Like David Letterman, I would like to begin the 2011 Communicator series with a Top Ten List. My list is serious rather than satirical, but like Letterman’s lists it is inspired by current topics—in this case topics in graduate education. The list is not meant to be exhaustive but rather to highlight special opportunities for our graduate school leaders to fulfill the promise of their unique role on campuses. A word about that role will serve to frame the particular contributions deans might make in each of these “top ten” domains.

These days, the life of a graduate dean on many of our member campuses is consumed by managing crises that appear in rapid succession. The job somewhat resembles playing “whack-a-mole” at the state fair: just as the administrative mallet comes down on a problem, another problem pops up to take its place. But when I reflect on the role of graduate deans I see another dimension to the mallet-swinging problem solver. I see the catalyzer.

Susan Sturm, plenary speaker at the 2010 CGS Annual Meeting and professor at Columbia University, describes organizational catalysts as “…individuals with knowledge, influence, and credibility in positions where they can mobilize change within complex structures…”1 For Sturm, the organizational catalyst is one who occupies a position at the convergence of different domains and levels of activity within an organization, who has as part of his or her mandate to “connect information, ideas, and individuals and thereby solve problems and enable change.”2 This set of roles is at the heart of the modern graduate deanship. Graduate deans conceptualize issues and opportunities in the graduate domain on their campuses. They plan, coordinate and convene in order to mobilize action that aims to improve the quality of graduate education and of the graduate student experience.

A key feature of the organizational catalyst role is that it spans boundaries, residing at the intersection of different functions and disciplinary spheres of activity. Located in the central administrative structure, the graduate dean can tap key points of power, knowledge, and authority and exercise the power of position as needed to move action. But to exercise this job effectively, he or she must also move beyond this structure to understand the varied needs of the institution and its organizational units and respond to the “voice” or “voices” of the graduate teaching faculty. Increasingly, deans must also cross institutional lines to hear, represent, and respond to stakeholders outside the university.

So the departure point for this year’s list of top ten action areas for graduate schools is the belief that, while “whack-a-mole” may feel like the best fitting metaphor for the graduate dean in 2011, the job depends on information and knowledge as much as action, and on strong relationships and communication as much as decision-making authority. And across North America, our organizational catalysts will be honing in on one or more of these issues.

Number 1: Assessment of Graduate Program Performance and Student Learning

One message that comes through loud and clear from the CGS PhD Completion Project is that data can have a transforming effect when they are shared with faculty and fellow administrators. The role of graduate dean as catalyst may be seen nowhere more clearly than in the data-sharing role. This year, data on outcomes of all kinds, from straightforward success measures like degree completion to program-tailored and nuanced measures of student learning will be available as never before. Because these data will allow comparisons across and between programs, both within and across universities—in part by the sheer force of the assessment winds on our campuses—this year will reach a new watermark in assessment activity among CGS members. And it will be in the conversations that graduate school deans initiate with faculty and program leaders that strategies for improving...
program practices and for strengthening student experiences will be crafted.

**Number 2: Supporting a Culture of Scholarly Integrity and Responsible Research**

For the past several years many graduate schools have been actively engaged in facilitating the development of training programs to deepen student awareness of and sensitivity to issues encountered in the pursuit of scholarly integrity. But NSF’s 2010 requirement mandating that institutions have a plan to provide training and oversight in the responsible conduct of research to NSF-supported graduate students and postdoctoral researchers has ratcheted up the stakes. Graduate schools across the country have engaged seriously in the work of developing and implementing activities to ensure graduate students and graduate research programs are compliant with new NSF and refined NIH guidelines for ensuring responsible conduct of research. Graduate deans will increasingly seize this as an opportunity to build meaningful RCR programs into the suite of professional development options available to graduate students.

**Number 3: Tracking Graduate Placement and Career Progression**

For decades we have known that high percentages of students who earn PhDs, from 20% in humanities fields to 70% in engineering, pursue careers outside of the world of tenure-track positions. But for decades we have remained in the dark on just what those career paths look like and how they intersect with the intended preparation embodied in the student plan of study. For graduates of master’s and professional programs we assume that we know much more about career trajectories. But the truth is that, apart from professional master’s programs, career outcomes for much of master’s education is also unexplored territory.

There is an emerging consensus that for graduate students to make informed decisions about their career paths, more information needs to be gathered about the concrete options that graduates from particular programs do have and take. For the last few years we have seen a growing consensus in the graduate deanery, as well as the graduate education policy community, that we must gather better information about the careers our graduates follow if we are to deeply assess the quality of our programs and powerfully make the case to our funders that the investments in graduate study are paying good returns to students and their employers. In 2011, graduate schools across CGS membership will respond to this need by building and launching systems for recording student initial placements and for following them throughout their careers.

