



Graduate Education

Articles from several perspectives by:

Ballowe, Galsky & Permuth
Guyon & Veri
Kruh

La Tourette
Rutledge
Tiedeman

THRESHOLDS

IN EDUCATION

Vol. VII No. IV
November, 1981

GRADUATE EDUCATION: WHERE WE ARE--OR, WHERE ARE WE?	R.F. Kruh	1
GRADUATE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH IN THE STATE UNIVERSITY	John E. La Tourette	5
THE RESEARCH OFFICE AT THE "MASTERS ONLY" PRIVATE UNIVERSITY	James Ballowe, Alan Galsky and Steve Permuth	11
FORMS AND FOCES LEADING TOWARD NONTRADITIONAL GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS	John C. Guyon and Clive C. Veri	15
GRADUATE EDUCATION--A CAREER EDUCATION THRUST	David V. Tiedeman	22
AN OPINION ON GRADUATE STUDY IN PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION	James A. Rutledge	27

It has been a privilege to solicit articles for this **Thresholds in Education** issue on Graduate Education. The articles, written by persons in position to know graduate education from different vantage points, are the opinions of the authors, and have been only minimally edited. I wish to thank the authors for their generous responses.

JAMES A. RUTLEDGE

THRESHOLDS IN EDUCATION FOUNDATION

BOARD OF DIRECTORS 1981-1982

Chairman
Dr. Byron F. Radebaugh

Vice-Chairman
Dr. Frank Lanning

Dr. Judith Blschoff
Dr. Weldon Bradtmueller
Dr. Robert J. Maple
Dr. Joan Peterson

Alternate
Dr. James A. Rutledge

Treasurer
Dr. Roy L. Bragg

ISSUE EDITOR
Dr. James A. Rutledge

CONTRIBUTING MEMBERS

Township High School District 214
Mt. Prospect, Illinois 60065
Superintendent: Edward H. Gilbert

Romeoville High School
Valley View Community Unit
District 364-U
Principal: John W. Slni

College of Education
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois 60115
Dean: John H. Johansen

EXECUTIVE EDITORS
Joseph R. Ellis
Byron F. Radebaugh

TECHNICAL ASSISTANT
Kathle Jakacki
Julie Michalowski

Cover: Hilikka Itkonen

EDITORIAL BOARD

Roger Bardwell
University of Illinois-
Circle Campus, Chicago

James Boyer
Kansas State University

Gloria Kinney
Palatine, Illinois

Patricia Krus
Arizona State University

Wilma Longstreet
DePaul University

Donald Potter
University of Nevada

William W. Purkey
University of North Carolina, Greensboro

Galen Saylor
University of Nebraska

Gary Taylor
University of Arkansas

Robert Wendel
Miami University

Views expressed do not necessarily reflect the views of the editors or the editorial board of **Thresholds**.

Manuscripts. Submit manuscripts to Editor, **Thresholds in Education**, P.O. Box 771, DeKalb, Illinois 60115. Suggested length — 900-5,000 words. Typed double spaced include author's vita.

The **Publications Manual** of the American Psychological Association (Sec. Ed. 1974) should be followed in preparing manuscripts.

Advertising rates: 1 page ad \$200; half page ads \$110.00 classified ads: up to 50 words, \$8.00, 51-100 words, \$15.00. Address: Business Manager **Thresholds in Education**, P.O. Box 771, DeKalb, IL 60115.

Thresholds is entered as Third Class mail at the Post Office in DeKalb, Illinois under permit number 265 and under provisions of Part 144, Postal Manual Authorization for mailing as a non-profit organization was secured on February 8, 1975.

Copyright: 1982 by **Thresholds in Education Foundation**. All rights reserved.

Subscription Information. Subscription rates are as follows: one year \$8.00, two years \$15.00, three years \$21.00. For foreign subscriptions other than Canadian add \$3.50 more per year. Send to Editor, **Thresholds in Education**, P.O. Box 771, DeKalb, IL 60115.

Thresholds is a refereed journal published quarterly in February, May, August and November.

Graduate Education: Where We Are-- Or, Where Are We?

By R. F. Kruh

That Americans are a learning society is a commonplace. The growth of knowledge, the increasing complexity of careers, and the essentiality of research for the nation's security and economic well-being all underscore the expanded role of learning. Education is increasingly viewed as a continuing process, and, with necessarily greater reliance on advanced work, it extends to the graduate level for more and more individuals. Today's graduate education takes place in so many ways as to defy general description.

The historic patterns of traditional graduate education, begun at Johns Hopkins in 1876, were largely maintained until after World War II. Following the impulse of Sputnik, more than a decade of spectacular growth created many opportunities for those involved in graduate education. Where it was not possessed by either, both students and institutions sought after the PhD. Numbers of degrees conferred increased so rapidly in the 1960's that the Office of Education predicted that annual awards of PhD's would reach 65,000 by the 1980's. Scores of normal schools and state colleges became universities, adding bright new faculty members from Michigan and Stanford to staff swelling classes and to transplant the research motif to their newly founded doctoral programs. By 1973 there were 35,000 PhDs awarded, three times the number conferred ten years earlier. The research university had become the model to emulate and the gauge of all that was good in graduate education.

The distortion of these years was plain to the late Alan Cartter, who complained that too many people were looking through the wrong end of the telescope. The drastic adjustment he predicted had to come. By the mid-1970's, with degree programs overbuilt and degree recipients too numerous for many a job market to absorb--especially in academe, universities found their circumstances complicated by sharply curtailed support for graduate students, double-digit inflation, and declining research funding. The National Board on Graduate Education wrote of the "new depression" in graduate education.

. . . Even though graduate education is still faulted by some as being overly rigid, today's pluralistic graduate institutions represent a remarkable responsiveness to a host of social imperatives. . . .

These trends were paralleled by changing societal patterns, all of which conspired to transform and diversify the traditional characteristics of graduate education. Even though graduate education is still faulted by some as being overly rigid, today's pluralistic graduate institutions represent a remarkable responsiveness to a host of social imperatives. Schools and programs differ widely, and any sweeping statement about graduate education can now easily be confuted. Graduate education embraces not only the historic research university, where resident doctoral study contributes to the disciplines, but also the extension center where mid-career professionals can complete an MBA evenings and weekends. It has recognized the needs and aspirations of minority students, women, older students returning to the classroom, and

R. F. Kruh, whose field is chemistry, is Dean of the Graduate School at Kansas State University, the former Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and immediate Past Chairman of the Graduate Record Examinations Board.

international students--with better counseling, more realistic programming, and flexible admissions policies.

Although the fraction of graduate degrees awarded to minorities has grown closer to their proportion in the overall population, their degrees are much more likely to be in education and the social sciences than in science, engineering, and agriculture. In the case of women the fraction of PhDs they earn now approaches 30%, but there are still marked disparities among fields. The policies of and attitudes within graduate education still have a long way to come. The various forms and approaches taken by graduate education must therefore be carefully analyzed before one attempts to draw any general conclusions as to its future.

A number of trends can be catalogued. Differences cited between institutions can also be as great among the programs in a single institution. Although foreign observers are thus often puzzled at the absence of any national system for the control of US colleges and universities, their enormous variety, and even redundancy, comprise a great power for the continued renewal of our society and a resource adaptable to a wide range of challenges. Collectively, American institutions of higher education have created a model of achievement envied throughout the world. If United States graduate education is at once to continue this record as well as to serve evolving needs of the nation it will necessarily give its attention, through the spectrum of its institutions, to a variety of pressing issues.

When Scholarship for Society appeared in 1973 it attempted to recognize a growing quest for graduate education by populations who sought a greater degree of physical convenience, program flexibility, and practicality than was provided by the traditional residential programs for

twenty-two year old baccalaureates. The publication raised a number of questions as to the nature of educational quality apart from educational process and considered alternate approaches (not alternatives) to graduate education for non-traditional graduate students.

Conflicting views recognized then still exist, for stereotypes die hard, but the graduate scene has changed dramatically.

. . . Part-time students now comprise a majority of those in graduate study, and off-campus study is widely provided for those unable to leave job and family responsibilities. . .

Responding to market forces and abandoning earlier habits of imitation, many a graduate school has a more realistic view of its ambitions, now redesigning and rescheduling offerings for the mid-career professional, the high-risk student, or the adult returning to change careers or begin a new one. Part-time students now comprise the majority of those in graduate study, and off-campus study is widely provided for those unable to leave job and family responsibilities. For many a masters degree, residency and research have become anachronisms, and the relative ease with which the degree can be had in some fields diminishes any exclusivity it might have possessed a generation ago.

With graduate education so forthcoming in serving a variety of new needs, one must pause to consider that not every whisper of the market winds should generate a reply. The danger is that offerings may be so ponderously laden with evanescent minutiae that private learning is discouraged. That capacity is one we all subscribe to as a worthy aim of institutionalized learning. In providing new responses, universities need to look to their integrating powers and demonstrate the versatility of the human mind. Particularly, they need to recognize that there are many learning modes, not all of which ought fall within their precincts. Threatened by enrollment losses, universities will be increasingly tempted to compete for all comers but need to recognize their special role even as they evolve in new directions.

Most of the changes have been taking place in the newer universities, where the forces of tradition were not well established and where such innovation was a welcome necessity. Without concerted design, but, rather, bent by the changing demands of new clientele, the nation is accomplishing a diversification and division of labor among universities that was not possible to achieve under the monolithic incentives of the 1960's.

Even now, however, there is reason to believe that still new responses are needed but that some of the current ones have overshot the mark. Degree structures whose prestige and meaning had been laboriously built over the preceding century now have such latitude and, in some fields, such universality that they lose all distinction. The unwillingness of universities (and, to be sure, of degree recipients) to accept new designations for novel programs has created much confusion about what graduate education really is. Universities still continue to behave as Thorstein Veblen portrayed them, "competitors for traffic in merchantable instruction."

If these developments evoke a slightly cynical reaction they must nevertheless be seen as a deepening process of renewal involving many more people, wherein the human intellect seeks to excel and perform at greater heights. Surely the daily work of the nation depends upon such refinements of these capacities, even though they are, in many cases, highly particularized. One might yearn for managers whose familiarity with Locke and Rousseau informs their judgments, or environmental engineers possessing a more than routine acquaintance with how the social movements of the Nineteenth Century were related to industrial development. Economic necessity seems to render the graduate programs of most adults utilitarian and episodic, however. Thus, just as we see value in encouraging more sophisticated skills, we must recognize that narrowness in a corporate manager is as exceptionable as in the scholarly specialist in Romance linguistics. The work of each is needed, but in a way that can be related to a larger universe. Each has a hand in understanding how our enormous scientific and other intellectual powers may be related to the values and purposes of our constitutional system.

