



CLASP 2012: Summary

October 2012

Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
CLASP 2012	4
Admissions and Recruitment	4
Student Funding.....	5
Time to Degree.....	8
“Success Cases”: Additional Topics of Interest	12
Departmental Reports: Additional Topics of Interest.....	13
Reporting: Where Do We Go from Here?.....	14
Appendix A: CLASP Meetings, 2012, Departmental Report Instructions	15
Appendix B: Competing Programs	17
Appendix C: Graduate Student Recruitment Offers, 2006-2011	18

Tables

Table 1: Multi-year offers by number of years	6
Table 2: Amount of stipends in dollars, 2006-2012	7
Table 3: “Seven Plus” cases by cohort year	11
Table 4: Departmental distribution of “Seven Plus” cases	12
Table B1: Competing programs as referenced in departmental reports	17
Table C1: Multi-year offers by duration and gender	18

Executive Summary

The 2012 College of Liberal Arts Strategic Planning (CLASP) meetings focused on graduate programs. Degree granting departments, programs, and centers submitted written reports and met with the deans in spring and summer 2012. The full-length CLASP report includes a detailed summary of issues raised in the course of CLASP 2012, and information about the college and its graduate programs. Here we offer a summary of findings and recommendations about admissions and recruitment, student funding, and time to degree.

Admissions and recruitment: CLASP 2012 brought to light the goal of departments to recruit from top undergraduate and M.A. programs and their struggles to compete with other top schools that offer more robust funding packages. In response, the college will use \$20,000 as its benchmark for a full-year fellowship stipend as of the next recruitment season. The analysis of CLASP information suggests that we should increase summer funding for Ph.D. students, which can be a deciding factor at recruitment. The deans recognize the importance of the early announcement of awards and timely distribution of graduate funding resources, and the college will make this information known to departments as early as possible, working with the Office of Graduate Studies (OGS) to secure coordination of funding announcements. The college encourages departments and centers to commit to multi-year funding explicitly at recruitment, and Liberal Arts Business Affairs is working with departmental graduate coordinators to develop an instrument that will allow departments to monitor their commitments better.

Student funding: The assumption reflected in CLASP 2012 about student funding was that we should fund all doctoral students, and that we fall significantly short of doing so, which hurts us in both recruitment and reputation. With all current resources available to us, combined, we can fund approximately 1,000 students per year. A strategic and realistic approach to student funding at both the college and department levels must prioritize funding Ph.D. students while further reducing cohorts and increasing grant-based funding. Smaller cohorts allow departments to make more competitive offers, and the college will continue in its effort to reduce the overall number of graduate students, with the goal of reaching a steady state of 1,300 students. Students and faculty should work with the expectation that funding will be based on a mixed model, involving more than one type and source. All commitments

made to students must include, and clearly articulate, a contingency for termination of funding as the result of inadequate progress.

Time to degree: Time to degree is broadly accepted as a criterion in the national evaluation of graduate programs, and the college, much like the university as a whole, is under increased pressure to reduce time to degree for doctoral students. With diminishing resources and ongoing pressures from the job market, it is our goal to assure that students complete their training in a timely manner and graduate as soon as they are ready, not prolonging their stay in graduate programs beyond what is necessary for their training. CLASP 2012 reflects increased awareness and buy-in within departments when it comes to time to degree. In light of CLASP reports and analysis of data on time to degree within the college, the goal of the college is to reach by 2017 a college average of 6.5 years to Ph.D., two years to M.A., and 1.5 years to exiting with no degree. The college will continue to monitor closely the manner in which individual departments manage time to degree, with efforts directed at significant reduction in the number of outliers that increase the departmental average time to degree.

While reporting in preparation for future CLASP meetings will involve other issues, departments should expect regular exchanges regarding these and other issues involving graduate students, among them placement and professional development. The college will coordinate its efforts with OGS and the Provost's office as it seeks to collect and make available information about its graduate programs.

