for full entry into the life of the mind: successful doctoral students, in the end, are those who conserve essential knowledge, produce new knowledge, and join an intellectual conversation that, for centuries, has valued knowledge in and for itself.

3) While the PhD may need transformation, a “re-structured” and “re-envisioned” PhD also should strive to meet Yehuda Elkana’s challenge: reforming structures entails “getting into content,” but “graduate programs in almost every discipline have become intellectually timid.” With this signal if debatable insight, Elkana properly shifts the ground from formal innovation to moral imagination.

The PhD will live, in sum, by continuing to do its critical work of producing researchers and scholars equipped with valuable knowledge and skills. It can thrive, as well, by guarding its fundamental intellectual integrity, by educating original thinkers as intellectuals rather than training them as technicians, and by producing philosophers—as the title of the degree promises—for the future.

II. Old Blue Eyes
The Chronicle of Higher Education alone has published some 50 articles on the PhD since the 1980s, a preponderance of them focused on the humanities PhD. The conversation has tended to embrace and advance a single master narrative: the uncertain humanities job market mandates a transformed humanities PhD.

Following a bust in the academic job market in the 1970s, professional associations advised humanities graduates to retool for other careers; responding to a “crisis” in the 1990s, the Modern Language Association encouraged its member disciplines to replace some PhDs with beefed-up master’s degrees; and, addressing worse conditions in 2014, the MLA Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature urged disciplines to “restructure” the PhD.

Notwithstanding an apparent evolution from retooling to replacing to restructuring, the underlying message remains the same: doctoral students, particularly in the humanities, must prepare for both academic and “non-academic” careers. The caveat: graduates in all disciplines must adapt to rough market conditions, but those in STEM can adapt more easily than those in humanities.

Though only half of graduates now enter, or intend to enter, the academy, those in many STEM fields—particularly engineering and biomedical sciences—often prefer positions in other sectors and find robust markets for researchers in them. Those in the humanities, however, appear more often to prefer positions in the academy, at least for the period immediately following graduation, but, as noted above, find them to be scarce and find research opportunities in other sectors neither obvious, abundant, nor, perhaps, desirable.

The humanities PhD, current wisdom holds, wants “restructuring” to prepare graduates better for teaching posts in non-research institutions or for leadership posts in non-academic sectors. The
proposed “restructuring” often (though not intuitively) focuses on reducing time to degree: if humanities students take longer than STEM students, and humanities dissertations are longer than STEM dissertations, then humanities should adopt or adapt STEM models.

The flaws in this line of thinking, also noted above, are clear: first, humanities scholarship differs in substance from STEM research, and, second, humanities dissertations therefore differ in substance (though also for less compelling reasons) from STEM dissertations. Since training in humanities, moreover, rarely entails a postdoctoral phase, time to professional preparation in humanities (as opposed to time to degree) arguably may approximate that in STEM.

The conversation about the humanities PhD, in sum, centers on restructuring the degree to align with career opportunities. Given a taste for coinages like “po-mo,” humanities disciplines not surprisingly prefer the trendy but loaded term “alt-careers” to the stodgy but neutral “multiple career paths.” Given core values, however, humanities disciplines do surprisingly seem to advocate more strongly for innovation in form than for muscularity in content.

The humanities have had as many crises as Sinatra had retirements—and just as many comebacks. I say have had rather than have suffered crises, because we obviously enjoy them—or, more equitably and precisely, enjoy depicting our setbacks as “crises.” Stories are our preferred form, conflict our preferred subject, and histrionics our preferred style; “crises” offer us leaner plots, richer themes, more drama, and sharper characters than do “problems.”

This is hubris. If the humanities are “in crisis,” then where are the refugees from brutal regimes or victims of earthquakes and tsunamis, where are the animal species being driven to extinction by climate change—in supercrisis? hypercrisis? metacrisis? Our ubiquitous tropes of crisis and renewal, death and rebirth, border on self-indulgence and may exact a price: the core humanist values of precision, proportion, and decorum.