. . . cadres of scholars and researchers must be nurtured if we are to maintain the thin, clear stream of creative intellectual leadership. . .

It still remains for the young baccalaureate to take the more deliberate path of concentrated study in those fields that

may not have immediate and obvious economic payoffs. Even as an enormous transformation has taken place in much of graduate education to accommodate the practitioners of a number of professions, a strong, traditional research sector must be made to survive and flourish. In his 1981 Report, President Bowen made the case for Princeton's insistence on full-time resident study for the doctorate. For it is essential that, while the ranks of practitioners are necessary to the execution of the nation's affairs, cadres of scholars and researchers must be nurtured if we are to maintain the thin, clear stream of creative intellectual leadership. Who, for example, might have foreseen that Radon's geometrical theorems, developed during World War I, would years later become the basis for medicine's powerful new diagnostic, computerized axial tomography (CAT)? Today there are concerns about the resources needed to sustain even some of our historically strong research universities as well as about maintenance of the best, young minds sufficient to create tomorrow's intellectual capital. When graduate education is criticized for a particular quality, or lack thereof, heed must be given to the broad diversity of the enterprise. The distinctive responsibility of universities has been to serve as centers of basic research, even though industry and government also contribute to that function. Meanwhile, their roles in training for the various professions and in providing services to society have expanded. Answers to criticism lie more in that diversity than in the reform of historic function, which continues as a crucial need.

The fraction of Harvard's honor graduates planning to go on to graduate school has dropped to little more than 30% as compared to 75% in the mid-1960's. Part of that exodus must be attributed to the growing income gap between academic careers and those in business and other professions. The personal satisfaction and relative freedom of faculty life no longer offset this perennial disparity. In addition, the inclination of faculty members toward self-preservation reduces their willingness to participate in the broader activities of their institutions while they mount departmental defenses against outside distractions and threats. With financial exigency a real prospect, collegial exchange is menaced, and the new faculty members face the neurotic

struggle for grants and for tenure. Gone for the older faculty are the warm, kind days of simple grace in academic life. For the younger ones, they never were! In a time of many new demands, the question for them may well be how to survive a traditional reward system in a world with non-traditional needs. Some choose not to survive at all, and the nation faces a very serious loss of young scholars whose new ideas are needed to invigorate the academy. David Riesman recently lamented that "I can't persuade my brightest students to enter academic life no matter how excited they are by the subject. I fear we may be entering a time analagous to the Chinese cultural revolution, where a generation of scholars were sent to the fields and lost."

The situation is now particularly acute in engineering, business, and computer science, for which the next generation of teachers may not appear. With enlightened self-interest, Exxon recently initiated a multi-million dollar support program to help recruit and keep key faculty members in engineering. And universities now face the competitive phenomenon of industry's providing its own organizations for advanced education. The lavish facilities of New England Telephone and IBM, and the programs of Arthur D. Little and the Wang Institute illustrate this development.

The depression in academic salaries, except for a handful of high prestige institutions, portends a fate for universities that has already befallen public education. Where public policy failed to maintain teachers' salaries that could continue to attract a share of the best, the general caliber of the faculty eroded. We bemoan the condition of our common schools, but the consequences of erosion in university faculties has longer-range implications to the degree that we are unable to attract the keenest minds to our faculties, thereby suffering a loss of intellectual leadership affecting the entire process of societal renewal through education.

As far as students are concerned, financial trauma takes another form. Facing higher and higher fees and the diminished availability of monetary support, they assume a greater share of the risk of undertaking graduate study. Not only are out-of-pocket costs far more substantial, but opportunity costs in the form of wages

forgone are nearly prohibitive in some

. . . The contributions of our graduate schools must be sustained, whether through those experts who cultivate knowledge for its own sake or through the greater numbers of skilled individuals who solve immediate problems. . .

cases. It therefore is more important than ever for students to have some estimate of their chances for success and for the schools to look closely at the appalling rate of attrition among graduate students. Also, it should be recognized that an apparent abundance of PhDs in some fields ought not obscure a shortage of women and minorities among them.

The contributions of our graduate schools must be sustained, whether through those experts who cultivate knowledge for its own sake or through the greater numbers of skilled individuals who solve immediate problems and provide specialized services to society. We need to create the environment in which the next Glen Seaborg or Milton Friedman may pursue discovery. We need the scholars of Islam and the geneticists whose insights penetrate complex problems in human affairs. And we also must have social workers who can sensitively and wisely assist the troubled family, accountants who can guide corporate growth with sound fiscal policies, and accomplished engineers who can build trustworthy structures.

Many alternative forms of graduate education are now arising. Some may be based on a genuine responsiveness of universities, while others are established elsewhere because their specialized objectives are not congenial to the university. Beyond the acquisition of skills there is clamor for certification and credentials. It is still an open question whether the universities should take on or compete for all of the new responsibilities. To the extent that our universities play a key societal role that, by all indications, must continue, it should be admitted that they should not be so transformed or diluted by extraneous activities as to divert them from continuing their necessary contributions. Other societal institutions may well assume or be invented to take on the auxiliary activities.

Current experience nevertheless shows that many such activities are dependent on the existence and practices of the universities. If variety multiplies, the challenge will be to interrelate the activities of society's educational functions and institutions. The danger is that a pre-

occupation with competitive forces in the open market will bring about a rivalrous depreciation of educational quality where it is most needed. Only a society determined to seek excellence can avoid that fate.



Graduate Education and Research in the State University

by John E. La Tourette

The system of graduate education and research defined as the state university is complex, multilayered, and multifaceted. There is no single model that can be identified in terms of origin, organization or scope of mission.

The state university runs the gamut from the comprehensive universities which emerged as centers for doctoral education and basic scientific research prior to World War II to the new universities which were established in the growth era of the 1960s. Included in this broad spectrum of universities are the land-grant colleges whose instructional programs were expanded to the graduate level in order to promote more effectively the development of agriculture and industry and the normal schools or teachers colleges which underwent several transformations during the twentieth century to become regional centers for graduate education at the masters level or even selective doctoral institutions. Some of these state institutions were originally established as private or municipal universities. Many of the well-established, as well as the new, institutions have been integrated into state university

systems, as in California and New York, with structured missions both at the undergraduate and graduate level. Graduate education in the institutions which comprise these systems ranges from a limited set of professional programs, directed to a particular academic field, to terminal masters programs in all disciplines, to "University Centers" which offer comprehensive programs in all disciplines at both the masters and doctoral levels.

The state systems, themselves, are as diverse as the institutions which are included in them. They extend from single to multiple flagship universities, as in Minnesota and New York, to institutions with stratified missions at the doctoral and masters levels, as in the University of California and the California State University systems. In some states, such as Ohio, loose federations support one or two comprehensive doctoral universities, as well as a group of institutions with both terminal masters and selective doctoral programs. The governing and coordinating boards which oversee these universities and systems are equally diverse.

In terms of the number of graduates and research commitment, graduate education in the public sector is dominated by the large state universities which emerged in the first half of this century as the university became the primary force in higher education. Spreading from the initial membership of the Universities of

John E. La Tourette, whose discipline is economics, is Vice President and Provost at Northern Illinois University, and previously served as graduate dean at two other state universities.

California, Michigan and Wisconsin in the Association of American Universities, which was founded in 1900, several other state universities in the midwest—Illinois, Iowa, Iowa State, Minnesota, and Ohio State—were awarding a significant number

. . . In the postwar period, the state university has assumed a more prominent role nationally in graduate education.

of doctorates by 1925. With the exception of some southern and western states, most of the institutions which now comprise the national system of state universities, originally established as state universities or later incorporated into state university systems, were awarding the doctorate by 1940. Thus the period 1900-1940, which has been characterized as the "university era in scientific research" saw the emergence of publicly supported graduate education and research in the state university.

In the postwar period, the state university has assumed a more prominent role nationally in graduate education. In terms of masters and doctorates awarded annually, the state institutions surpassed the private universities in the early 1950s. By the mid 1970s, state universities awarded almost two-thirds of the graduate degrees. Reflecting the sharp reduction in the growth of graduate enrollment in the past decade, the proportion of degrees awarded by state universities has stabilized at approximately 63 percent of the total, at both the masters and doctoral levels.

Also, in the past thirty-five years, the state universities in the west and south have become more important in graduate education by increasing their share of the number of graduate degrees awarded. Moreover, state university systems have been established or have launched doctoral programs in the northeastern states in which the large, prestigious private institutions dominated graduate education for the first half of this century. For example, although they incorporated some institutions awarding the doctorate, the State University of New York and the City University of New York are basically postwar entries into comprehensive doctoral education. The

University of Connecticut awarded its first Ph.D. in 1949. By the late 1960s, spurred on by the United States reaction to Sputnik and the rapid growth of undergraduate students, the major state universities or the flagships in the state university systems offered a comprehensive array of doctoral and masters programs in the traditional arts and sciences and the professional fields of business, agriculture, engineering and education.

At the same time that the mature state universities and the new institutional entries were establishing comprehensive graduate programs across a broad range of research disciplines and professional fields, state colleges growing rapidly in undergraduate enrollment during the 1950s and 1960s began to move heavily into graduate education at both the masters and doctoral levels to respond to the expanding societal need for more advanced education and more teachers at all levels, but especially in colleges and universities. In this period, society's broad acceptance of the baccalaureate degree as preparation for a career, necessitated a parallel expansion of doctorally trained faculty. But, beyond this growth, the expanding need of a more technically and professionally-oriented economy for more advanced education generated a significant upsurge in demand. Although the prestigious private institutions which led the development of graduate education in the early part of this century are an essential part of the national system, the state university provided the primary response to this expansion at all levels within both the traditional disciplines and professional fields.

In spite of the diversity found in the origin and comprehensiveness of the state university, the organization of the graduate school and the role of the graduate dean show little variation. The general similarities in these aspects of graduate education override the distinctions and should be kept in mind in the discussion which follows. Because of the division of undergraduate and graduate education described below, the graduate dean is usually not a line dean and generally has limited budgetary authority, as well as restricted participation in tenure and promotion decisions. Thus, it is frequently emphasized that the graduate dean must be a recognized scholar who by persuasion and enlightenment can influence the programmatic, budgetary and personnel

processes to promote the quality of the graduate enterprise and scholarship.