CLASP 2012

The 2012 College of Liberal Arts Strategic Planning (CLASP) meetings focused on graduate programs, specifically on **admissions and recruitment**, **student funding**, and **time to degree**.¹ This report highlights common themes from CLASP reports and meetings, and establishes the expectations of the college for the upcoming years. These expectations, and other comments on issues raised during the meetings, appear in italics within the narrative. We also make references to themes emerging from “success cases” narratives included in departmental CLASP reports.²

Admissions and Recruitment

In their CLASP reports, 12 of our reporting units mentioned the importance of recruiting students from top undergraduate or M.A. programs. A concern raised in all but two of the narratives and conversations was the weakness of the University of Texas at Austin funding offers relative to those of competing programs.³ This weakness was noted in terms of the size of our offers and the availability of fellowship years that students could use for research or dissertation writing. A minimum stipend in the vicinity of \$20,000 was the consensus in discussions regarding competitive support levels that would enhance our success in recruitment. Another issue of concern was the late announcement of awards, which puts The University at a disadvantage in terms of recruitment.

The college will use \$20,000 as its benchmark for a full-year fellowship stipend as of the next recruitment season.

We recognize the importance of the early announcement of awards and timely distribution of graduate funding resources. The college will make this information known to departments as early as possible, and is working with the Office of Graduate Studies (OGS) to secure adequate timing of OGS funding announcements.

Success cases in admissions and recruitment: Targeting better-prepared students for recruitment – for example, students with an M.A., developed foreign language skills, fieldwork experience, or grant-writing experience – and making strong funding offers appeared in the narratives as keys to successful recruitment. Sustained contact with designated faculty members throughout the recruitment process,

¹ See *Appendix A* for the instructions on preparing the CLASP report.

² Our goal in asking for “success cases” was to create the basis for a college narrative on what departments view as success in recruitment, funding, and time to degree. We received information on 69 success cases, but departments reported on these cases with less focus than we had hoped, creating a mix of the three areas with placement (in 64% of the cases reported) and other indicators of success.

³ For competing programs see *Appendix B*.

the strength of the faculty, and the general departmental atmosphere were also mentioned in the narratives, at times in the context of compensating for the impediment of low funding offers.

The ability to make better recruitment offers was a common theme in narratives addressing the question of where the unit sees itself in five years. 12 of the units mentioned an increase in the number of recruits as a goal for that time period.

The college will continue its effort to reduce the number of graduate students, with the goal of reaching a steady state of 1,300 students. Successful recruitment is directly linked to competitive offers, which, in turn, depend on smaller cohorts, especially when funding is tight. Improved time to degree will allow for some growth in recruitment, as the exit of more students will allow us to increase the number of admissions offers.

Student Funding

The assumption reflected in the CLASP reports and conversations was that we should fund all our doctoral students, and that we fall significantly short of doing so, which hurts us in both recruitment and reputation. The importance of summer funding was also noted in most of the conversations, and units seem to be increasing their efforts to provide such support which, in most cases, entails relatively small amounts (\$2,000-\$5,000).

*With all current resources available to us, combined, we can fund approximately 1,000 students per year. The gap between that and our desired steady state will not be closed without a massive fundraising effort, which, even if successful, will not bring us to a full funding model. A strategic approach to student funding at both the college and department levels and realistic funding goals must assume **funding Ph.D. students as a priority, further reduction of cohorts, and an increase in grant based funding**. Students and faculty must work with the expectation that funding will be based on a mixed model, involving more than one type/source, and could, at times, be partial (e.g., tuition assistance benefit as opposed to full tuition).*

Departments noted the significant role of signature courses in funding graduate students, and the price of having to adjust departmental curricula as the result of faculty engagement with signature courses.

Thirteen of the reporting units listed external funding obtained by graduate students, and 15 noted in the narratives some kind of faculty involvement in graduate student funding or failed attempts at obtaining such funding.