Let us agree that the humanities have problems. The story is familiar, if exaggerated: on one side, a philistine national culture and crass higher education industry produce a soulless corporate university that regards students as clientele, workforce development as mission, and jobs as product; on the other side, a disinfected humanities professoriate, boots deep in that muck, becomes dispirited, loses faith in vocation, and too often embraces abjection: a haberdasher could get rich peddling hair shirts at meetings of AHA, ASA, or MLA. Scholars by trade, we respond with commissions, conferences, symposia, and monographs—often to good effect.

Meanwhile, dissertators drown in jargon: “The notion of altermodernities also problematizes the conceptualization of modernization as a coherent teleology . . . .” Academic leaders torture metaphors: “The modern research university is a strong STEM, with the humanities the flower at its top.” Our chief executive knows no history, reads no books, and uses a sixth-grade vocabulary; federal legislators equivocate and obfuscate; and voters cheer bombast and cant. Intolerance rages, and incivility rules. Every day, the culture confirms that we humanists have urgent work to do.

A coastal New Englander would say: “it’s time to fish or cut bait.” So let’s stop chopping chum. We must find and land our opportunities. As doctors of philosophy, we may want to suspend worrying the humanities as an institution and focus more on practicing it as a philosophy—one whose core values will outlive our antagonists and ourselves and thrive in the academy and in the “world elsewhere.” The way lies in learned study, cogent thinking, critical reading, limpid writing, lucid speaking, impassioned teaching, and bold cunning. The rest is sound and fury.

Based on presentations made in 2014 and 2015, this essay was written in December 2016 and January 2017. The subsequent proposed budgetary cuts to the National Endowment for the Humanities tell us that we probably cannot afford to “suspend
worrying the humanities as an institution.” The much broader threat to scholarship, creativity, and research that they reflect—a devaluation of intellect and expertise—tells us that we certainly cannot afford to waiver in our commitment to the humanities as a philosophy. The opinions expressed in this essay are my own and not necessarily those of CGS.

ii Jules LaPidus, former president of the Council of Graduate Schools, observed in 1999 that “the past few years have seen a plethora of studies, and not just in the United States, that use words like reinvent, reengineer, rethink, and reform when discussing doctoral education.” “Is What’s Past (or Post) Still Prologue.” *A Walk Through Graduate Education* (CGS, 2000), p. 145.

Inclusion Innovations to Improve the Graduate Education Climate

Barbara A. Knuth, Sara Xayarath Hernández, Colleen McLinn, Cornell University

Confronting -Isms and Phobias

Like other leaders in graduate education in the United States, we are concerned that implicit and explicit biases, racism, sexism, and other “-isms” and social “phobias” such as Islamophobia, are negatively affecting the ability of graduate students and scholars to thrive academically and personally. We are honored to receive the 2016 ETS/CGS Award for Innovation in Promoting Success in Graduate Education as one step we are taking to challenge and confront this negativity.

Through this award, we are designing and implementing a series of innovative, active interventions to foster a more inclusive climate at Cornell. Our innovations engage graduate students, faculty, and staff and aim to achieve a campus climate where incidents of bias are minimized, and in which all graduate students feel valued and have a sense of belonging among their peers and faculty. Four keys to our inclusion innovations are interactive theatre, facilitated dialogue, learning from lived experiences, and collaborating with others to broaden impact.

We Need to Talk

Colón Ramos and Quiñones-Hinojosa (2016) wrote in the *New York Times* about *Racism in the Research Lab*, expressing concerns that stereotypes applied to minority scientists and women diminish their significant accomplishments and compromise their ability to focus on their science because they have to spend time dealing with prejudices of various types. They argue that it is rare for frank discussions about race and prejudice to occur in campus research environments. Theirs is a narrative that is echoed by many other diverse scholars in academia across the disciplines. This is exemplified in *Conditionally Accepted*, an *Insider Higher Ed* blog, which provides news, personal stories, and resources from scholars that feel “at best, conditionally accepted.”