In the state university, the academic officer responsible for graduate education is typically the administrative head of a graduate school or college. Without any clear basis of distinction, except perhaps the historical period in which the institution initiated graduate degrees, this person may or may not be the chief academic officer for sponsored research. In a limited number of leading state universities, the person carries the title of Vice Chancellor or Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research. This title suggests a position in the administrative hierarchy somewhere above a dean, but not higher than an Executive Vice Chancellor or Academic Vice Chancellor. Frequently, in this administrative organization, there is also a dean who reports directly to the individual designated as responsible for both research and graduate education. However, a more widely-used model is one in which the person who carries the title of dean of the graduate school or college also has a title which indicates responsibility for grants development, as opposed to grants administration which is generally an activity organized under the vice president (vice provost) for business affairs. Thus, the title is typically Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost for Research, or some variant thereof. This person is considered a peer among the other deans and the chief administrative officer for grants development. Many of the state universities, especially the teachers colleges and new universities of the 1960s, which were relative late comers in doctoral education originally employed this title combination, quite possibly, to indicate the increased importance the institution was assigning to this new or rapidly expanding mission. Yet, by examining the titles listed in the Directory of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, the most frequently used title is simply dean, emphasizing the academic leadership which the person is expected to give to the graduate enterprise. This is especially the case among the state universities which awarded their first doctoral degree prior to 1940 and are among the leaders in graduate education in terms of total degrees granted. In many of these universities, the grants development office is a separate activity under the jurisdiction of an appropriate vice president. In a

very real sense, however, the graduate

. . . major issues or themes which characterize graduate education . . . include teaching versus research, preparation for teaching, the growth of professional degree programs, quality control and continued growth. . .

dean in all institutions is the spiritual leader for scholarship and this of necessity makes the person an advocate for grants development in support of research.

Given the limitations imposed by an essay, it is appropriate to focus on some of the major issues or themes which characterize graduate education, especially as they relate to the state university. These include teaching versus research, preparation for teaching, the growth of professional degree programs, quality control and continued growth.

The dependence on public support and the economics of higher education have dictated that the state university subsidize its more expensive graduate and research programs from less costly undergraduate instruction which attracts proportionately larger enrollments. Historically, the placement of the German-based graduate school on top of the English undergraduate college has been the source of a continuing debate about the relative importance of teaching and research as appropriate criteria for tenure and promotion, the division of undergraduate and graduate faculties, and the lack of preparation for teaching in the research oriented university. Although a tenuous accommodation has been reached on the criteria and graduate faculty issues at many state universities, especially at the centers or flagships in systems which have allowed them to have selective admissions at the undergraduate level, the debate is at or just beneath the surface at long established institutions which must admit all high school graduates who have successfully completed a college preparatory program. The debate still ebbs and flows, and occasionally rages, at institutions which are relatively recent entrants on the graduate scene. This is a controversial issue at many of the transfigured liberal arts and teachers colleges, especially when the Graduate Dean is pushing for higher standards in scholarship and

research for tenure, promotion or graduate faculty status.

The author, in previous appointments, has personally experienced this phenomenon at a state university center which was developed from an elite liberal arts college and at a selective doctoral university which began as a normal school. In the former, compromise reached ten years after the establishment of doctoral programs placed all tenure and tenure-track faculty on graduate status, but reserved for quality control a limited number of appointments of "graduate scholars" to serve on dissertation committees. Upon accepting the graduate deanship at the second institution, the author immediately was confronted with a graduate faculty review process initiated by an interim appointee who had observed that the criteria for graduate status were so lenient that approximately 680 of the 720 regular faculty were members of the graduate faculty. Taking into account the heavy undergraduate commitment of the state universities, the likelihood that undergraduate enrollment will decline in this decade, and the recent origin of graduate education in many state institutions, the teaching/research and graduate faculty debates are not likely to subside in this century.

The research doctorate experience has also been criticized for years as being too limited and narrow for the prospective undergraduate college teacher. One might observe that the development of the research doctorate originally occurred in the science and technical fields which emphasize basic research and provide a wide range of employment opportunities outside the academic world. Non-academic employment opportunities have never been substantial for the humanities and many of the social and behavioral sciences, although some progress has been made in the past decade in opening industry and government to doctorates in these disciplines. The state university has perhaps a somewhat better record than the prestigious private institutions of preparing doctoral students for teaching careers through its use of a large number of teaching assistants for instruction at the undergraduate level. But, typically, this has been done more to keep the cost of instruction down, to provide students financial support, and to justify the graduate school and the heavy commitment of its faculty to research, than as an

explicit program to provide appropriate preparation in teaching methods, testing and the use of instructional media. Although individual faculty members, given the responsibility of coordinating large classes to which teaching assistants are assigned, do take seriously the preparation of their students for instructional duties, the graduate school in most large state universities has not established a means by which all graduate students who are potential college teachers are given systematic preparation through a structured program operated by or at least monitored by the graduate dean's office. Whether this is due to the relatively weak position of most graduate deans, or conversely, to the strength of the departments and line deans, the strength of the research mystique, or the skepticism of the traditional disciplines for education-type courses, this is still an agenda which the state university has failed to address fully.

The last twenty years has seen the growth of a staggering array of professional (practice-oriented) degree programs. The Council of Graduate Schools in the United States has reported the existence of over 300 masters and doctoral degrees with a discipline or field designator such as Master of Business Administration, Master of Public Administration, Master of Library Science, Master of Accountancy, etc. This growth has permeated the state university as these programs have taken their place beside the M.A. and M.S. degrees in the traditional research disciplines; in fact, before the "tagged degree"—Master of _____ became widely accepted, many of the professional programs used the M.S. designation with a specified field, such as the M.S. in Education or the M.S. in Nursing.

The growth of the practice-oriented masters degree as a terminal experience in the past two decades parallels the earlier expansion of the doctoral program into the professional fields of agriculture, business, education, engineering, home economics, journalism, librarianship, nursing, and social work. The growth of the terminal masters, however, was in direct response to the demands of business, government, and school systems for more highly specialized training beyond the baccalaureate degree, rather than for doctorally-qualified students whose training was more appropriate for university or college teaching. The state university

has been heavily involved in the expansion of the masters degree into many new fields, in some cases, with an almost bewildering variety of degree titles or alternate paths to a particular career. One example, which recently came to the author's attention, illustrates the point. A Masters in Physical Therapy is a relatively new degree for terminal preparation in the field. Therefore, a number of degree programs continue to serve practitioners, including the M.S. in Education (Special or Physical Education), the M.S. in Biology (Physiology or Anatomy) and the M.S. or M.A. in Physiology, Psychology, Anthropology (Physical) and Sociology (Medical).

In 1981, graduate education in the comprehensive state university includes this complex array of masters programs in the professional fields, as well as the traditional research disciplines. Although the term "practice-oriented programs" may serve to identify the primary purpose of these degrees--a terminal, essentially practice-oriented experience with no significant research requirement--they may also serve as preparation for the professional doctorate. In contrast, many of the traditional research-oriented programs have options, with a reduced emphasis on research, directed toward professional preparation. Thus, although still viewed as primarily designed as preparation for the traditional doctorate, such degrees have acquired a dual purpose in many disciplines.

. . . The research experience in the professional doctorate varies widely and the degree label is not always as helpful as it could be. . .

Built on top of the broad base of practice and research-oriented programs is the doctorate which, in the traditional disciplines, has generally retained its heavy research emphasis. The research experience in the professional doctorate varies widely and the degree label is not always as helpful as it could be. For example, both the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. are awarded in Education. Yet, the Ph.D. in Education awarded at many institutions involves the completion of a dissertation which is considerably less demanding than those in the traditional disciplines in terms of originality, analytical expertise and disciplinary significance. On the

other hand, some of the Ed.D. programs at other universities (or even within the same institution) have a strong research component, with standards fully comparable to the social, behavioral or natural sciences which generally provide the disciplinary base for the research emphasis. Concurrently, the perception of the need for or the prestige of the doctorate has led to its being sought as a terminal, practice-oriented experience. This results in students pursuing graduate degrees because salary schedules are based on advanced study or because people appointed to certain positions in the community are expected to hold doctorates. It even extends to the campus where faculty members in fields in which the terminal educational experience is the masters are compelled to seek the doctorate in another professional area to receive tenure or a promotion.

The state university has attempted to balance the public's increasing demand for credentials, the pressure for greater professionalism and the traditional expectations about quality within the academic community. Given these sometimes conflicting objectives, it is no wonder that there is a perception within the graduate establishment that there are significant differences in the level of intellectual and analytical development reached by students at the masters and doctoral level in different fields. This issue has been a major theme in graduate education for a hundred years and will likely continue to be one in the future.

Another dimension of graduate education to be considered in the state university is the quality of academic programs. Considerable effort has been devoted to the measurement of the quality of programs in the traditional research disciplines and professional fields. In the past two decades, this evaluation has ranged from a single author, Alan Cartter, ranking departments and institutions by the "quality" of the faculty to multidimensional assessments of both doctoral and masters programs, sponsored jointly by the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States and the Educational Testing Service. The rapid growth of graduate programs and enrollments in the 1960s, particularly among the state universities, raised concern first about the quality of education and then, in the early 1970s as doctoral output continued to increase dramatically, about an oversupply of Ph.Ds. This set the stage for temporary

moratoriums imposed by state coordinating boards on the approval of new doctoral programs in state universities. The immediate and probably long-term effect was a dramatic reduction in the initiation of new programs at the doctoral level and a careful evaluation of proposed masters programs. Another lasting phenomenon was the emergence of the process of academic program review as an instrument to measure quality, to determine student demand and societal need, and to assess the resource requirements for program maintenance or improvement.

It has been observed that twenty-five years of determined effort is required to move an institution into the magic circle of leading universities. The state universities which established doctoral programs before 1940 were leaders in graduate education before the rapid expansion of doctoral degrees in the 1960s and largely remain as the premier state-supported institutions. It is true that the system has become more decentralized and degrees now are awarded from a much broader range of institutions, but many of the new state universities or transformed teachers colleges had their development as comprehensive graduate institutions abruptly terminated in the past decade, when state planning authorities adjusted their undergraduate enrollment projections downward and reassessed the demand for doctorally-trained people. Many of these universities have taken their place in the system as regional institutions with selective doctoral programs. A few have moved beyond a regional emphasis to national recognition. Although the quality of doctoral programs in the leading state universities is uneven, the disparity is generally much greater, as one would suspect, in those institutions which have emerged as universities in the past two decades. On the other hand, as the state-wide review of doctoral programs by discipline in the state of New York suggests, some departments within these institutions have truly made remarkable progress in a period of fifteen years.