The role of funding in time to degree was treated in the narratives in general terms, with the assumption that funding improves time to degree. For example, "funding has a significant relationship to graduation and reduced time to degree" (Psychology) or "quite naturally, students that lack departmental funding are likely to take longer to finish their degrees due to the necessity of working outside the department to support themselves." (Government)

We are beginning to study this issue using College data, as increased funding and shorter time to degree are not necessarily positively correlated. It is quite possible that secured funding beyond a certain point in the student's training has a negative effect on time to degree, especially when the job market is weak.

Multi-year funding: Multi-year offers, extended at recruitment, regularly combine fellowship and TA/Al/GRA funding. We requested information on multi-year funding offers and first-year offers of all students who entered between fall 2006 and fall 2011, altogether 1,951 students. Departmental reports suggested that of the 1,951 students, 1,200 (61.5%) received multi-year offers. For analysis purposes we reduced the number to 1,113 (57%) to account for inconsistencies in the individual departmental reports. While other students may have been funded for multiple years, these students were not given multi-year offers **at recruitment** but were rather funded year by year, which we will study separately as we work to establish the full funding picture. It is feasible to assume at this point that around 60% of COLA students receive multi-year funding offers at recruitment.

Table 1: Multi-year offers by number of years

Number of Years	Number of Students	Percent of All Offers
2 years	175	15.72%
3 years	57	5.12%
4 years	149	13.39%
5 years	515	46.27%
6 years	177	15.9%
7 years	40	3.59%
Total	1113	100%

As we see from the table, 881 (79%) of the multi-year offers were for four years or more.

*Departments and centers should find a way to commit to multi-year funding **explicitly** at recruitment, taking calculated risks and managing their commitments carefully. Liberal Arts Business Affairs is working with departmental graduate coordinators to develop an instrument that will allow departments to monitor their commitments. While some departments did succeed in recruitment efforts using statements like “we cannot make a full commitment at this point, but in practice we fund our students for at least x years”, we do lose top students if we make vague statements regarding funding.*

All commitments made to students must include clear references to progress expectations, with defined benchmarks and explicit reference to the possibility of losing the funding with lack of progress or interruptions in the continuity of studies that impede progress.

Summer support was included in the offers of 108 students (9.7%) out of the 1,113 who received multi-year offers. This low level of commitment highlights the need to find ways to increase summer support in recruitment offers, because summer support is known to facilitate degree completion.⁴

The average stipend per first-year offer in 2006-2011 was \$16,021 (including both fellowships and TA/Al/GRA funding for all student reported; amounts figured into the calculation do not include tuition but do include summers when applicable). Inflation adjustments for 2012 show an overall decline in the value of the offers as of 2010.

Table 2: Amount of stipends in dollars, 2006-2012⁵

Year	Average First-Year Offer	Inflation-Adjusted for 2012
2006	\$13,768	\$15,646
2007	\$14,879	\$16,441
2008	\$15,868	\$16,885
2009	\$16,457	\$17,574
2010	\$16,653	\$17,511
2011	\$17,255	\$17,575
2012	\$ 17,266	\$17,266

⁴ Council of Graduate Schools, *Ph.D. completion and attrition: Policies and Practices to Promote Student Success*. (Washington, DC: Council of Graduate Schools, 2010), p. 44.

⁵ Additional information about funding offers is provided in *Appendix C*.

Success cases in student funding: Of the 69 success cases reported to us, seven were categorized specifically as funding successes, and two as successes in both recruitment and funding. The student's ability to secure funding was mentioned in many of the success narratives: 23 of the students secured a Continuing Fellowship, 18 secured external fellowships, nine the Pre-emptive fellowship, and seven the FLAS fellowship. Among the success cases, we also had three Harrington Fellows and two recipients of diversity fellowships, one internal and one from the National Science Foundation. Most students highlighted in the "funding success" narratives secured multiple fellowships.

The success cases clearly highlight the critical role of university fellowship support, but at the same time speak of the necessity to develop a "mixed model" expectation and to increase efforts to both recruit top students and to make competitive grant/fellowship applications part of the expected funding model for our doctoral students.