**Number 4: Enhance Interdisciplinary Opportunities**

Myra Stober’s recent *Chronicle* commentary reports that her research continues to find “differences in assumptions and their methods of discerning, evaluating and reporting ‘truth,’” continue to hinder interdisciplinary dialogue in the academy. While it is often the case that talented young researchers gravitate toward intellectual challenges at the interface of disciplines and that universities have broadly embraced interdisciplinarity at the strategic level, a wide gap exists between these aspirations and the practical implementation of interdisciplinary opportunity at the graduate level. One small data point suggesting little change comes from the NSF Survey of Earned Doctorates, which indicates that the share of doctoral recipients reporting interdisciplinary dissertation research has remained stable, fluctuating between 28% and 30% over the 6 years between 2002 and 2008. So designing structures and processes to eliminate unnecessary barriers to interdisciplinary program development and to strengthen interdisciplinary opportunities for students will remain on the agenda of graduate deans in 2011.
Number 5: Development and Fundraising

For more than a decade, many graduate deans have been active members of their university's development teams. Development strategies such as building a graduate school advisory board with some level of donor requirement for participation, or hiring and sustaining graduate school development officers, are now standard practices on many CGS member campuses.

As pressure continues to mount on state budgets and as deficit reduction discussions continue to constrain growth at the federal level, the private fundraising activities of the graduate schools in the public universities will more closely align with the longstanding practices of our private university members. Notwithstanding the fact that development staff have sometimes been cut as part of budget reduction requirements at many public institutions, I predict that this trend will reverse in 2011 as the private sector is viewed increasingly as a source of support for excellence at the graduate level. Taking advantage of their unique boundary-spanning role, many graduate deans will develop new, effective strategies for reaching out to potential funders.

Number 6: Strengthening Diversity Programs

In percentage terms, graduate schools have made great strides toward achieving a more inclusive graduate community over the last 10 years. Total graduate enrollment of African American students increased by 95% over the past decade, and total enrollment of Hispanic students increased by 67%. Remarkable gains occurred in female participation: while 43% of all doctorates were awarded to women in 1998-99, this percentage grew to 50% in 2008-09. However in selected fields the gains remain far from adequate. In 2008-09, women earned just 22% of the doctorates awarded in engineering, 27% of those in mathematics and computer sciences, and 33% of those in physical and earth sciences. Diversity efforts cannot truly succeed if they depend solely on the untiring work of a handful of campus champions, as vital as those champions are at every institution. Enduring success also requires leadership from the top and strategic cross-campus coordination. At one university, a wonderful line of new research in this area points to some innovative approaches that resulted in mobilizing faculty and strategic cross-campus coordination. At one university, diversity continues to be a top priority of our graduate deans and the graduate schools they lead.

This year, the conversations I am having suggest that CGS deans are thinking deeply about how to achieve better synergy across programs, through new recruiting and mentoring strategies that support retention as well as efforts to merge retention and diversity initiatives in a way that strengthens both areas. Clearly there are some inhibitors and facilitators of student success that are unique to underrepresented minorities (URMs) or to female students, but there are also many factors that are common across different categories of students. Making informed decisions about improving student success can only happen if you are operating out of a data set that includes all students. This approach is, of course, mandated in states where policies make focus on URMs illegal in admissions or programmatic funding. But an approach that includes diversity pursuits in the context of improving success for all students may have promise across the board.

Thinking more systemically about increasing opportunity and success for URMs by incorporating diversity questions into the main stream of analysis of graduate program performance may be a strong area of strategy in 2011.

Number 7: International Partnerships and Climates

All CGS member graduate schools have as an implicit or explicit goal to produce globally competent scholars, researchers and professionals. To some extent the mere presence of a substantial number of international students sharing laboratories and office spaces with domestic students facilitates a kind of intercultural exposure for both groups. Nevertheless, all signs indicate that US graduate schools will be paying increased attention to cultivating strong international applications to their programs.

In addition, there will be continued development of international degree programs, a trend first marked in CGS's 2008 international survey, where 31% of CGS members indicated an intention to develop one or more international collaborative degree programs. Models will vary from established branch campuses like the Michigan State program in Dubai, to joint and/or dual degrees programs and research collaborations, structures closely examined in the 2010 CGS publication, Joint Degrees, Dual Degrees, and International Research Collaborations.

In 2011, we will see no retreat from the trend of recent years to both build international programs and collaborations to strengthen the international exposure for domestic students while improving the campus climate for increasingly recruited international students. On many campuses graduate deans will be key players in catalyzing new thinking about globalizing the student experience.

Number 8: Advocacy with Stakeholders in States and Local Communities

Advocating for graduate education with stakeholders outside of the university was not a significant component of the graduate school dean's role a decade ago. Trained as academics and groomed as leaders of programmatic activities inside the academy, deans were often ill equipped to deal with the work of practical politics. Today, however, graduate deans are frequently called upon to interact with a variety of interested and crucial stakeholders outside the university: trustees, legislators, community leaders and others. The data we are collecting on CGS deans' engagement with the Path Forward Report is documenting a strong and, for some deans, new advocacy role. In 2011, CGS member deans will continue to find new channels and platforms for communicating the message about graduate education and its contribution to the relevant stakeholders in the states, regions and broader communities.