Now that the growth in the number of doctoral programs has tapered off sharply and the degrees awarded annually have declined to just above 30,000, it appears that the system of graduate education has essentially reached a limit in terms of general development for the rest of this century. There may be significant changes,

however, within this structure as the system responds to changing student demand, societal need and disciplinary trends. If the maturation process noted earlier continues, we can expect many of the institutions which initiated graduate study in the 1960s to develop stronger programs. Moreover, increasingly demanding program review processes should foster this development by eliminating the weakest and assisting the potentially strong to improve. New programs, targeted to particular specializations or clientele, will likely be approved at the doctoral level, but this growth will be rather limited. Some modest expansion at the masters level, especially in the area of practiced-oriented programs, is likely to be required because of the growing emphasis in business and

. . . The system of graduate education in the state university. . . is likely to remain multilayered and multifaceted. . .

government on more advanced professional education and the professional upgrading that will be demanded in mid-career by the large baccalaureate degreed population now active in the labor force.

The system of graduate education in the state university, therefore, is likely to remain multilayered and multifaceted. Comprehensive state university centers either as single or multiple flagships will continue to be the primary focus for graduate education and research; however, the selective doctoral institutions will tend to mature and improve in quality. Some selective doctoral institutions, like the state universities with a broad range of terminal masters programs, will remain essentially regionally oriented. This system of graduate education, therefore, will continue to provide for the full-time residential pursuit of a degree, an expanding opportunity for part-time study at the regional institution, or graduate work offered by state universities at off-campus sites. Any significant expansion in graduate enrollment is more likely to be at the masters level in professionally-oriented programs or in the more applied options of the traditional research disciplines. The growing shortage of scientists, mathematicians and engineers is likely to result in these disciplines increasing their doctoral enrollments, primarily in existing

programs, while the humanities continue to adjust downwards to a level consistent with undergraduate enrollments and the replacement market in the academic marketplace. Most of this expansion will occur at the state universities, probably raising to an even higher level the proportion of degrees

. . . The adaptability of the system is readily apparent even in an institutional context which is generally considered to be resistant to change. . .

awarded in the public sector.

Looking backwards over almost a century of development, graduate education and the associated faculty research programs in the state university have

responded to the need for highly sophisticated scientific and technical education, the advancement of basic and applied research, and the growing need for more advanced professional preparation. Reflecting a more complex and technical society, graduate education now offers a broad range of study opportunities to a diverse population seeking more advanced knowledge, analytical and technical skills. The adaptability of the system is readily apparent even in an institutional context which is generally considered to be resistant to change. It is reasonable to assume that this flexibility will be maintained, but it is also reasonable to assume that most of the debates which have characterized the graduate establishment will continue to be just as lively in the future as they have been for a hundred years.



The Research Office at the "Masters Only" Private University

by James Ballowe, Alan Galsky,
and Steve Permuth

At the medium-sized private university which is predominately undergraduate and which offers graduate work at the master's level only, teaching is a high aspiration of the faculty. That is as it should be. It is also true that the exceptional teacher has always been that person who year after year grows with the discipline and catches the imagination of

successive generations of students. Every faculty has a few excellent teachers with lengthy track records. But in the '70's while looking for ways to keep an increasingly static faculty alive and productive, some teaching institutions began to encourage their faculty members to exercise

. . . It is difficult to overcome the prevalent mythologies about teaching and research. . .

their skills as scholars and creators. One way this has been attempted at Bradley University is the subject of this essay.

At the outset, it must be said that not all the answers sought have been found this past decade. It is difficult to overcome the prevalent mythologies about teaching and research: that the one excludes the other; that one cannot teach

James Ballowe, a professor of English, is Associate Provost and Dean of the Graduate School at Bradley University, and the former Chairman of the Midwestern Association of Graduate Schools. Alan Galsky is Acting Assistant Dean for Research and Sponsored Programs and a professor of Biology. Steve Permuth, an associate professor of Education Administration, is the founding Assistant Dean for the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs and Acting Dean of the College of Education.

full time and publish too; that unless one is at a Ph.D. research institution, resources will not be available; or that research interests will not serve master's degree student interests, let alone undergraduate needs. Such myths become truths for faculty who have not been encouraged to engage in their own professional interests since they left their Ph.D. programs. Some will not be inclined to renew the quest for the challenges and rewards they had expected earlier in their careers but somehow had lost sight of along the way.

As a matter of fact, Bradley University has long been building toward the development of a faculty which understands that teaching and research can be two sides of the same coin. Its traditional undergraduate programs in science, liberal arts, and the professions have attracted faculty who have been individually productive and who have encouraged intellectual inquiry among their students throughout this century. Those university policies and procedures which encourage professional growth are customary at Bradley: sabbaticals; consulting days; internal funding for research and creativity; departmentally-administered reduced teaching loads for faculty with active projects; research assistants; and institutes which promote disciplinary study and service to the community. Faculty in such areas as biology, engineering, and psychology introduce upper-division undergraduates into the rigors of research in the normal courses of study and have co-authored literally hundreds of papers with them. Similar practice has been true of the graduate faculty (essentially the same personnel), and research and creativity in the discipline are common characteristics running throughout the twenty-one graduate programs. (The term "research" is used at Bradley to describe inquiry into the discipline; the term "creativity" is used to describe artistic production. In effect, the terms are concomitant.)

What was lacking at Bradley was not the opportunity for the faculty member to engage in creativity--for many had done it. The need was for an identifiable administrative office which would facilitate the development of research activities throughout the University, principally by means of helping those faculty who needed to find means of support from external sources. Of course, the University had such an office. But it was located under Development which in the '70's had to list faculty research as one of its lowest priorities.

The University began to recognize that if a more active coordination of research were to be achieved it might have to become the responsibility of the academic sector which had the most interest in the process. Some five years ago the University attracted a chief academic officer whose experience as a research administrator and a graduate dean had given him an understanding of the usefulness of placing research activities in a centralized academic office. (The value of centralization was important, particularly for the purpose of achieving neutrality.)

. . . (Laying the groundwork for working relationships with interested units) is of immense importance in a university in which all units are relatively small and must work closely together. . .

Shortly an Office for Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) was located in the Graduate School which, with programs in every sector of the University, was logically the place where centralization could be well assured. This was done, however, only after the Graduate School had over a period of years carefully laid the groundwork for appropriate working relationships with Development and other interested units. Such planning is of immense importance in a university in which all units are relatively small and must work closely together.

Once the support of central administration was assured, a faculty member was appointed to a one-quarter time administrative position with the title of Assistant Dean of the Graduate School for Research and Sponsored Programs. The selection was necessarily focused not on a person with great experience in grants, but on one who could be self-motivating and enthusiastic about the grants area and had strong basic administrative skills. An immediate overall task was to help develop a research consciousness within a faculty devoted to teaching. Several steps were taken during the initial six months of the existence of the Office. First, consultants were called in to aid the assistant dean in establishing patterns of operation for the Office with specific suggestions about how to maintain the Office and how to increase its visibility among the faculty and professional staff.

Second, the assistant dean sought personal experience by attending a national American Association of Colleges seminar on proposal writing and development, and visited federal agencies to learn first hand of their expectations and procedures. At the same time, a questionnaire was developed and submitted across the campus to assess faculty background in the grants process and the degree to which faculty were interested in learning about the grants process. Based on this information and advice from persons internal to Bradley University, the decision was made to give the Office high visibility, and the following strategies were developed:

1. The Office was listed by major granting agencies and grant requests were "paired" with faculty personnel showing interest in certain areas. Rather than passing on information, vis-à-vis visits were to be used if at all possible.
2. At least three trips a year to Washington were needed to stay current with and be visible to the Washington bureaucracy. An important effect of this was that the assistant dean in a face-to-face setting got vital information as to what was being looked for in the grants arena of a given agency.
3. The Office took the initiative of offering proposal-writing seminars to all concerned faculty. Emphasis was placed on existing internal support (library, computer) and help (Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, Controller's Office).
4. Priority was placed on involvement with the National Council of University Research Administrators at both the regional and federal levels.
5. A newsletter was developed to share information of forthcoming grant requests to all faculty members.

The processes were enhanced and the role of the Office took on its most significant designation when it became part of the formal sign-off procedure for proposals in the University and a formal policy

statement was introduced in the University Faculty Handbook as follows:

The Office for Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) has a primary mission to facilitate and solicit external funding from governmental agencies to aid faculty members, departments or divisions, and colleges in furthering research activities and academic programs. Those considering the submission of a grant or those in the early stages of writing are asked to contact ORSP as early as possible to allow for discussion of time schedules for internal review, potentially conflicting grant requests, etc.

Bradley requires that external funding requested from governmental agencies involving University personnel or any commitment by the University receive internal approval before submission. This process of approval is accomplished through a covering Extramural Funding Proposal Transmittal Form available in ORSP. The proposer must complete the form in full and obtain the required signatures. The form along with two copies of the proposal that can be retained by the University must be submitted to ORSP.

Thus the Office became an initiating point and had closure effect on proposals coming through the University, including those from institutes and life-planning components of the University. While success is difficult to define, in comparison to four external grants submitted the year before the Office was established, some fifteen were submitted in 1979-80 and twenty-seven in 1980-81. Of the fifteen submitted in 1979-80, four were funded and, with lessons learned, at least thirteen of twenty-seven were funded in 1980-81 (with word still to be received on two). Monetary benchmarks are, of course, the measure of success for research offices. Goals for this office are being established upwards as sponsored programs and research projects appear almost weekly. A rough estimate since the inception of the Office shows that proposals with a value of over four million dollars have been

processed and grants of over one million dollars have been received. Now in its third year, the Office for Research and Sponsored Programs now warrants and has received half-time administration to manage its activities. In addition, the Controller's Office has for the first time found it necessary to assign a full-time position for management of grant accounts.