Time to Degree

Time to degree is broadly accepted as a criterion in the evaluation of graduate programs, and the college, much like the university as a whole, is under increased pressure to reduce time to degree for doctoral students. With diminishing resources and growing pressures from the job market, it is our goal to assure that students complete their training in a timely manner and graduate as soon as they are ready, not prolonging their stay in graduate programs beyond what is necessary for their training. By graduating in a timely manner, new Ph.D.s gain a foothold in the job market, while making room in the graduate program for new students. Monitoring and reducing time to degree is a priority for COLA, and while in previous years departments were slow to respond to our communications re this priority, CLASP 2012 reflects increased awareness and buy-in within departments when it comes to time to degree. We are now monitoring individual students who have reached the six-year mark, with the goal of establishing **an average of 6.5 years to Ph.D., two years to M.A., and 1.5 year to no degree** across the college by 2017. Twelve of the departments made references to national standards of time to degree in their reports, indicating that they were within or better than the national average for their discipline or field. Eleven departments made references to programmatic changes that are likely to shorten time to degree, among them:

- The elimination of obsolete requirements
- Introduction of benchmarks by year (for example, a second-year paper, or dissertation defense at the beginning of the seventh year)
- Organizing courses into concentrations
- Revised curricular guidelines and procedures for examinations

- Changes in reading lists for qualifying/comprehensive exams (from total elimination to reduction of volume)
- Changes in qualifying/comprehensive exams (from total elimination to structural changes in the exam)

In the CLASP reports and during the meetings, departments demonstrated an effort to graduate or dismiss students who are not making timely progress toward their respective degrees, but this effort overall falls short of our need. We list here some of the common themes raised in the conversations on this issue and insert our responses.

- Some students have legitimate reasons for prolonged study (health or family reasons, academic reasons that have to do with grant activities, language study or field/archival work)

Eliminating outliers, or reducing their number significantly, can have a significant effect on departmental averages, allowing departments to accommodate cases in which prolonged study is legitimate. Admitting students with advanced language skills, and careful planning of archival/field work may help in shortening departmental time to degree averages.

- Dissertation/thesis supervisors are hesitant to dismiss students, preferring the remote chance of graduation to dismissal. Often, the prolonged stay is the result of inadequate mentoring by the faculty involved as much as it is the result of the student's lack of progress.

Students who are unlikely to finish their dissertations should be identified and counseled out as early as possible. Allowing students to extend their studies indefinitely does not benefit the individual student and hurts the department. We expect departmental GSCs to work with supervisors whose students are not making adequate progress, referencing a set of well-defined and clearly articulated departmental expectations.

- Students who are not funded do not tax our resources, and those who are funded as TA/AIs at least serve our instructional mission.

"Resources" must be considered in a broader sense—they involve much more than financial support (consider faculty supervisors' time, graduate coordinators' time, or library services, to name only a few).

Careful recruitment and admissions, combined with collaboration between COLA units, will assure the availability of the necessary TA/AI support, especially if combined with optimal involvement of faculty in the teaching mission.

- Some students find a job before they finish their studies, and experience difficulties in completing their dissertation.

To the degree that it is possible, departments should push students to complete their degrees before they accept a job or start the actual job. Students should explore the possibility of negotiating a delayed start of the job.

- In quite a few cases students take numerous “comps preparation” or similar courses, at times for a couple of years with nine hours per semester (presumably to maintain employment/funding eligibility or to keep student loans in deferment).

Departments should monitor these courses carefully, decide on a departmental standard and enforce it. COLA will monitor these courses as well.

- Likewise, students take the “Dissertation W” course for a couple of years, at times having actually finished their work but delaying their graduation for a variety of reasons, chief among them lack of academic job options coupled with the prospect of continued funding.

Again, departments should decide on a departmental standard and monitor students carefully. As we reduce our cohorts, allowing students to stay longer than necessary will adversely affect the ability to recruit and admit new students.