Number 9: Efficiency and Effectiveness

Over the past two years graduate deans have been compelled to remind themselves that “a crisis is a terrible thing to continued on page 4
waste.” Many deans struggled to maintain this positive message as they both organized and reorganized their own operations to accommodate shrinking resources and engaged in a variety of exercises to streamline graduate offerings institution-wide. This year will be a time for taking stock of the efficiency and effectiveness of measures taken. But pressure will remain to strive for new levels of efficiency and effectiveness in all aspects of graduate programming. As the benefits and costs of doing more with less become more apparent, we look forward to our members sharing their lessons learned, recommended practices and real success stories. On campuses we can look to graduate deans to monitor the impact of the measures taken to assess program quality and the student experience.

Number 10: Strategic Thinking for Graduate Program Development

Strategic thinking for building on graduate program strengths and addressing current weaknesses has always been at the heart of the graduate dean’s job. In 2011, two conditions will be in place to accelerate this activity and potentially make it more productive for the graduate school. The first is the urgency introduced by the budget constraints that, in many public institutions, promise to be with us at least through 2013. But the second is the growing availability of data upon which to make decisions about the future.

Several forces are converging to encourage a culture of evidence in our institutions. Stimulated by accreditation processes, by national assessments such as the NRC research doc study, and by many initiatives undertaken by institutions themselves, such as tracking graduate attrition and completion, a wealth of evidence on performance has emerged. A major activity for graduate deans in 2011 will be to selectively engage faculty and administrative colleagues in conversations about strategic opportunities for new program development with attention to core academic strengths and workforce demands. These conversations have the potential to strengthen both the overall ranking of university programs, and equally important, the quality of the student experience.

I conclude my “top ten” list with a sense of awe at the agenda that lies before CGS members. At the same time, I believe that CGS deans are well-equipped to fulfill the promise of their unique roles in our member universities. They are the connectors, the problem solvers, and the organizational catalysts for graduate education. In collaboration with administrative leadership colleagues and with faculty, they will make a difference for their institutions and their graduate students—even on days when they feel like they are playing whack-a-mole.

By Debra W. Stewart, President, Council of Graduate Schools
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Data Sources: Graduate Enrollment at Hispanic-Serving Institutions

Hispanic-serving institutions (HSIs) play an important role in graduate education. According to the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU), HSIs are defined as “…colleges, universities, or systems/districts where total Hispanic enrollment constitutes a minimum of 25% of the total enrollment. ‘Total Enrollment’ includes full-time and part-time students at the undergraduate or graduate level…” (Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities, 2011). The federal government does not maintain an official list of HSIs, but as of January 2011, HACU listed 230 member HSIs on its website. Of those institutions, 53 award graduate degrees and are included in the survey population for the CGS/GRE Survey of Graduate Enrollment and Degrees. It is important to note that since the enrollment share of Hispanic students at individual institutions varies from year to year, the list of institutions considered HSIs also varies from year to year. This article examines graduate enrollment at institutions classified as HSIs by HACU as of January 2011.

Findings

The Hispanic population in the United States has increased rapidly over the past two decades. Hispanics comprise about 16% of the US resident population today, up from about 13% in 2000 and 9% in 1990 (US Census Bureau, 2000, 2002, and 2008). The US Census Bureau estimates that by 2050, 30% of all US residents will be Hispanic (US Census Bureau, 2008).

Partly as a result of this population growth, the participation of Hispanics in graduate education has increased as well. In fall 2009, 8.4% of all US citizen and permanent resident graduate students were Hispanic, up from 6.7% in 1999 and 3.9% in 1989 (Council of Graduate Schools, 2010). Yet, Hispanics remain underrepresented in graduate education. Their share of the US population today is twice as large as their share of US citizen and permanent resident graduate student enrollment.

In fall 2009, 36% of all Hispanic graduate students attended HSIs, relatively unchanged from 37% a decade earlier in fall 1999 (Council of Graduate Schools, 2010). However, Hispanic graduate students are less likely to be enrolled at HSIs today than they were twenty years ago. In fall 1989, 44% of all Hispanic graduate students were enrolled at institutions now classified as HSIs. Despite a smaller share of Hispanics attending HSIs today, the large increase in Hispanic graduate enrollment over the past two decades has resulted in larger numbers of Hispanics at both HSIs and non-HSIs.

On average, graduate students at HSIs are more likely to be enrolled at the master’s level than students at non-HSIs. In fall 2009, 85% of all graduate students attending HSIs were enrolled at the master’s level compared with 75% of the graduate students at all other institutions (Council of Graduate Schools, 2010).