We see a role for our Graduate School to purposely bring forward stories from students as well as faculty to create broader understanding of the diverse lived experiences represented within graduate education and the professoriate. Through our four inclusion innovations, we seek to provide transformative learning opportunities for productive, frank conversations about these complicated topics, and reduce circumstances of exclusion and isolation. In
so doing, we aspire to build a campus environment in which all members of the graduate community feel a genuine sense of belonging, and value diverse identities, lived experiences, and perspectives.

Our four interventions are designed to actively engage and empower graduate students to understand factors influencing their success, and create powerful and supportive social and professional networks. Additionally, these interventions help students, faculty, and staff bring into consciousness the influence of privilege, importance of identities, and our shared individual and collective responsibilities to foster social change.

**Hear My Voice as I Tell My Story**

Based on authentic narratives from graduate students who shared their lived experiences through anonymous surveys, focus groups, and discussions, actors in *My Voice, My Story*, a video-based interactive theatre tool, portray eight graduate student characters whose stories demonstrate the breadth and depth of lived experiences and identities within our graduate student community. Through facilitated dialogue following a viewing of the *My Voice, My Story* video, participants are stimulated to discuss their reactions, thoughts, and feelings about the complex issues and experiences portrayed in the video. These dialogues also help participants consider what actions they can take related to advancing inclusion, engagement, and diversity within the graduate education community.

We are training staff, student, and faculty facilitators to be able to prompt discussions among their peers to enhance skills of listening for understanding; comprehend the impacts of exclusion and inclusion in a research environment; develop respect for differences; exhibit empathy for others whose life experiences are different; and become aware of unconscious bias and how to confront it. We are using this innovative conversation-starter proactively in graduate programs that seek to build these skills in their communities, as well as in response to particular instances of prejudice, bias, or conflict. Different, carefully planned approaches are required for each of these contexts; working with interactive theatre professionals and organizational behavior experts helps target our methods and trainings to the specific situation.

**Explicit Advice Breeds Success**

We recognize that success as a graduate student is tied to individual talents and the ability to apply those talents within a particular academic culture full of unspoken expectations and traditions. Our Summer Success Symposium engages new and continuing PhD students from across all graduate fields who identify as belonging to groups historically underrepresented in graduate education. The symposium has a particular focus on bringing together recipients of graduate fellowships in support of diversity as well as other doctoral scholars who identify as students of color, first generation college (FGC) students, and/or who identify with other historically underrepresented groups such as Veterans, students with disabilities, and LGBTQQQ+.

Tinto’s (2016) research on student persistence teaches us that “students who perceive themselves as belonging are more likely to persist because it leads not only to enhanced motivation, but also a willingness to become involved with others in ways that further promote persistence. In contrast, a student’s sense of not belonging, of being out of place, leads to a withdrawal from contact with others that further undermines motivation to persist.” Consequently, the Summer Success Symposium focuses on helping students establish strong social and academic networks and gain access to “insider knowledge” from faculty and alumni who have shared lived experiences as diverse scholars.

Through this symposium, participants gain insights to help them navigate the developmental phases of achieving a PhD while they form critical social connections with peers across graduate programs to develop a strong sense of community, belonging, and support. This helps students, especially those from marginalized communities, accumulate the social capital needed to negotiate the challenges they will
confront in graduate school, and influence positive change in their social and academic environments.

**Let’s Talk Across Difference**
Our Intergroup Dialogue Immersion Project blends theory with experiential learning to facilitate communication across social, cultural, and power differences. Intergroup dialogues focus intentionally on discussing the role and impact of identities such as race, socio-economic status, sexual orientation, political affiliation, ability/disability, and gender to promote the development of explicit consciousness about social identity, oppression, and privilege.