Success cases in time to degree: Departments seem to have found it difficult to articulate a well-defined concept of success in terms of time to degree. Out of the 69 test cases, only five Ph.D. students were defined as success specifically in terms of time to degree. The time to degree of doctoral students included in the pool of success cases varies, with no discernible pattern based on degree at entry, that is, students entering with an M.A. did not exit faster than those entering with a B.A.

In January 2011, we sent departments notices including lists of students who had reached the six-year mark, and asked that departments put together plans for graduating or dismissing these students. We did the same in 2012. Altogether, there were 245 “six plus” students on the 2012 list. Of these, 136 (56%) were included already in the 2011 notices. For these 136 students, now “seven plus” years at the university, the cohort distribution is as follows:

Table 3: “Seven Plus” cases by cohort year

Cohort year	Number	Spring 12 Graduation	Summer 12 Graduation	Remaining
1993	1	1		0
1994	2			2
1995	1		1	0
1996	2		1	1
1997	4	2		2
1998	3		1	2
1999	4			4
2000	5			5
2001	21	6	3	12
2002	18	2	1	15
2003	46	9	5	32
2004	29	7	3	19
Total	136	27	15	94

Thirty-two of the 136 were reported by departments as graduated or dismissed in the spring of 2012, and 30 as defending in the summer of 2012. We have confirmed 27 graduations in the spring and 15 in the summer, 68% of the graduations reported by departments.⁶ As the distribution numbers above demonstrate, departments overall fell short of their graduation plans, and the higher concentration of graduations was within the later cohorts, as students who have been in school for the longer periods were much less likely to graduate. At this point it looks like some 69% of the “seven plus” students are still enrolled in the fall of 2012.

Following these two years of detailed communication with departments, we will require enforceable action (graduation or dismissal) come the spring of 2013 and in years to come.

The distribution of “seven plus” students varied greatly among departments. We provide here the departmental numbers as recorded in the spring of 2012.

⁶ According to information provided by the Graduate School, there were no official dismissals of COLA graduate students in the spring or summer of 2012. We do not have information on students counseled out at the departmental level.

Table 4: Departmental distribution of “Seven Plus” cases

Department	7+ students	Total enrollment in spring 2012	7+ students, % of total enrolled in spring 2012
American Studies	4	48	8%
Anthropology	16	93	17%
Asian Studies	3	32	9%
Classics	8	33	24%
Comparative Literature	2	38	5%
Economics	3	83	4%
English	13	147	9%
French and Italian	4	42	10%
Geography	4	38	11%
Germanic Studies	5	20	25%
Government	10	122	8%
History	29	173	17%
LLILAS	1	34	3%
Linguistics	9	59	15%
Middle Eastern Studies	0	42	0%
Philosophy	4	51	8%
Psychology	1	101	1%
Slavic	0	5	0%
Sociology	9	101	9%
Spanish and Portuguese	11	87	13%
Total	136	1349	10%

“Success Cases”: Additional Topics of Interest

Degree at entry: Of the 69 success cases, 41 (59%) came in with a B.A. or the equivalent (B.S., B.F.A., etc.), and 28 (41%) with an M.A. or the equivalent. So while preparedness in the form of M.A. at entry was mentioned in some of the recruitment success cases, we cannot predicate “success” on admission with an M.A.

Gender: Of the 69, 36 (52.2%) were male and 33 (47.8%) were female students. The college, over the past ten years, had an average of 47.4% male and 52.6% female graduate students. Female students were, then, less represented in the success cases than in the general student population.

Foreign students: Of the 69, seven (10.1%) were foreign students. The college had an average of 21.2% foreign students among its graduate population in the past 10 years, with a significant decline as of 2008. The representation of foreign students among the success cases was significantly lower than in the general population.

Ethnicity: Of the 69, 10 (14.5%) self identified as Black and Hispanic (five each), 49 (71%) as white and two (2.9%) as Asian American.⁷ The College had an average of 11.9% underrepresented minorities among its graduate population in the past ten years, and thus underrepresented minorities had a higher presence in the success cases than in the general population.