Over the past twenty years, the overall growth in graduate enrollment (including students of all citizenships and races/ethnicities) has been greater at HSIs than at all other institutions (see Table 1). Between fall 1989 and fall 2009, total graduate enrollment increased 58% at HSIs and 40% at all other institutions (Council of Graduate Schools, 2010). In contrast, over the last one-, five-, and ten-year periods, the gains were greater at non-HSIs than at HSIs. For example, between fall 2004 and fall 2009, total graduate enrollment increased 6% at HSIs, less than half the 13% rate of increase at all other institutions.

For Hispanic graduate students, the enrollment growth that occurred over the past two decades happened in both HSIs and non-HSIs, but was greater at non-HSIs than at HSIs (see Table 2). Between fall 1989 and fall 2009, Hispanic graduate enrollment increased 229% at non-HSIs compared with 132% at HSIs (Council of Graduate Schools, 2010). Similarly, the rate of increase in Hispanic graduate enrollment between fall 1999 and fall 2009 was 76% at non-HSIs compared with 52% at HSIs. Over the last five years, most of the growth in Hispanic graduate enrollment has been at non-HSIs. Hispanic graduate enrollment increased just 7% at HSIs between fall 2004 and fall 2009, but rose 33% at all other institutions.

Implications

While the gains for Hispanics in graduate education at both HSIs and non-HSIs are encouraging, there remains a long way to go before parity is reached. And the barriers to achieving parity remain great. The two primary barriers are the high dropout rates for Hispanics in high school and the low enrollment rates of Hispanics in undergraduate education. In 2008, 18% of Hispanic 16- through 24-year-olds were not enrolled in high school and had not earned a high school diploma or alternative credential (Chapman, Laird, and KewalRamani, 2010). In contrast, just 4% of Asian/Pacific Islanders, 5% of Whites, and 10% of African Americans were high school dropouts. And among high school graduates ages 16 to 21 in 2006, 79% of Asians and 61% of Whites were enrolled in college, compared with 49% of African Americans and 45% of Hispanics (Davis and Bauman, 2008).
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| Table 1. Changes in Total Graduate Enrollment, Fall 1989 to Fall 2009 |
|-----------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
|                 | % Change, ’08 to ’09 | % Change, ’04 to ’09 | % Change, ’99 to ’09 | % Change, ’99 to ’09 |
| Hispanic-Serving Institutions | 3% | 6% | 36% | 58% |
| All Other Institutions | 5% | 13% | 37% | 40% |
| Total | 5% | 12% | 37% | 41% |
| Source: CGS/GRE Survey of Graduate Enrollment and Degrees |

| Table 2. Changes in Hispanic Graduate Enrollment, Fall 1989 to Fall 2009 |
|-----------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
|                 | % Change, ’08 to ’09 | % Change, ’04 to ’09 | % Change, ’99 to ’09 | % Change, ’99 to ’09 |
| Hispanic-Serving Institutions | 5% | 7% | 52% | 132% |
| All Other Institutions | 8% | 33% | 76% | 229% |
| Total | 7% | 22% | 67% | 186% |
| Source: CGS/GRE Survey of Graduate Enrollment and Degrees |
PSM Stakeholders’ Process Concludes with the Recommendation of a Process and Organizational Structure for PSM Program Recognition

There are currently over 200 Professional Science Master’s (PSM) programs at more than 100 institutions in the US and abroad. The growth and diversity of PSM programs are encouraging and signal the need for a recognition process along with an organizational structure for managing the process that will ably accommodate the intensive activity, resource demands, and quality assurance needs of the future. Therefore, the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS), which has taken a leadership role in the promotion and branding of the PSM, convened a series of three meetings of key stakeholders including graduate deans; current PSM program directors; employers from business, nonprofit, government sectors; professional society leaders; PSM alumni; policymakers; and appropriate individuals from CGS and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation to develop a more recognizable and sustainable process for quality assurance.

The first stakeholder group, which included 22 representatives, convened on June 29, 2010, and recommended a set of guiding principles and new guidelines for PSM affiliation, including a preamble for context. These documents were broadly disseminated to approximately 1,000 members of the PSM community for comments and were made available to the public via www.sciencemasters.com. The guidelines were revised based on feedback gained during the two comment periods and based on input from PSM stakeholders.

The second stakeholder group met on September 30 to identify an appropriate process for quality assurance and to specify characteristics of an organizational structure that will be responsible for implementing and managing the quality assurance process. The stakeholders indicated that the key characteristics of an organization responsible for the oversight of the PSM recognition process include objectivity, legitimacy, access to appropriate infrastructure, adequate financial and human resources, and the ability to effectively recruit, train, and manage a cadre of expert volunteers.

A report about quality assurance practices and the development of those practices in selected fields was compiled by CGS to inform the discussion. The report was based on information gathered via web analysis, literature review, and personal interviews with representatives of accrediting agencies, disciplinary societies, and experts in the quality assurance field. Three generic processes were identified: internal review, external recognition, and accreditation.