Talking across difference helps build respect and relationships and strengthens individual and collective abilities to promote social justice. The immersion program is designed to enable participants to learn from each other about issues related to their social identities and be empowered to shape productively their experiences in the graduate education community. Participants emerge from this experience with an expanded skill-set to apply intergroup dialogue practices in other contexts, through which they make important contributions toward enhancing the academic climate for all members of our community.

**Teaching and Practicing Inclusion**
Our fourth innovation is an Inclusive Teaching Institute for Graduate Students and Postdocs that engages participants in complex discussions about diversity and inclusion at Cornell, and how to incorporate inclusive teaching and learning practices in the classroom. Through readings, activities, and facilitated discussions with faculty speakers and undergraduate panelists, participants expand their teaching toolboxes and understandings of topics such as unconscious bias and microaggressions.

Importantly, participants form a lasting learning community that lives on after the institute is over. Achieving the cultural change necessary to confront various -isms and phobias within the learning environment is both an individual and collective undertaking. Supportive social and professional networks are critical to making progress on the inclusion of diverse voices, perspectives, and experiences.

**The Importance of Collaborators**
Our ability to make progress on these innovations is certainly enhanced by the several collaborations we engage across campus. Our efforts are centered in the Graduate School, through activities of staff in our Office of Inclusion and Student Engagement (OISE) and our Cornell University Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching, and Learning (CU-CIRTL). We collaborate with Cornell’s Office of Academic Diversity Initiatives, Intergroup Dialogue Project, Center for Teaching Excellence, Diversity Programs in Engineering, and Cornell Interactive Theatre Ensemble.

These collaborations enable us to leverage resources not otherwise accessible to our graduate students, and expand the ideas and creative approaches that fuel our innovations. Diversity of partners strengthens the impact of our programs.

Similarly, the diversity of schools represented in the Council of Graduate Schools can expand the impact of these ideas and innovations designed to foster inclusion. We hope some of these ideas will be useful to other CGS members, modified for the particular circumstances at your schools, and that you’ll share what you learn from your experiences so we can make progress together, as a graduate education community learning from each other.


With nearly one out of five U.S. master’s and doctoral students being international students, the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS), graduate deans, and the graduate education community have high stakes in supporting the recruitment and success of international graduate students and scholars pursuing their studies in the United States. Though it has been over five months since the first immigration executive order was signed, much uncertainty remains as to how the current political climate and immigration policies may be affecting that flow. A short survey conducted by CGS finds that member deans are seeing a decline in admission yields of prospective international graduate students, a sign that the global appeal for U.S. graduate education may be suffering.

**Survey Results**

First, the data indicate that more graduate deans are seeing declines in admission yields of prospective international graduate students than of prospective U.S. citizen/permanent resident graduate students. Particularly for prospective master’s students, 46% of graduate deans indicated that they are seeing substantial downward changes in admission yields for international students, while only 24% reported the same for domestic students. At the same time, 41% of graduate deans reported that they are seeing substantial upward changes in admission yields for prospective domestic master’s students. Given that the large majority of international graduate students are offered admission into master’s degree programs, this may have substantial implications for first-time enrollment of international graduate students for Fall 2017.

Second, declines in admission yields for prospective international graduate students were more pronounced at R2 and R3 institutions. Over one half of respondents at R2 and R3 institutions (55%) indicated that they are seeing substantial downward changes in admission yields of prospective international master’s students. This is compared to 42% at R1 institutions and 39% at Master’s Colleges and Universities and others. The contrast was even more dramatic for admission yields of prospective international doctoral students. Forty-two percent of graduate deans at R2 and R3 institutions reported the same.
Finally, declines in admission yields of prospective international graduates vary by regions of origin. Fifty-two percent of graduate deans reported that they are seeing declines in admission yields for prospective international graduate students from the Middle East and North Africa region. The observation of downward changes was particularly pronounced at R1 institutions, where 60% of graduate deans reported declines in admission yields for students from that region. Also, forty-two percent of graduate deans indicated that they are seeing a decline in students from Asia. Notably, 55% of graduate deans at R2 and R3 institutions reported substantial downward changes in admission yields of prospective Asian graduate students. For other regions, many fewer graduate deans reported a decline, and the majority of them noted no substantial changes in international admission yields.