Departmental Reports: Additional Topics of Interest

We list below some additional issues gleaned from the reports that may be of interest.

Retention: Effort invested in retention was mentioned in the narratives of nine reporting units.

According to combined information from the past 20 years, close to 23% of graduate students in COLA exited with no degree, with 2.48 years as the average time to exit.

We are in the process of establishing the data for the past decade, and will work with departments in which retention seems to be a concern.

Faculty Hires: In the narratives of where units see themselves five years from now, 11 departments made references to increasing the number of faculty or developing new areas of excellence.

Faculty hires in the upcoming years will be minimal, and departments need to develop their plans with this expectation in mind—our current budget plan calls for 491 FTEs by 2016-17, a net loss of 30 FTEs from this year's count.

Intra-college Collaboration: Collaboration with other units in the college as a factor in successful graduate student recruitment, training and funding was referred to in the narratives provided by 16 of the reporting units. Such collaboration is likely to become more critical as resources become tighter.

⁷ We have no information on the ethnicity of the foreign students and of one US citizen within the 69 test cases.

Undergraduate Instructional Mission: The effect of the undergraduate instructional mission on the departmental graduate programs was mentioned in seven of the narratives, but the discussions did not convey a sense of critical interdependence. References to competing programs were even less concerned with such interdependence.

Reporting: Where Do We Go from Here?

We will keep steady our focus on admissions and recruitment, student funding, and time to degree. While reporting in preparation for future CLASP meetings will involve other issues, departments should expect regular exchanges regarding these and other issues involving graduate students, among them placement and professional development. Coordinating our efforts with the Provost's Office and the Office of Graduate Studies, we are in the process of establishing the optimal strategy for information gathering and processing, with the goals of producing useful data for departments on a regular basis and collecting such data without burdening departmental administration with multiple and parallel reporting requests. We very much appreciate the effort that was put into the CLASP reports, and extend our thanks to all involved. We look forward to meeting the challenges of graduate education in the 21st century through innovating thinking, collaborative efforts, and steady commitment to excellence.

Appendix A: CLASP Meetings, 2012, Departmental Report Instructions

The 2012 CLASP meetings will focus on the College's graduate programs, specifically on admissions and recruitment, student funding and time to degree.

Please prepare a concise report of up to six pages in length, covering the topics below. Keep your comments short, and use bulleted items or narratives as you see fit.

Introduction: Provide a brief historical review of the graduate program in your department. Address the most notable developments in the program in the past decade or so, its national standing, and the department's vision for its graduate program five years from now. If the department has more than one graduate program, feel free to refer to them separately but address the different programs within the context of departmental priorities.

The next three sections should constitute the bulk of the departmental report.

Admissions and recruitment: Discuss admissions and enrollment trends over time, your current thinking about admissions goals and practices, and plans for the upcoming five years. Incorporate in your discussion a note on successes and challenges in student recruitment. For your reference in this section, we have included the *Admissions and Yield* spreadsheet, which details applications, admissions, and enrollment in the past ten years. Unless you have comments on the spreadsheet, there is no need to return it to us.

Identify up to three competing programs and provide information on their recruitment and admissions practices: How large are these graduate programs? What kind of recruitment offers do they typically make? How large is the faculty, and in which ways does the undergraduate instructional mission of the department affect the size of these graduate programs?

Student funding: Collecting information about student funding has proven to be a very complicated task, and we are still in the process of refining the information that can be collected centrally. We request that you complete the *Student Funding* spreadsheet, where we have listed students from the past six years -- we will use this list as our frame of reference for the CLASP discussion, focusing on multi-year offers and the types of funding students receive during their first year in the program. In your report address the following: student funding practices in your department; changes in funding trends and their impact on cohort sizes; multi-year offers and their effect on recruitment and retention; the role of departmental faculty in funding graduate students; and the effect of funding on graduation and time to degree.