Internal review is a quality assurance model that is widely-used and is well-understood in the graduate community, in which the locus of management control resides within the institution, usually the graduate school, rather than with an entity that is external to the institution, such as an accreditation agency or disciplinary society. External recognition refers to a program assessment or evaluation process that is managed by an entity that is external to universities and colleges, such as a disciplinary society, but that does not result in formal accreditation. The external recognition process does not require that the external organization overseeing the assessment or evaluation be approved by the US Department of Education or by the Council of Higher Education Accreditation. However, the external entity typically derives its authority from members who are active professionals in the field and who periodically review the recognition process to ensure that it represents current best practice. Accreditation, as described by the US Department of Education, ensures “…that education provided by institutions of higher education meets acceptable levels of quality” (US Department of Education, 2010). Accreditation is managed by entities external to colleges and universities but not by the Department of Education. Recognized accrediting agencies lead the development of standards and procedures by which institutions and programs may seek to achieve accredited status. There are two types of accreditation: institutional and programmatic or specialized. Institutional accreditation may be awarded to an entire institution whereas programmatic or specialized accreditation may be awarded specifically to programs, departments, or schools that are parts of a larger institution. (Vincent et al., 2010).

The second group of stakeholders considered each of these three processes for applicability and adaptability to the PSM quality assurance process—PSM affiliation or recognition—and identified external recognition by consensus. In addition to the applicability and adaptability of the external recognition process, this process was also deemed appropriate as it meets the quality assurance needs of the PSM with relatively minimal costs and bureaucracy in contrast to some of the other quality assurance models. Consistent with current practice, when PSM recognition is granted, programs will be designated as an approved PSM program on www.sciencemasters.com, and will be permitted to use the PSM logo on the program’s website.

The second stakeholder group also recommended implementing a program review model analogous to a “journal review” model. This model, selected in part because of its reliance upon trained, expert volunteers from the PSM community and relatively minimal central administrative and operational costs, is envisioned to consist of an organizational structure comprised of a governing board and an employee to provide administrative assistance who will work with a cadre of trained, expert, volunteer reviewers. The governing board was envisioned to be composed of representatives of organizations with deep interest in the PSM. The journal review model is particularly suited for the PSM recognition process at this stage of continuing growth because of its structural and interdisciplinary adaptability.
The last of the three stakeholders meetings occurred on November 9. At the final meeting, the stakeholders explored potential partnerships and assessed areas of need that will be critical to implementation of the recommended process and for organizational planning. Among other topics discussed were ideas for establishing and executing the operational model, potential elements of an administrative entity/structure, the elements of a preliminary review cycle, and a viable business plan. Given the broad scope of the logistical and structural needs of this project, the existing PSM recognition process and guidelines will continue until formal execution of these recommendations.

Figure A, Stakeholders Process Overview, illustrates the activities that have taken place to date and indicates remaining work. In the coming year, CGS will develop the existing relationships into an infrastructure that will support the long-term growth and sustainability of the PSM Initiative and will specifically assume oversight and management of the PSM recognition process identified through the stakeholders process.

Contacts: Leontyne V. Goodwin, Sally Francis, and Carol Lynch
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Osmer Becomes Chair of 2011 Board of Directors

Patrick S. Osmer has served as Vice Provost of Graduate Studies and Dean of the Graduate School at The Ohio State University since 2006. A Distinguished Professor of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, he was chair of the astronomy department from 1993-2006. In 2009, Osmer was elected a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Before coming to Ohio State, Osmer was a member of the scientific staff and deputy director of the National Optical Astronomy Observatory in Tucson, Arizona. Prior to that, he was on the scientific staff of the Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory in La Serena, Chile, where he served as director of the observatory and head of mission from 1981-1985. He earned a BS in astronomy with highest honors from the Case Institute of Technology and a PhD in astronomy from the California Institute of Technology.

Osmer oversees more than 90 doctoral and 115 master's programs at Ohio State, with a graduate student enrollment of approximately 10,000. As dean, Osmer carried out an assessment of Ohio State's doctoral programs that is the foundation for the graduate school's activities and has become a national model. Under Osmer's leadership, the Graduate School is providing direction for a reorganization of Ohio State's graduate and research efforts in the life and environmental sciences. In addition, Osmer is engaging graduate faculty directly in discussions about current national and global trends in graduate education with an eye toward making sure that Ohio State's graduate programs are forward-looking, attractive to an increasingly diverse pool of applicants, and appropriate for the career options available to the full range of graduate degree holders.

Osmer was a member of the commission that produced the recent CGS and ETS report, *The Path Forward: The Future of Graduate Education in the United States*. An authority on the evolution of distant quasars and their relation to their host galaxies, he recently chaired the panel on optical and infrared astronomy from the ground for the national astronomy and astrophysics decadal survey New Worlds, New Horizons carried out by the National Academy of Science and National Research Council. He is also a member of the Board of Directors of the Research Corporation for Science Advancement, a foundation dedicated to science since 1912.