Discussion
In the CGS Pressing Issues Survey earlier this year, nearly one half of graduate deans at U.S. doctoral universities (48%) indicated that they were seeing downward changes in international graduate applications this year, compared to the last application cycle. With the second immigration executive order now making its way to the U.S. Supreme Court, the Administration’s continued scrutiny of the visa review processes at U.S. consulates abroad, as well as H-1B visa and optional practical training programs, much uncertainty still remains. Yet, a few key indicators have emerged to offer additional insight into how these policies may be affecting the flow of international graduate students and scholars to the United States.

A recent review by POLITICO noted that fewer non-immigrant visas, including F-1 visas that international graduate students need, were granted this year as compared to last year, particularly in Arab countries. However, the visa issuance statistics alone are difficult to interpret, since we do not know whether this is because of fewer applications submitted, fewer applications approved, or a
combination of both. An examination of admission yields offers additional insight, as the decline suggests that fewer students are willing to pursue opportunities for graduate education in the United States, even when acceptance into a degree program is offered to them. Prospective international graduate students appear more likely, in particular, to turn down those opportunities at the master's level, as well as at R2 and R3 institutions. While the survey cannot pinpoint particular factors that might be shaping such shifts, the uncertainty with prospects of post-graduate school employment under optional practical training and/or H-1B visa programs, as well as opportunities to pursue graduate education in other English-speaking countries, may in part explain some of the declines graduate deans are observing.

CGS remains committed to seeing U.S. graduate education remain open and that U.S. graduate schools continue to be the desired destination for talented students and scholars both domestic and from abroad. More importantly, CGS is the platform for our member deans to exchange ideas and promising practices that may strengthen the global appeal of U.S. graduate education collectively. At the upcoming Summer Workshop in Denver, CGS is pleased to welcome Esther Brimmer, executive director and CEO of NAFSA: Association of International Educators to hear her perspective on this subject. Also at the Annual Meeting later this year, we will convene a pre-meeting workshop to discuss strategies and approaches for recruiting international graduate students. In the meantime, we encourage our members to take advantage of the Dean's Discussion Board to pose questions and/or share insights with fellow graduate deans.

“That’s My School!” Increasing the Reach and Impact of Your Graduate School’s Success Stories

Julia Kent, Assistant Vice President, Communications, Advancement and Best Practices, Council of Graduate Schools

Students and Alumni Help Us Tell (and Share) Our Stories

Earlier this year, my alma mater, Topeka High School in Topeka, Kansas, was featured in an in-depth New York Times series about students aspiring to college. When I shared the story with my social media networks—“That’s my school!”—it was quickly re-shared by old friends and former fellow students, where, as it became visible to their networks of alumni and fellow Kansans, it was re-shared again and again.

As I watched the “shares” of this story multiply, I begun to understand why the Times’ running list of its “most emailed” articles often includes stories about particular educational institutions. These articles may focus on a negative story, but many are positive, profiling a faculty member who has won an award, or a sports team that has had a phenomenal year. The fact that these stories can compete for top viewing in the crowded landscape of our national news cycle says something about our strong identification with the schools and institutions of higher education that are a part of our own stories. We seem to be more likely to share an article that prompts the reaction: “That’s my school!”

This phenomenon, I would argue, presents graduate institutions with an important opportunity to share the success stories of their graduate students and alumni. Positive stories about graduate education get the attention of current students, faculty and alumni who collectively represent vast social networks. Even a short piece on a successful student or innovative program can travel far and wide.
CGS’s **GradImpact** project demonstrates this phenomenon. Designed to share stories of graduate education contributing to the public good, **GradImpact** invites CGS member universities to submit stories of students and alumni whose work has high potential to improve the lives of others. We have proudly shared the stories of master’s and doctoral students in a broad range of fields whose research and other professional activities are already improving lives. To our great pleasure, CGS tweets about **GradImpact** profilees were our top performers in terms of reach, or the number of estimated Twitter users who may have seen a post.