Time to degree: We have provided a spreadsheet with a list of students who have been in the program for six years or more (*Six Plus Students*). Please comment on each student in the "comments" column of the spreadsheet. In the report, state the departmental position on time to degree, articulating it in the context of national trends in your field. Address efforts to mentor students for timely graduation, and curricular changes that have been made, or are in the planning, which will affect time to degree.

Test cases: Briefly illustrate in this section three cases that you consider successful in terms of recruitment, student funding, and time to degree, respectively. Provide a brief profile of each of the three students, and articulate what specific processes contributed to the successful outcome.

Other: If there is a topic that is currently very important to the department and is not included in your report so far or does not pertain to the graduate program, please outline it briefly for us in this section.

Appendixes: As needed, but no more than four pages.

Appendix B: Competing Programs

The notion of “competing programs” is discipline specific and often varies from program to program within our departments. However, some concentrations of “competition” can be observed across the college. We will use these concentrations in studying various issues pertaining to graduate students (for example, we are currently looking into enrollment commitments that come with fellowships, and the nature of summer fellowship support in these institutions).

Table B1: Competing programs as referenced in departmental reports

University	References
University of Michigan	14
University of California, Berkeley	11
Yale University	7
University of Chicago	7
New York University	6
University of California Los Angeles	6
Harvard University	5
University of Minnesota	5
University of North Carolina	5
Penn State University	4
Columbia University	4
Stanford University	4
University of Wisconsin	4
Princeton University	4
University of Illinois	4
Brown University	3
Ohio State University	3
University of Pennsylvania	2
Cornell University	2
Duke University	2
Notre Dame University	2
University of California at Santa Barbara	2

Also mentioned were Georgetown, University of California San Diego, Indiana University, MIT, University of Southern California, Johns Hopkins University, University of Virginia, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, University of Pittsburgh, University of Massachusetts, University of Maryland, Toronto, and University of Oregon

Appendix C: Graduate Student Recruitment Offers, 2006-2011

Analysis: Maggie Tate

This analysis is based on recruitment offers made to graduate students in the College of Liberal Arts between 2006 and 2011. The primary questions asked of this data were:

- How many incoming COLA students were given multi-year offers?
- What is the gender breakdown of those given multi-year offers?
- What is the average dollar amount of first-year funding offers by gender?

The data set was compiled from information provided by individual departments as part of the College of Liberal Arts Strategic Planning (CLASP) process. Because of inconsistencies in the way information was recorded and reported, we chose to drop from the analysis students who had missing or unusable data. Consequently, these results should be read as close approximations rather than exact answers to the questions above.

During the years 2006 to 2011, COLA enrolled 1,951 incoming graduate students. Of those, 1,058 were female students and 893 were males, which translates to 54% females and 46% males.

We used the data set to establish the number of incoming COLA students who were given multi-year offers at recruitment. 57% of graduate students who enrolled between the years of 2006 and 2011 were offered multiple years of funding at time of recruitment (1,113 out of 1,951). Of those students, 56% were female and 44% were male (622 females and 491 males). Though these offers varied widely in the number of years, the average multi-year offer for graduate students was 4.5 years with a standard deviation of 1.4.

Table C1: Multi-year offers by duration and gender

Years	Female	Male
2	101	74
3	33	24
4	85	64
5	281	234
6	98	79
7	24	16

As the above tables demonstrate, nearly half of all multi-year offers, for both female and male students, provided for five years of funding, and close to 79% of offer recipients received an offer of four years or more. When broken down by gender, we see almost no difference in duration of offer, with women getting offers on average of 4.5 years with a standard deviation of 1.4 and men getting offers on average of 4.5 years with a standard deviation of 1.3. Of the 1,113 students in our data set who had first-year funding offers, the average first year offer for female students was \$15,829 and for male students \$15,873. This shows that on the whole, there is a statistically insignificant difference between what female and male students are offered for funding at time of recruitment.