The Office has two major goals in 1981-82 in order to serve better the needs of the University. These goals have been strongly influenced by an increased emphasis on the need for seeking external support (a priority of the current administration) and a constantly changing grants picture in Washington. The first goal, therefore, is not only to continue to keep up with the latest information on grants, contracts, and requests for proposals, but to seek new avenues for potential funding. With the increasing tax shelters available for industrial support of university research, this avenue has a high priority. In addition, this office has on file most of the application forms and guidelines covering these grant materials. Faculty now feel confident that they can receive such information from their research office.

The second major goal of the Office for Research and Sponsored Programs is to keep the university community continually aware of its services. This is being accomplished by distributing grant information as rapidly as possible to the

. . . shrinkage or elimination of programs which in part have provided a constant source of potential funding of research creates a new challenge. . . in the 1980's.

faculty, administration, and professional staff; by publishing and distributing a forthcoming Research Handbook; and by continuing to sponsor seminars on proposal writing. In addition, the Office is willing to assist with the steps involved in grant preparation by such means as discussion of an idea for a proposal, advice on budget matters, and securing letters of support from the administration.

Rapidly changing federal funding policies in Washington, accompanied by the shrinkage or elimination of programs which in part have provided a constant source of potential funding of research, creates

a new challenge for the Office for Research and Sponsored Programs in the 1980's. The research office must become more enterprising in seeking funds. That means more telephone calls, more trips, more creativity, and, obviously, more frustration. As the challenges increase and the opportunities diminish, the need for a university like Bradley to have an Office for Research and Sponsored Programs becomes even greater. It is evident from the increasing number of proposals submitted and the numbers funded that the Office has had an impact. In addition, it is clear to those who have championed the cause of research over the past years, that a positive feeling exists throughout the university community about the need to carry out research and seek external funding.

Early success in the Office has been gained through expected means: funded proposals for equipment and teacher-training programs. It is now apparent that an increasing number of individual researchers are seeking the services of the Office. And significantly, these faculty represent the breadth of the University, with proposals ranging from plant cancer research to humanistic research such as a major study entitled Monumenta Latina Rerum Mongolorum. Another noticeable effect is that the quality of proposals seeking internal funding has improved both in presentation and purpose. In a larger sense, Bradley faculty, professional staff, and administration are understanding the value of cooperative efforts to continue to improve the teaching function through making ongoing research and creative activities of the faculty possible and rewarding. Research and teaching are becoming practically and symbolically concomitant at Bradley. (It is not surprising that in the past couple of years university-sponsored awards for excellence in teaching and excellence in research have gone to the same faculty members.) Specifically, master's programs have gained funds for research assistants, equipment, teacher-training, and development. Finally, master's level education at Bradley has always been complementary to the undergraduate program. Through helping to bring to the campus projects which directly affect the development of all academic programs, the Graduate School has served to emphasize that role and to improve both the importance and the effectiveness of the Office to the entire University.

Faculty traffic is heavy in the Graduate School.

NOTE

The Office for Research and Sponsored Programs became a reality at Bradley in late fall of 1978. The authors have had responsibility for the operation. But it would not have been effective without the oversight of the Provost and Vice Presi-

dent for Academic Affairs, Dr. John C. Hitt, nor could it have survived without the enthusiastic participation of the faculty and professional staff. In the early stages, the Office also benefited greatly from the incisive consultation of Dr. Eric Rude, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, University of Wisconsin-Madison and Dr. William Koehler, Vice Chancellor and Dean of the University, Texas Christian University.



Forms and Forces Leading Toward Nontraditional Graduate Degree Programs

by John C. Guyon and Clive C. Veri

INTRODUCTION

As colleges and universities seek to become responsive to the graduate education needs of students or seek to meet the pressures of both internal and external constituencies, many institutions develop degree programs which, however labeled, fall within the generic definition of nontraditional education. The degree programs may be variations of existing curricula and course requirements, or they may be entirely new programs which are interdisciplinarily based. The degree programs may be identical to existing programs but offered at times and locations which are different than usual, or they may be existing degree programs which are offered through the use of various media rather than through face-to-face instruction.

Most colleges and universities which offer nontraditional degree programs are traditional institutions. Most nontraditional graduate degree programs, moreover,

have been modeled after nontraditional undergraduate degree programs.

In this article, a sampling of different nontraditional degree programs is presented. The forces which have led toward the development of these programs are examined and suggestions are offered which will place control of the development of nontraditional graduate programs within institutions rather than within exogenous bodies. Lastly, consideration is given to the future of graduate education and the role which rapidly expanding technologies may have in extending graduate education to people not now served by traditional institutions.

WHAT IS "NONTRADITIONAL?"

"Nontraditional education" has broad implications and means a variety of different things to those who use the term. The concept of a nontraditional degree program is a potent educational force in the United States at present and is one of the most discussed topics in American higher education. Traditional modes of education are being swept by this current of change.

John C. Guyon is Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research at Southern Illinois University - Carbondale. Clive C. Veri is Dean of the College of Continuing Education at Northern Illinois University.

The theme of the nontraditional degree programs is the apparent need to become more flexible about the ways educational opportunities are made available for varied populations, especially those who are not able to attend college in residence on a full-time basis. When people speak of nontraditional degrees or nontraditional education, they express concepts embodied in the phrases:

- open education
- off-campus credit courses
- extension education
- distance education
- non-resident education
- continuing education
- correspondence education
- independent study
- university without walls
- experiential education
- external degree
- competency based testing
- field-based education
- learning by wire
- education permanente

Thus, nontraditional education is composed of a number of methods, techniques and systems for delivering post-secondary education typically outside the physical confines of educational institutions. It may be delivering instruction on-campus through innovative means. It may be the certifying of past experiences for degree purposes. Nontraditional education may be learning experiences delivered by any method other than live, face-to-face instruction.

Generally speaking, nontraditional degree programs are recognized by one or more of the following major characteristics:

1. minimal or no residence
2. self-paced learning experiences
3. student-generated programs of study
4. assessment procedures for translating into academic credits what has been learned through career and life experiences
5. more flexible response to the transfer of prior college-level

credits, more flexible admissions standards, and more flexible course requirements leading toward a degree.

The Commission on Non-Traditional Study, sponsored by the College Entrance Examination Board and the Educational Testing Service and funded by the Carnegie Foundation, produced the definition which appears to be the one most often used and quoted:

...non-traditional study is more an attitude than a system and thus can never be defined except tangentially. This attitude puts the student first and the institution second, concentrates more on the former's need than the latter's convenience, encourages diversity of individual opportunity rather than uniform prescription, and deemphasizes time, space and even course requirements in favor of competence and, where applicable, performance... (Commission on Non-Traditional Study, p.xv.)

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The impact of the nontraditional degree movement has been and still is viewed by many authorities as a radical departure from traditional patterns of American higher education (Boone and Fox, p. 159). Close examination of the historical evolution of American higher education reveals that the nontraditional degree movement represents a logical and predictable development in the ongoing quest to integrate democratic ideals into educational practices.

Three philosophies have characterized the evolution of higher education in the United States. It has moved from an age of aristocracy, when higher education served an elite class, through an age of meritocracy, when ability became the basis for attending college or university, to modern higher education's search for the egalitarian ideal of education for all. The passing of each era has been marked by establishment of new types of institutions and new curricular patterns, reflecting new ideas about the nature of man, society, and the role of education in human and societal development.

Significant events, summarized by Boone and Fox (1979), in this developmental

process include the Morrill Act of 1862 establishing the land grant universities, the introduction of the elective system at Harvard in 1869, the rapid expansion of state university systems, and the establishment of the community college system. These changes constitute the historical foundations of the nontraditional degree movement and made its evolution almost inevitable.

MODELS OF NONTRADITIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS

In 1947, the University of Maryland was in the forefront of developing non-traditional degree programs when it contracted with the United States Armed Forces to offer degree courses for military and civilian personnel at off-campus locations in the District of Columbia area. Two years later that program was expanded to include locations in Europe before expanding to other countries on four continents (Gordon, p. 1).

In 1961, the University of Oklahoma became one of the first collegiate institutions to offer a national off-campus degree when it offered programs that enabled students to study where they lived, attending only brief seminars usually held on campus during summer months. The programs have continued and expanded since 1961 and have served as models for many similar programs in operation today.

During the late 1960's and early 1970's, the concept of nontraditional education was widely discussed and developed rapidly. It was felt that there should be more alternative avenues by which students could earn degrees or complete a major portion of their work for degrees, and that opportunities should be expanded to increase accessibility of higher education for those to whom it was not available because of work schedules, geographic locations or responsibilities in the home. It was also realized that there should be continued experimentation to seek better nontraditional programs that would minimize the traditional rigidities of campus life: space (residence on campus); time (prescribed years of study); and systems of academic accounting (credits for honor points earned).

It was during this late 1960's and early 1970's period that different terms for nontraditional education, mentioned earlier, were proposed. While the notions, terms, and directions for nontraditional education were being expressed by leading

spokesmen in higher education in the United States, a major effect was launched in England where the development of The British Open University took place. Originally referred to as "The University of the Air," the British Open University was planned during the 1960's. By 1971 it had attained full university status and a great deal of international attention. The

British Open University now represents the most ambitious effort yet attempted to harness the potential of radio and television, wed them to a system of independent study, and organize the program as a formal degree-granting operation.

Some American educators were interested in the British Open University and saw potential mutual benefits to be derived from American adoption of the open university system. There were many questions about the appropriateness of using British-designed learning experiences with American students and the academic efficacy of the open university concept which combines instruction by media with independent study, small group seminars and a faculty mentoring system. The British proved their system workable, however, and by the mid-1970's several respected American universities were adapting the system for use in the United States.

The University of Mid-America, an outgrowth of the pioneering State University of Nebraska, is now proposing the establishment of the American Open University patterned after the British Open University

. . . Graduate education . . . has moved much more slowly (than undergraduate education) . . .

concept (McNeil, 1981). There is little doubt that the questions of academic efficacy have been answered at the undergraduate level, where the use of nontraditional programming is becoming so commonplace as really not to be controversial any longer.

Graduate education, in its typically conservative fashion, has moved much more slowly. Certainly, there are institutions which offer sequenced courses of study at off-campus locations where graduate students can earn all of the requirements for master's degrees without ever having to visit the "home campus." Other institutions offer courses of study during weekends

on their campuses using regular, full-time faculty as instructors. Still others use temporary or adjunct faculties to teach in degree programs offered ten or a thousand miles from their home campuses. With a few notable exceptions, such as Nova University, almost all of these degree programs are at the master's level; they are taught on a face-to-face basis with a small portion (if any) of the learning experience including independent study; and the course content and curriculum is similar if not identical to that of the residential degree program. These degree programs at the master's level may seem to be nontraditional when, in fact, they only approach the commonly accepted definition of non-traditional education cited by the Commission on Non-Traditional Study.