Our collaborative work with member institutions meant that a broader network of individuals heard about the important work of Tiffany Bridgett, a doctoral student in Clinical Psychology at Gallaudet University, who helped make a crisis counselling service accessible to the deaf community. Tiffany’s story received over 16,000 impressions or potential views on Twitter. We observed a comparable response to the story of Josh Gershlak, a PhD candidate in Biomedical Engineering at Worcester Polytechnic Institute, whose research has led to an innovation in the treatment of heart disease. Our gallery of stories, updated each week, illustrates the scope of this important work.

**Compelling Stories Support Graduate Education Advocacy—and More**

The response we have seen to the **GradImpact** project enhances the reputations of institutions, but more importantly, it helps to make graduate education relevant and relatable; in the words of CGS’ Communications Manager, Katherine Hazelrigg, who oversees the project here at CGS, these stories “humanize” the work we do. This is so important for all of us who are called upon to advocate for the importance of graduate education, whether in a policy context, in conversation with potential funders, or on university campuses.

Unsurprisingly, an additional benefit of this program is that it communicates to students that they are appreciated and supported. Some of the warmest responses to the **GradImpact** tweets have come from students and their networks of friends and colleagues who are delighted to see their loved ones receiving much-deserved recognition.

**Learn How to Tell & Share Stories with Impact**

If your institution has not joined this effort, we hope you will consider submitting a story through a [short electronic form](#) on the CGS website. It will take you less than five minutes. If you have any questions about the project, don’t hesitate to contact Katherine Hazelrigg ([khazelrigg@cgs.nche.edu](mailto:khazelrigg@cgs.nche.edu)).

If you would like to learn more about strategies for enhancing communications about graduate education, and take better advantage of the power of digital media in enhancing communications about your graduate school, please take note of three upcoming sessions:

**CGS Summer Workshop:**
- “Social Media for Beginners” is scheduled from **Monday, July 10 from 11:00 am to 12:00**
- “Advanced Social Media Strategies,” a technical workshop, will take place on **Wednesday, July 12, from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00**

**CGS Annual Meeting:**
- “Using Student and Alumni Success to Tell Your Graduate School's Story,” will be a pre-meeting workshop at the 2017 Annual Meeting in Scottsdale, Arizona (December 6-9). Stay tuned for more information when registration opens in August.

CGS is also expanding its efforts to include member institutions’ communications professionals in our work to communicate the impact of graduate education, and you will be hearing more about this effort soon.
CGS New Deans & Titles

- **Jennifer Bonds-Raacke**, Dean, Graduate School, Fort Hays State University
- **Charles McAllister**, Vice Provost and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, Southeast Missouri State University
- **Laura Palmer Noone**, Senior Vice President, Academic Affairs and Chief Academic Officer, Ashford University
- **Thomas Regan, S.J.**, Dean, Graduate School and Dean, College of Arts & Sciences, Loyola University of Chicago
- **Emily Sallee**, Associate Provost, Academic Affairs, Park University
- **Peggy Ward-Smith**, Interim Dean of Graduate Studies, University of Missouri, Kansas City
- **Robert Wilhite**, Dean, College of Graduate Studies, Concordia University Chicago

CGS New Members

Regular Members:

- **La Salle University** (Pennsylvania) – returning member
- **Midwestern State University** (Texas)

International Members:

- **Eindhoven University of Technology** (The Netherlands)

CGS BOARD NOMINATIONS SOUGHT

Nominations are being accepted for election to the CGS Board of Directors. If you are interested in serving on the Board, or if you would like to nominate a colleague, please send a CV to the attention of:

M.J.T. Smith
Chair
CGS Nominating Committee
CGSBoardElection@cgs.nche.edu
Reach prospects who have **demonstrated** graduate-level **readiness** through their **GRE** test performance.