Tedesco Becomes Chair-Elect of 2011 Board of Directors

Lisa A. Tedesco joined Emory in May 2006 as Vice Provost for Academic Affairs – Graduate Studies and Dean of the James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies. She is a professor of Behavioral Sciences and Health Education in the Rollins School of Public Health.

Under Tedesco's leadership, the Laney Graduate School, with 1900 students in 46 degree programs, is emphasizing opportunities for interdisciplinary study and professional preparation. New programs range from doctoral degree tracks that train students in both laboratory and population sciences, to a new master’s program that trains 21st century sustainable development professionals, and to certificate programs in translational research and in interdisciplinary studies in mind, brain and culture. The Laney Graduate School supports a comprehensive Grant Writing Program preparing students to compete successfully for professional funding and recognition; the New Thinkers/New Leaders Fund for innovative initiatives in graduate education; and is developing comprehensive contemporary programs for training in scholarly integrity and the responsible conduct of research. Priority areas in support of program excellence include improved access to information and program performance data for faculty and continuing commitments to diversity in the graduate student population.

In 2009, Tedesco was elected to the Board of Directors of the Council of Graduate Schools. She is a member of the AAU Association of Graduate Schools executive committee and serves on the GRE Board.

As a health psychologist, Dr. Tedesco is interested in how people think about and act to prevent illness and promote well-being. Her research has focused on cognitive behavioral enhancement of oral health status, relapse prevention, and stress, coping and oral disease. Her teaching has been in areas related to behavioral sciences and the health professions, and she has written and worked institutionally on matters related to curriculum change, inquiry-based learning and teaching, faculty development, and diversity. She has published widely and has presented her work at national and international meetings.

Tedesco earned her doctorate in educational psychology from the State University of New York at Buffalo. Prior to joining Emory, she was a professor and associate dean in the School of Dentistry at the University of Michigan and also served as Vice-President and Secretary of the University and as Interim Provost.
The CGS Annual Meeting celebrated its 50th anniversary December 1 through 4 at the JW Marriott in Washington, DC. The meeting drew over 675 attendees, making the 2010 event the highest attended meeting in the Council’s history. The meeting included 50 attendees from outside the US and Canada, from: Australia, China, England, Germany, Ireland, Malaysia, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Spain, the United Arab Emirates, and the West Indies. Six powerful plenary sessions and 16 breakout sessions on current topics, as well as networking opportunities and other activities, engaged attendees who came seeking information about current issues and future directions for graduate education.

This year’s meeting, as in prior years, offered a full range of pre-meeting workshops with sustained, in-depth discussions and training on a range of topics. This year’s topics included: assessment and review of graduate programs (doctoral and master's); online graduate programs; fundraising and the use of advisory boards; technology tools; support programs for PhD students; international collaborations; copyright; legal issues; professional science master's; enhancing diversity programs; and designing effective career programs. Over 250 people attended these workshops. The meeting program began with the traditional Opening Reception and Dinner hosted by CGS President Debra Stewart and Jeffery Gibeling, Chair of the Board of Directors.

Dr. Stewart opened the 2010 CGS Annual Meeting by describing its theme, “The Path Forward.” While 2010 as the Golden Anniversary for the CGS Annual Meeting encourages us to reflect with pride on our accomplishments, the plenaries encourage us to also look ahead so we can continue to build on our successes for the next 50 years. Each of the six plenaries, she explained, addresses a different aspect of this theme and features an important voice, or set of voices, on key issues facing the graduate community. Below is a summary of those plenary presentations.

In the first plenary, journalist and scholar Martin Walker discussed global demographic trends and transformations around the world and provided his perspective on the implications these transformations have for the students of the future in US graduate programs. He expressed optimism about the next 25 years for the US. While birth rates in China, Europe, and the Middle East are low, he noted, American fertility is high. Given that the fastest growing population in the US is people over 60, he interprets such high domestic fertility as a positive sign for continued US prosperity and economic competitiveness: “the US,” he said, “is by far in the best demographic shape of all developed countries;” and the projected GDP of the G7 through 2035 suggests that those countries (as compared with BRIC nations, for example) will remain competitively situated in a way that will benefit US graduate education. Mr. Walker discussed the implications of demographic trends for consumer demand and the global flow of talent in graduate education, gender disparities in birth rates and rapidly aging populations, and possible shifts in major sending countries to US graduate programs (“Turkey, Mexico, and Indonesia will be clamoring for graduate education.”). His stimulating presentation provoked thoughtful comments by respondents and by attendees. Respondents Mary Ritter, Provost, International Affairs, Professor of Immunology, Imperial College London, and Paul Tam, Pro-Vice Chancellor and Vice President, Research and Dean, Graduate School, University of Hong Kong, shared international perspectives on issues such as the increased importance of “lifelong learning” and skills development in graduate education for older students, and the rapid growth of capacity and demand in Asian postgraduate education.