. . . it will only be a matter of time until nontraditional graduate education will flourish. . .

It can safely be said, then, that non-traditional education is becoming an accepted "attitude" of institutions for the delivery of degree programs at the undergraduate level. The history of development of nontraditional undergraduate degree programs is now being rapidly paralleled at the master's degree level and it will only be a matter of time--a few short years--until nontraditional graduate education will flourish.

FORCES WHICH LEAD TOWARD THE DEVELOPMENT OF NONTRADITIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS

If an institution's faculty and administration themselves are to control the development of nontraditional graduate degree programs, it will be instructive to analyze the reasons why traditional institutions become interested in developing nontraditional degree programs. Or, stated another way, how are traditional institutions stimulated to serve place-bound learners with nontraditional degree programs?

In the University of Maryland case, the administration was urged by clients to develop its overseas program for armed forces officers who had simply started taking extension courses at the Pentagon during the World War II years and wanted to complete their degree programs wherever

they were sent in the world. Maryland's University College--a financially self-supporting operation--was envisioned as a future market and dependable source of income through meeting the continuing education needs of armed forces personnel. The College at one time served some 60,000 enrollments a year throughout the world and rightfully boasted that "The Sun Never Sets on Our Campus."

As an interesting historical note, University College was among the first American colleges to import the British Open University system into the United States. Currently, the University of Maryland is one of the major institutions which is providing leadership for the delivery of adapted British Open University courses throughout the United States via television with the assistance of the National University Consortium for Telecommunications in Teaching.

The Oklahoma Bachelor of Liberal Studies program was started as a variation on the Maryland theme. The Oklahoma program had developed an excellent reputation for serving the Air Force's Strategic Air Command installations with courses for credit and degree programs on the Maryland model--sending in the main regularly appointed professors to teach typical campus classes in remote locations. Oklahoma also had a conference center and, as a result of past experiences and recognized needs, ultimately combined independent study with short residential experiences in the center. Thus, Oklahoma started its nontraditional Bachelor of Liberal Studies degree program.

Several other universities, including the University of Northern Colorado, Tulsa University, and Southern Illinois University, developed variations of the Maryland-Oklahoma models which combined short residential experiences in the students' cities of residence with independent study. Inspired largely by the Federal government, this program was called the "University Without Walls"--frequently funded by government contracts.

The British Open University's inspiration was largely politically based; it was designed in the populist movement of correcting Britain's historical error of providing higher education only to the elite of society. How to educate the masses? The British Open University elected to adopt the only logical method of teaching hundreds of thousands of people by using the mass media as a delivery

system. On balance, while the initial start up costs are very expensive--as the State University of Nebraska and now the University of Mid-America have found--the use of mass media, combined with independent study and a faculty mentoring system, is a cost beneficial way of educating large numbers of people.

The development of Empire State College and the New York State Board of Regents External Degree programs are worthy of mention here in order to understand fully the forces which lead toward developing nontraditional degree programs. Empire State College was stimulated by State University of New York administrators as a way first, of getting the lethargic giant of their system to develop innovative delivery systems in educating people and second, as a political response to the Regents External Degree movement. It was only natural that the Regent's external degree--the validation of learning and resultant award of a college degree--was an outgrowth of the Regent's long history in testing high school students and awarding Regent's high school diplomas. That the Regents and State University of New York systems seem frequently to be at loggerheads suggests that the Regent's external degree program may have been a political strategy to force the State University of New York to become responsive to the educational needs of new learners.

The fleshing out of the skeletal history of the development of nontraditional degree programs leads to the belief there are several reasons why traditional institutions offer themselves (their courses, their faculty and their degree programs) to clientele through different delivery systems. These motivations, urged primarily by external stimuli, include the following:

- clientele demands
- financial need of institutions
- governing board stimuli
- Federal government and philanthropic foundation initiatives through funding opportunities
- state legislative action
- administrative vision of meeting the continuing education needs of new learners or, on occasion, administrative vision of an undesirable future.

While almost all of the degree programs described are at the baccalaureate level, the inspiration for these programs

. . . (certain forces) will cause colleges and universities to offer a set of educational options to graduate students. . .

is instructive for institutions of higher learning, their graduate deans and faculty members. This is the same inspiration which will cause universities to become proactive in offering graduate degrees differently than they have in the past. These are the same forces which will cause colleges and universities to offer a set of educational options to graduate students--largely place-bound, working adults--who cannot, or will not, pursue degree programs in residence and on campus.

In studying the history of nontraditional degree programs, it is difficult, if not impossible, to find a single case in the movement which has been stimulated by faculty. This, too, should be instructive to faculty and administrators who seek to have their institutions offer education differently than in the past for, if faculty and administrators with vision do not foster the development of nontraditional graduate degree programs with a set of high academic standards, one of the other forces pointed out will.

How do higher education institutions avoid exogenous bodies forcing the development of nontraditional graduate degree programs? First, institutions must work together within the states to avoid unnecessary and unwise duplication in offering graduate outreach degree programs in order to keep statewide coordinating boards from stepping in and solving these problems in ways institutions will not find tolerable. Second, it is clearly in the best interests of institutions to cooperate with coordinating boards in the development of consortial arrangements in operating outreach centers. There must be a start in working together to deliver

. . . programs must be designed. . . to make androgogs out of pedagogs

cost-effective, high quality degree

programs which, when resources are combined, will better meet the needs of part-time students than through independent action. Third, ways must be found to provide library, research and computing facilities, as well as advising services, for off-campus populations of learners who can study only part time and off campus as they seek to earn graduate degrees. Fourth, mechanisms must be developed to protect the quality and academic integrity of graduate degree programs and to prevent losing sight of the fact that "learning is more than earning a living." Fifth, programs must be designed which will reorient and redevelop faculty to become mentors and facilitators of adult learners--to make androgogs out of pedagogs--to be concerned less with teaching, per se, and more with the art and science of helping adults to learn. Lastly, the authority, responsibility, and sometimes inane requirements of professional accrediting associations which severely limit the authority of faculty, deans, provosts, presidents and trustees in the administration of our institutions must be challenged.

These half-dozen "musts" will solve some of the vexing problems which graduate institutions will face tomorrow. For tomorrow's tomorrow--the long range future--the very question of survivability of graduate degree programs as they are now known must be faced.

THE ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY IN GRADUATE EDUCATION

. . . Will institutions be able to face the technological advances with which they might very well have to cope (in graduate education)? . . .

The present problems of nontraditional degree programs and the forces by which such programs thrive will have become minor concerns by the year 2000. Will institutions be able to face the technological advances with which they might very well have to cope?

1. What will be the role of students, faculty and graduate deans in the full-scale use of computers in the teaching-learning transaction?

2. How will videodisc lectures and demonstrations delivered at low cost in students' homes be utilized effectively?
3. How will interactive cable television systems be used to share instruction and research libraries with students outside of the campus environment?
4. Will the two-way, interactive videotex system supplant face-to-face graduate instruction in the year 2000?
5. Will institutions be ready to accommodate to a nationally-based graduate program which telecasts several courses at the same time via satellite for reception in students' living rooms or neighborhood learning centers?
6. Will colleges and universities willingly accept, as transfer credit into degree programs, the academic credit from several institutions which have been data-banked at the American Open University? Offer credit for experience at the graduate level? Continue to use "credit" as the currency of accomplishment at universities?
7. Will institutions be ready to admit the labor-intensive and high salary cost of education will force us into a technologically-based delivery system? Will institutions, in fact, be able to maintain "campus" as it is known today, given that exponentially rising energy costs are already causing some campuses to operate only four days a week? When will it become three days a week?
8. And, too, will educators be ready to see the dehumanization of education, devoid of human interaction and the synthesis-analysis-valuation process which graduate professors now provide students?

You may say, "Technology will never take over the graduate classroom!" May you be right! These are very different prospects for traditionalists to ponder, but they do provide the questions for a scenario of what institutions of higher education could become in the year 2000 and beyond.

SUMMARY

"Nontraditional education is more an attitude than a system. . ." to quote the Commission on Non-Traditional Study. It has been attempted here to identify briefly a few of the models of nontraditional education, largely at the undergraduate level, in order to point out models which may be developed at the graduate level. Having analyzed the forces which provided an impetus for the development of non-traditional degrees, ways in which institutions should be able to retain control of their futures have been suggested. Lastly, it is acknowledged that technological developments may have a decided impact upon the long-range future of graduate education, but questions only have been asked, however, since the scenario remains to be written.

REFERENCES

- Baldi, Victor H. "External Degree Programs." North Central Association Quarterly, 51(1976): 275-279.
- Boone, Edgar J. and R. D. Fox "A Historical and Philosophical Perspective on the External Degree." Peabody Journal of Education, 56(1979): 159-166.
- Commission on Non-Traditional Study. Diversity by Design. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.
- Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. A Taxonomy for Classification and Determination of the Nontraditional Nature of Postsecondary Education Institutions. Report No. 7, September, 1978.
- Feather, Frank, Ed. Through the 80's: Thinking Globally, Acting Locally. Washington, D. C.: World Future Society, 1980.
- Gordon, Linda W. On-Campus/Off-Campus Degree Programs for Part-Time Students. Washington, D. C.: National University Extension Association, 1976.
- Hartnett, Rodney T. The British Open University in the United States: Adaptation and Use in Three Universities. New Jersey: Educational Testing Services, 1974.

Houle, Cyril L. The External Degree. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1973.

McNeil, Donald R. Plan for the American Open University. Mimeographed. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Mid-America, 1981.

Perry, W. The Open University. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

Toffler, Alvin. The Third Wave. New York: William Morrow and Co., 1980.



Graduate Education--A Career Education Thrust

by David V. Tiedeman

Graduate Education

About a decade ago I sat in an audience of proud parents and relatives as President Leonard Carmichael called their progeny to center stage in clusters and bestowed the degrees of Tufts University upon its graduates, cluster by cluster. I heartfully applauded my son as he went forward in his cluster to receive his bachelor's degree. He deserved credit for earning that degree through his hard work. I honored him as he honored me in his walk to the rostrum.