In Plenary II, “Reform, Resistance and the Future of Graduate Education,” Louis Menand (Professor, Harvard University and author of the Pulitzer Prize-winning book The Metaphysical Club) discussed the history of graduate institutions and the reasons why reforms are difficult. His talk focused on three topics: interdisciplinary scholarship, time-to-degree in PhD programs, and the development of graduate programs and curricula to prepare students aspiring to non-academic careers. According to Menand, many of the sources of resistance to progress in these areas stem from the late-nineteenth century emergence of academic departments and institutions. Respondent Ernst Rank, Dean, Graduate School, Technische Universität Munchen, discussed how his institution has overcome disciplinary barriers through reforms recognized by the German Excellence Initiative. Jo Rae Wright, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School, Duke University, then described recent progress in some areas as well as additional areas (placement data and internationalization) where reform is still needed and current efforts still meet resistance.

Plenary III featured Martha Kanter, Under Secretary of Education, US Department of Education, who shared her perspectives on “Quality and Accountability in Graduate Education.” Dr. Kanter emphasized that the Department of Education was focused now on “trying to build a culture focused on outcomes,” i.e., what students can do, rather than on “teaching to the test,” in order to ensure a globally competitive workforce. The current administration’s emphasis on degree completion at the college and K-12 levels, she said, will put pressure on US graduate education. One consequence of a rise in baccalaureate completion will be that a higher percentage of Americans will pursue graduate degrees. While postsecondary education needs to do a better job demonstrating how investments in the enterprise result in innovation and benefit society, she also expressed her concern that in the current climate some disciplines are at risk of disappearing if they do not generate revenue. “Critical thinking, concentration, and reading” are staples of higher education, and graduate programs across all disciplines have a role in ensuring that a postsecondary degree attests to the student’s development of these skills. Respondents Carlos Alonso (Acting Dean of the Graduate School for Arts and Sciences, Columbia University), Maxwell King (Pro Vice continued on page 10
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Chancellor, Monash University), and Douglas Peers (Associate Vice President and Dean, Graduate Studies, York University) addressed different aspects of quality and accountability in the US, Australia, and Canada, respectively. Dr. Alonso’s remarks, which appeared later in the Chronicle of Higher Education, expressed concerns that “accountability” could come to mean that the expectations, metrics and values of others outside academe will measure and define the success of the graduate education enterprise.

In Plenary IV, actor, writer, and director Alan Alda presented an innovative improvisational technique he developed for Stony Brook University to train graduate students in the sciences to communicate more effectively. After an engaging talk in which he discussed the genesis of the training program and the importance of communication skills for young scientists, graduate students (joined by CGS deans Kim Barrett and John Keller) demonstrated theater improvisation games. Before-and-after videos of the PhD students’ oral presentations on their research demonstrated the potential of these techniques.

Plenary V looked at “Diversity: National Trends and Models for Change.” Freeman Hrabowski, President, University of Maryland, Baltimore County described the history and current status of underrepresented minorities in the graduate pipeline after decades of national diversity efforts. He inspired the audience by discussing the factors contributing to the success of the nationally renowned diversity effort at UMBC, the Meyerhoff Program, in the context of those national trends. Dr. Hrabowski emphasized that one key to the success of the program stems from its emphasis on high achieving minority students in tight-knit learning communities with frequent supervision and contact. Susan Sturm, George M. Jaffin Professor of Law and Social Responsibility, Columbia Law School, followed by discussing aspects of organizational structure and leadership that result in effective inclusiveness and diversity efforts, emphasizing that true leaders are catalysts who “reproduce and diffuse” leadership and “are not limited by their own vision.”

In Plenary VI, “The Path Forward and Promising State Strategies,” Robert Augustine (Dean of the Graduate School, Eastern Illinois University), Philip Cohen (Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost, Academic Affairs, University of Texas Arlington), and Carol Shanklin (Dean of the Graduate School, Kansas State University) discussed the role of higher education in the plans their respective states are crafting for economic development. They provided specific recommendations based on practices they found effective in their own advocacy efforts.

The plenary sessions were well complemented by 16 concurrent sessions on an extensive array of topics such as: research and scholarly integrity; the role of the master’s in STEM; tracking career outcomes for graduate degree recipients; using NRC data; innovative models for online doctoral education; master’s completion; and graduate student quality of life. At the LaPidus lunch, the new director of the National Science Foundation, Subra Suresh, described priorities for the National Science Foundation for graduate education with an emphasis on domestic talent and workforce development. The entire meeting program may be found on the CGS website at www.cgsnet.org.

Exhibitors included: Academic Analytics; American Speech-Language-Hearing Association; CollegeNet, Inc.; Deltek; Educational Testing Service; Elsevier; Embanet-Compass Knowledge Group; Epigem Inc.; GradSchools.com; Hobsons; Hotcourses Inc.; IDP Education; IELTS International; Interfolio, Inc.; The New York Times; Pearson; ProQuest/UMI; Survey of Earned Doctorates; Vietnam Education Foundation and World Education Services. Two exhibitors further contributed to the meeting with ETS and ProQuest/UMI sponsoring breakfasts and evening receptions. Pearson Language Tests also sponsored a breakfast at the meeting.

Refreshment breaks were well appreciated by the meeting attendees. Sponsors for these events were: American University, Appalachian State University, Bowie State University, The Catholic University of America, Clemson University, College of Charleston, Duke University, Duquesne University, East Carolina University, Fordham University, George Washington University, Hofstra University, Howard University, Johns Hopkins University, Loyola University Maryland, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, McMaster University, Morgan State University, North Carolina State University, Northeastern University, Penn State University, Regent University, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Rutgers University-Newark Campus, Sarah Lawrence College, Stony Brook University, Temple University, University of Maryland, University of Maryland Baltimore County, University of New Hampshire, Virginia Council of Graduate Schools, William Paterson University, and Winthrop University.

At the Saturday morning business meeting, Debra W. Stewart addressed the achievements and growth of CGS over the past year. Jeffery Gibeling passed the gavel to Patrick Osmer who will serve as Chair of the Board in 2011.

It’s not too early to plan for the 2011 Annual Meeting, CGS’ 51st, which will be held December 7 - 10, 2011, at the Westin Kierland Resort in Scottsdale, AZ. Mark your calendar!

Save the Date

2011 CGS Summer Workshop &
New Deans Institute
July 9 - 13: Monterey, California
Registration begins March 2011
Given these high dropout rates from high school and low enrollment rates in undergraduate education, it is not surprising that the educational attainment of the Hispanic population also lags that of other racial groups. In 2009, just 3% of Hispanics 25 years of age and older in the United States had a graduate degree, compared with 10% of Whites and 6% of African Americans (Snyder and Dillow, 2010). The pathways to graduate school must be improved in order to ensure parity for Hispanics in graduate degree attainment. To achieve this goal will require the participation and support of HSIs as well as non-HSIs.

By Nathan E. Bell, Director, Research and Policy Analysis
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Award Winners Announced at CGS Annual Meeting

The Awards Luncheon at the JW Marriott in Washington, DC was the venue for the announcement of the award winners for 2010. The young scholars who received the awards shared insights into their research and graduate school experiences.

The ETS/CGS Award for Innovation in Promoting Success in Graduate Education: From Admission to Completion is an award created two years ago to recognize promising efforts in initiating or scaling up innovations in graduate education. James Wimbush, chair of the selection committee, announced that Michigan State University, was the winner of the $20,000 award. Karen Klomparens, Dean of the Graduate School, accepted the award for their proposal, “The Whole Student Experience: Admissions to Student Success.” The project utilizes successful interventions from other grants to expand delivery to additional programs and students. Two grant proposals were recognized with the designation of Honorable Mention: Morehouse School of Medicine and the University of California, Irvine.

Christopher C. Fennell, assistant professor of anthropology at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, received the 2010 Gustave O. Arlt Award in the Humanities for his book, *Crossroads and Cosmologies: Diasporas and Ethnogenesis in the New World* (University Press of Florida). Nominated by UIUC, Fennell is a graduate of the University of Virginia. The award of $1000 was presented by Andrew Moore, chair of the selection committee.

Two recent doctoral graduates were recognized for their dissertations. Charles Conroy, who received his doctorate in Astrophysical Sciences in 2010 from Princeton University, was chosen the winner of the CGS/UMI Distinguished Dissertation Award in Physical Sciences, Mathematics and Engineering. Dr. Conroy, a junior fellow at the Society of Fellows at Harvard, received an award of $2000 for his dissertation, *Stellar Population Synthesis for the Future*. Gary Slater, chair of the awards committee, also announced the following as finalists: Bethany List Ehlmann, nominated by Brown University, and Dale Langford, nominated by McGill University.

Gerald Baldasty, chair of the committee for the CGS/UMI Distinguished Dissertation Award in the Social Sciences, announced that Gregory Samanez-Larkin, who is a postdoctoral fellow at Vanderbilt University, was selected as the winner for his dissertation, *Incentive Processing in the Aging Brain: Individual Differences in Value-Based Learning and Decision Making Across the Adult Life Span*. Dr. Samanez-Larkin completed his doctoral studies in psychology at Stanford University in 2010. Dr. Baldasty said that Joseph Conti (nominated by the University of California, Santa Barbara) was recognized with an Honorable Mention. John Marston (UCLA), Nathalie Williams (University of Michigan), and Vanessa Summering (University of Iowa) were selected as semi-finalists by the committee.
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