As I applauded, I noted that President Carmichael referred to the bachelor's group which he summoned to the rostrum as first degree holders. However, the impact of Carmichael's usage of "first degree" didn't sink in for me until the offspring of some of the other proud parents began being summoned to the rostrum to receive what Carmichael referred to as second and third degrees.

Aside from the fact that I was momentarily struck by the humor of a doctor being given the "third degree," President Carmichael's usage of three stages in a university's degrees then started to work in me. I had always myself been conscious that I entered a different level of understanding and capability as I advanced from the high school to college and then on to the degrees of bachelor, master, and doctor. Each degree accelerated my self conception a notch in my notion of the mind at work

in universe. I was therefore glad that the President of a major University affirmed that a master was comprehensively different from a bachelor and that a doctor was comprehensively different from either. That difference provides good structure for my consideration of career education in graduate education. But first let's stipulate some simple assumptions about graduate education.

It is my presumption, as it was President Carmichael's, that graduate education exists to qualify persons to master a speciality and/or to doctor at least one. The third university degree can, of course, be won without qualifying for the second degree. That is, doctoring something seems to assume specialized knowledge needed in what one doctors but not that that something necessarily be certified as a master's degree. Graduate education is also offered with assumption that some general education with an initial specialization has occurred in undergraduate education. Graduate education, therefore, normally takes a progressive stance in furthering the mind's career. Graduate education provides both the second and third university degrees (or stages) in the development of the mind in humankind's pursuit of consciousness.

The Career in Graduate Education

As soon as an educational institution decides to be school-like in any degree, the institution effectively takes responsibility for only a part of the human career. The educational institution has done so because it then stipulates certain requirements for the mind stages of its students upon admission and advertises certain promises to students and society about the

David V. Tiedeman is Executive Director of the National Institute for the Advancement of Career Education, University of Southern California.

mind actions of its graduates. The educational institution thereby essentially solidifies its own external manifestation of a part of the human career, the part for which the educational institution effectively elects to account to student and society.

Since all the graduate education known by the writer is administered through graduate schools, all graduate education is schooling. In making this assertion, it is fully understood that there takes place in the United States a considerable amount of postgraduate schooling and education not called graduate education. Such postgraduate study (and personally monitored experience) is not called graduate education simply because society has given graduate schools a monopoly on the term graduate education. If graduate schools will not offer graduate credit for study and experience after the bachelors degree, it simply is then not called graduate education.

Persons who are interested in careers, particularly their own careers, cannot afford to be as myopic about their postgraduate study and experience as graduate

. . .the graduate school has one impression of the student's career and the student has another impression. . .

schools ordinarily are. Such persons simply have to conceive what they feel, organize, and intuit in developmental schemes of their own or live without thought about themselves. Most people so conceive their own careers and then enroll in graduate schools to do something about those conceptions. There they meet the graduate school in a situation where the graduate school has one impression of the student's career and the student has another impression. A highly improbable event occurs when these two have semblance of identity. Similarity? Perhaps. Identity? Probably never.

The essence of the unknown-to-the other part in the association of personal and publicly specified career is non-identity. There is always some non-identity of the two conceptions which the student and institution experience while the student studies in the institution and the institution and the student weigh

whether the student is "qualified" or not. Furthermore, there is ordinarily even more non-identity in what the institution imagines the student will do in the work career and what the student actually does over extended periods of time.

Toward Consciousness of Career Education in Graduate Education*

Those of us who are interested in career education are interested in all the above three effects of individual and institutional meeting in graduate school: (1) the externally defined graduate study and work career; and (2) the association of the school's externally defined career image and the student's personal one as that association in turn reflects into (3) the association of the school's externally defined image of the student's work upon graduation and the graduate's actual work career. Let's turn then to a two-part career education context within which these conditions can be examined: (1) the school's view; and (2) the person's view.

The School's View

In graduate schools offering instruction both for the masters and the doctors degrees, each of those two external career paths potentially manifest in the three phases which Miller-Tiedeman and the writer (Tiedeman and Miller-Tiedeman, 1976) specify as a general career education model for adults: namely, (1) accommodation of the decision to be in the graduate school; (2) choice of studies in the graduate program; and (3) decision to make one or more moves into useful activities following graduation. In addition to having at least both of these forms of decision development with which to contend in a graduate school offering both masters and doctors degrees, such graduate schools can also anticipate that some of their students will switch from the masters to the doctors track and sometimes the reverse as well. In switching from one to another degree track, the interaction of the two decisions merely adds variety to the institution's decision possibilities; the inter-

*Expanded version of this section available upon request to David V. Tiedeman, NIACE/USC, P.O. Box 77963, Los Angeles, CA 90007-0963.

action does not, of course, eliminate presence of the basic two-phase decision frame.

The Person's View

From the student's standpoint, all decisions have, in potential, an accommodation phase. In addition, the anticipatory phase has, in potential, the aspects of exploration, crystallization, choice, and clarification. Furthermore, the accommodation phase has, in potential the aspects of induction, reformation, and integration. These phases and aspects are idealized forms of consciousness which humans are capable of materializing while deciding (see Tiedeman and O'Hara, 1963). However, not all humans use all phases and aspects in each decision. Furthermore, not all humans do what is possible with sets of these decisions, namely to put them together into continually clarifying experience as one decision unfolds into another and as each leaves telltales capable of instructing the individuals when they pause and examine personal experience. Finally, relatively few humans do what can be done as they prove able to engage in the experiencing of anticipatory action with clear identification of its four mind-set variations (exploration, crystallization, choice, and clarification) as those mind-sets flash on and off during thought about the future. What humans can do is to anticipate the future with enough vividness and belief for them to stake their present upon such visions.

. . .we must emphasize innovative education rather than maintenance schooling and stress anticipation and participation during schooling. . .

Botkin, Elmandjra and Malitza (1979) make the need for such a human state quite clear in No Limits to Learning. According to these authors, we must emphasize innovative education rather than maintenance schooling and stress anticipation and participation during schooling if we are to close the now widely growing human gap between today's global problematique and citizens' capac-

ities to deal with that world problematique, the fact that we are living beyond the globe's present capacity to support us for ever in present consciousness state. It would seem that graduate schools would be clamoring to lead this evolution. But the writer fails to find them doing so. Instead graduate schools are doing maintenance kinds of things ever more carefully and clearly, little realizing the now validated principle of dissipative structures (Ferguson, 1980; Prigogine, 1980) to the effect that, as systems become more coherent, they become less stable. This is the consequence from individual action which graduate schools can anticipate from their actions to make requirements ever clearer to students and to make evaluation of students ever more rigorous. The graduate schools may well thereby become more coherent, but they will also become more unstable in their society. Thus, graduate schools could well afford to infuse career education and benefit from the heavy dash of anticipatory and participatory learning which career education seasons into any form of schooling. Such seasoning will cultivate the personal responsibility and action which our globe so badly needs at this juncture in its evolution toward an educated, not just a schooled, citizenry.

The Thrust of Career Education in Graduate Education

At present the writer feels that the "thrust" of career education in graduate

. . .the virtual lack of a career education "thrust" in graduate education is due to its "blindness" to career education. . .

education is so small as to be more like the pinprick of a balloon which is administered so lightly it hasn't even popped the balloon as yet. And that certainly falls far short of anything which might be considered a "thrust."

Actually, it seems that the virtual lack of a career education "thrust" in graduate education is due to its "blindness" to career education. We in career education know what is needed and we are able to produce what we seek whenever

graduate faculty members as a whole gain sufficient personal courage to turn their present graduate schools into graduate educational resource centers. Career education isn't in graduate education very deeply neither because career isn't a clear conception to its educators nor because education isn't understood by many of them as different from schooling. Instead, career education isn't very deeply infused into graduate education simply because graduate institutions continue to be schools; graduate schools simply lack the courage as organizations to become graduate educational institutions.

This condition seriously blocks a whole societal transformation which is needed with regard to education (see Botkin, Elmandjra and Malitza, 1979). For better or for worse (the writer presently thinks almost for worse), our graduate institutions sit at the apex of the pyramid of schools. For better or worse, graduate school visions of disciplines therefore filter down into college, secondary and elementary schooling in order to give them factory-like structures (Toffler, 1980) in the general societal enterprise of producing scholarly "automatons" in specialities defined as today's scholarly "gods" dictate (Fuller, 1981). The writer sometimes despairs of what good can be done for education (to say nothing of career education) in elementary and secondary schools when it appears the structural deficit between schooling and education which is occasioned by our present reverence for "scholarship" and our present dislike of "careership" in our supposedly open society. Where has the trust of personal judgment gone in the United States? Has any graduate educator seen such trust lately? The writer hasn't. In fact, the seeds of distrust of personal judgment seem everywhere in graduate schools.

In 1977, several colleagues and the writer optimistically issued a report to what subsequently became the Illinois State Board of Education. That report was blithely entitled Towards the Career Education of All Educational Personnel in Illinois. The writer still thinks that his good NIU friend, Edward J. McCormack, and he combined with quite an effective set of career education thinkers in that report to offer higher education in Illinois a considerable vision of what it

might become were it to enlarge its purpose from only schooling to include educating--that is if higher education in Illinois were to help the processes of schooling and of education become one in each student.

It should come as little surprise that the report suffers the fate of most reports--on a shelf and overlooked. Faculty members in colleges and graduate schools will have to change their own perspectives on what they do in their schools before the recommended transformation can take root. The seeds of necessary change exist in the minds of the faculty members in all graduate schools. We are all atunable in universe. But the graduate institution itself must change through its members before the needed structural shift can occur in schools (kindergarten through graduate school) to make career in education anything but a concept which is much to be desired and little to be observed.

The writer's presence in the directorship of the National Institute for the Advancement of Career Education since the beginning of 1981 certainly indicates that at sixty-two he is either a slow learner or an eternal optimist. He inclines to the latter view and thinks that the model of "layered" education as detailed in the ISBE report noted above, if facilitated as innovative learning (Botkin, Elmandjra, Malitza, 1979) according to McCormack's model of advising, could work with students of all kinds and of all ages, not just with educational personnel being tutored in career education concepts. Furthermore, the stream of personal and social transformation presently runs deep among us humans even though relatively silently. Those who doubt really owe themselves reading the references identified by asterisks at the conclusion of this article.

Such reading offers a norm against which the present curriculum in undergraduate and graduate education can be measured. A contrast such as that should make it quite apparent that in postgraduate education we emphasize specialization in smaller and smaller segments of the mind in universe to the detriment of perpetual personal aspiration towards mind expansion, integration of person and universe, and the advance of the human career in consciousness.

REFERENCES

The authors listed above, whatever the diversity of their emphases, share an intuitive conviction that humankind has spiraled upward in quality and quantity of consciousness to a stage in which evolution for some humans now transpires socio-psychologically, not just through genetic spontaneity. With evolution of the human career presently so far advanced socio-psychologically, it is a travesty on our society's support of its graduate schools that we keep the presumed epitome of learning—graduate education—fixed in the state of its disciplines and their instructional organizations of the moment. Today's need for attack upon comprehensive galactic tasks which are undertaken comprehensively in incisive detail presently far outstrips present graduate school specialization and organization (Fuller, 1981; Botkin, Elmandjra, and Malitza, 1979).

Career education presently relates to graduate education as a mere balloon prick of force unable even to burst the balloon because graduate schools presently fail to advance the human career as needed. America therefore cannot advance the career part of education through its Institute for presumably doing so until American citizens in the private sector unite to advance their graduate education as it needs to be thrust forward. Furthermore, we cannot advance the education part of career education until American citizens in the private sector unite to advance graduate education from graduate schooling.

The straight facts of today's sorry showing of career education in graduate education seems to be that we presently let our graduate schools top off individual careers because the graduate schools remain insensitive and unresponsive to developing human career consciousness presently under acceleration. It is really time to advance in graduate education. Lead time inhering in the world problematique is indeed short. Therefore let's really thrust career education into graduate education and learn how to live with it, not to kill it before it has chance to take hold as we presently do with our non-comprehensively oriented professorial advisement, career counseling, and placement segments of what could spark into a comprehensive program of career education if understood and strongly backed in graduate school.

- Bentov, Itzhak. Stalking the Wild Pendulum. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1977.
- *Botkin, James W.; Elmandjra, Mahdi; and Malitza, Mircea. No Limits to Learning Briding the Human Gap. New York: Pergamon Press, 1979.
- *Feather, Frank. (ed.) Through the '80s: Thinking Globally, Acting Locally. Washington, D.C.: World Future Society, 1980.
- *Ferguson, Marilyn. The Aquarian Conspiracy: Personal and Social Transformation in the 1980s. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980.
- *Fuller, R. Buckminster. Critical Path. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981.
- *Hofstadter, Douglas R. Godel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- *Jaynes, Julian. The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976.
- Prigogine, Ilya. From Being to Becoming: Time and Complexity in the Physical Sciences. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1980.
- *Servan-Schreiber, Jean-Jacques. The World Challenge. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1980.
- *Thomas, Lewis. The Lives of a Cell. New York: Bantam Books, 1974.
- Tiedeman, David V. Toward the Career Education of All Educational Personnel in Illinois. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education, 1977.
- Tiedeman, David V.; and Miller-Tiedeman, Anna. Adult Career Education Model Thresholds, 1976, 2 (1), 20-22.
- Tiedeman, David V.; and O'Hara, Robert P. Career Development: Choice and Adjustment. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1963.
- *Toffler, Alvin. The Third Wave. New York: William Morrow, 1980.
- *Zukav, Gary. The Dancing Wu-Li Masters: An Overview of the New Physics. New York: William Morrow, 1979.



An Opinion on Graduate Study in Professional Education

by James A. Rutledge

In this article the writer offers an opinion concerning certain elements of graduate study in professional education generated out of twenty-seven years of involvement in various ways in that field, including about twelve years of graduate school administration.

The field of graduate study in professional education may be identified in simplified fashion as that field of study at post-baccalaureate level concerned with the principles and practice of teaching and learning. Thus identified, this field constitutes an important aspect of graduate education in the United States, from the standpoints of numbers of graduate students involved, graduate degrees conferred annually and numbers of faculty members concerned with elements of the programs for such degrees.

Although assailed from some quarters as credentialism involving the development of degree programs whose substance is questionable and whose rigor is suspect, the field of graduate study in professional education has developed and maintained important stature in many universities. This field has developed as a result of the expressed needs of practitioners and researchers in professional education, as well as of the institutions and organizations they serve. Their requests have been for advanced work and special preparation beyond that possible in the time restrictions of the initial four years of baccalaureate preparation. This work has

. . .As the body of educational research expands, expertise in practice grows and various educational specializations continue to develop and differentiate, the needs increase to provide advanced work. . .

proved to be of sufficient magnitude to demand the equivalent of one, two, and for some work, even three years of graduate study for its completion.

As the body of educational research expands, expertise in practice grows and various educational specializations continue to develop and further differentiate, the needs increase to provide advanced work through organized graduate programs in the field of professional education together with the conferring of appropriate graduate degrees upon the completion of such programs. The alternative of turning over the function of post-baccalaureate preparation in professional education to some agencies or organizations other than the established universities does not seem desirable from the standpoints of academic quality, the best interests of the profession or financial economy.

But does there now exist in the universities the best organization and array of graduate programs necessary to prepare persons for service in the field of professional education? If not, what are desirable changes that should be wrought? Within the space limitations of this article only one basic problem can be dealt with.

Traditional degrees — exemplified by the Master of Arts and the Doctor of

James A. Rutledge is a Professor of Leadership and Educational Policy Studies at Northern Illinois University and a former Graduate School administrator.

Philosophy — are conferred by some universities at the satisfactory culmination of appropriate programs of graduate study in professional education, ostensibly retaining with some minor variations the typical requirements for these degrees. For a variety of reasons, however, degrees with designations specific to professional education have for some time been conferred by a substantial number of universities. The Master of Education, the Doctor of Education, and the intermediate advanced degree of Education Specialist are illustrative. In some universities these are the only graduate degrees available for work in professional education. Among the reasons for the specific professional degrees being offered has been the misgivings of campus graduate faculty bodies and administrators concerning the appropriateness of traditional degrees for graduate study in an applied field such as education. Another cogent reason, especially with regard to the Doctor of Education degree, has been the desire of education faculties to secure greater flexibility in areas such as program specifics, research topics and procedures, residency, and foreign language or "research tool" requirements to meet more effectively the needs they perceive for this special category of graduate student.

Masters degrees have in many universities lost the standardized form which was once prevalent and have proliferated so many options and program alternatives as to permit great flexibility under a variety of masters degree designations. Thus providing for the needs of professional educators can be carried out through a variety of masters degree programs with considerable program flexibility and without creating undue concern on the part of campus graduate faculty and administrators. The Education Specialist degree currently provides recognition in some universities for completion of a planned program equivalent to a second year of graduate study beyond the baccalaureate degree, built on the masters degree and sometimes including a research component. Its purpose needs clarification and wider acceptance, and the requirements to achieve it need further consideration, development and standardization. The importance to the profession of this degree is difficult to assess and its future seems to the writer to be uncertain.

The Doctor of Education degree, in those universities in which it is offered, is sometimes not understood by the university graduate faculty, does not seem to have a clear purpose, gives rise to research which is sometimes compared unfavorably to the research done for the Doctor of Philosophy degree, and is looked at askance as it competes with the traditional graduate degree programs for scarce resources. It has been common to view the Doctor of Education degree as a university award culminating academic preparation for professional practice in the field of education, as differentiated from academic preparation for research, the avowed primary purpose of the Doctor of Philosophy degree programs. However, this distinction is not clearly drawn, since in a number of universities both degrees are not available in the field of education, and hybridized degree programs purporting to prepare for both professional practice and research are the alternative. Presently the roles which recipients of one or the other of these degrees are called upon to play in their various positions do not clearly fit into categories of research or practice. For example, many recipients of Doctor of Education degrees find themselves in academic positions in which they are ex-

. . . The lack of differentiation between the Doctor of Philosophy and the Doctor of Education in the field of professional education has led to confusion... . . .

pected to function in much the same way as holders of traditional research doctorates. In the university in which the writer works, well over half of the graduate faculty in the education departments hold the professional doctorate as their terminal degree.

The lack of differentiation between the Doctor of Philosophy and the Doctor of Education in the field of professional education has led to confusion that the writer believes is at the heart of criticism and misunderstanding of the purpose and function of doctoral degrees in education. It is the opinion of the writer that both the traditional Doctor of Philosophy degree and the professional Doctor of Education degree should be

available in every university offering doctoral level study in the field of education. There should be a sharp delineation of the purpose of the respective degrees and individual degree programs should be designed to that end. Attempts to prepare for both excellence in research and excellence in practice for each degree candidate should cease. It was never possible!

The widely recognized traditional requirements should prevail unmodified for the Doctor of Philosophy in the field of education. It should be the degree sought by the scholar in education who is preparing for a career in which research activity is a central factor. Such careers might include teaching and carrying out fundamental research in education in a university setting or research planning and leadership in a large school system or state department of education. Selection procedures for those entering such a program should be designed to permit choosing a limited number of those with notable scholarly attributes, a research-oriented background and personal inclination and at least some strength of preparation in education-related fields such as sociology, psychology, and anthropology. The doctoral program for the Doctor of Philosophy in education should include a

substantial amount of cognate work in one or more traditional disciplines related to professional education, and the fraction of the post-masters credit allocated to dissertation research should be at least one-third and preferably more.

Graduate study for the Doctor of Education degree should be reserved for the academically qualified career practitioner who has demonstrated exceptional aptitude for professional practice in education, and whose ultimate professional employment may reasonably be expected to be at a level requiring extensive preparation and one or more specializations attainable through doctoral study. There should be freedom to develop for this practitioner a doctoral program with reasonable flexibility permitting research of an applied nature and freed from emulation of the research component required for the Doctor of Philosophy degree. However, it is the opinion of the writer that freedom and flexibility can be abused with respect to this degree and that the perception of the degree in academe and its stature among practitioners could be enhanced by the development of a new and timely set of definitive standards agreed to by the profession, endorsed by the appropriate professional bodies in the field, and widely disseminated in the academic world and in the profession.



TO OUR READERS:

This issue of Thresholds is one of the many contributions that Dr. James A. Rutledge, former Dean of the Graduate School at Northern Illinois University, Professor of Education, member of the Thresholds in Education Foundation Board of Directors, and Issue Editor, has made to the educational community. We thank him for these contributions and wish him well on his retirement.

THE EXECUTIVE EDITORS

**THRESHOLDS IN EDUCATION
P.O. BOX 771
DEKALB, IL 60115**

**NON PROFIT ORGANIZATION
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
PERMIT 120
DEKALB, ILLINOIS 60115**