DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 604 HE 017 329

AUTHOR Crosson, Patricia H.; Nelson, Glenn M.
TITLE A Profile of Higher Education Doctoral Programs. ASHE 1984 Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Mar 84
NOTE 68p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Chicago, IL, March 12-14, 1984). For a related document, see ED 240 952.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Admission Criteria; *College Curriculum; Degree Requirements; *Doctoral Programs; *Enrollment Trends; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; National Surveys; *Postsecondary Education as a Field of Study; Program Descriptions; Questionnaires; Specialization; *Teacher Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

A descriptive profile of 72 U.S. doctoral programs for the study of higher education is presented. Attention is directed to program goals, academic offerings, organizational structure, faculty and student characteristics, and admissions and degree requirements. Directors of the 92 higher education programs listed in the ASHE-ERIC "Directory of Higher Education Programs and Faculty" (3rd edition) were asked to provide a brief program description and complete a questionnaire. Seventy-two programs provided useable responses to the survey and 65 provided program descriptions. The findings are compared to those of an earlier study by Dressel and Mayhew (1974). Information is provided on the following: areas of specialization, titles of core courses, the number of faculty members with formal full-time and part-time appointments, the academic rank distributions of full-time faculty, the use of part-time faculty by programs, the percentage of faculty that are tenured, the number of students in doctoral higher education programs, the proportions of full-time and part-time students, the numbers of students who are EdD or PhD candidates, student-faculty ratios, the number of assistantships and/or fellowships awarded each year, and admission and degree requirements. Appendices include a questionnaire, a list of participating institutions, and titles of academic programs. (SW)

A PROFILE OF HIGHER EDUCATION DOCTORAL PROGRAMS

Patricia H. Crosson
University of Pittsburgh

Glen M. Nelson
University of Pittsburgh

This paper was prepared for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE), March 1984

ASHE Association for the Study of Higher Education
The George Washington University/One Dupont Circle, Suite 630/Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 296-2597

This paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Conrad Hilton Hotel in Chicago, Illinois, March 12-14, 1984. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

A PROFILE OF HIGHER EDUCATION DOCTORAL PROGRAMS

This paper presents a descriptive profile of doctoral programs for the study of higher education in the United States.[1] It describes program goals, purposes and objectives; curriculum and degree offerings; organizational structure; faculty and student characteristics; and admissions and degree requirements in seventy-two doctoral granting programs. Although the emphasis is on description rather than evaluation or quality assessment, the information should prove useful to those concerned with the development of higher education as a field of study and department chairs and faculty concerned with program development and improvement.

Background and Research Design

Programs for the study of higher education are a relatively recent phenomenon. Many universities offered higher education courses during the first half of this century and three institutions (the University of Chicago, Columbia Teacher's College and Ohio State University) initiated formal programs for the preparation of college administrators during the 1920's (Dressel and Mayhew 1974). Most doctoral programs in higher education, however, date from the 1960's. As part of an in-depth examination of higher education as a field of study, Dressel and Mayhew (1974) surveyed approximately eighty universities for programs offering doctoral degrees (eliminating institutions offering only course work, masters level

degrees or minor concentrations in higher education). They subsequently documented and described sixty-seven higher education programs. There have been no subsequent comprehensive examinations of higher education as a field of study or of higher education doctoral programs, although there have been studies of exemplary graduate programs (Keim 1983), and of selected aspects including faculty (Francis and Hobbs 1974, Cooper 1980, Johnson and Drewry 1982), students and graduates (Carr 1974), curriculum (Cooper 1980, Crosson 1983) and books used in higher education courses (Weidman and Nelson, in press).

The past decade has been one of change in Schools of Education and other professional fields. Schools of education have experienced enrollment decline at undergraduate and masters levels and faced fiscal stringency. They have decreased emphasis on the preparation of teachers and increased the commitment to doctoral level work. The number of earned doctoral degrees awarded in all fields in the United States increased dramatically each year until 1974 and then started to decline with a 4.2 percent overall decline between 1975 and 1980 (Baker and Wells 1977, Baker 1981). Doctoral degrees in Education increased by 16 percent between 1970 and 1974 and by 2.2 percent between 1975 and 1980 (Baker and Wells 1977, Baker 1981). Other professional fields experienced declines in doctoral degrees awarded during the later period, so[illegible] them dramatic (e.g. business -17%, engineering 11% and [illegible]). Given the recent public attention to schooling issues, it seems likely that schools of education are facing a period of more dramatic change.

For all of these reasons, it seems time to take stock of doctoral programs in higher education. This paper updates this aspect of the work of Dressel and Mayhew and provides a descriptive profile of higher education programs. Research for this paper was undertaken as a project under the auspices of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) Committee on Curriculum, Instruction and Learning. The project included a compilation of program descriptions and a survey of higher education programs. In October, 1982, Marvin Peterson then-President of ASHE, Jonathan Fife, Director of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, and Robert Birnbaum, chair of the ASHE Committee on Curriculum, Instruction and Learning, wrote to the directors of all higher education programs listed in the ERIC Directory of Higher Education Programs and Faculty (1982 edition). Directors were asked to provide a brief program description and complete a questionnaire.

The descriptions received by January 1983 were compiled into a draft booklet and distributed to program directors present at the March, 1983 ASHE meeting. In May, a follow up request was sent to program directors who had not submitted descriptions. At the same time, other program directors were given the opportunity to revise their initial descriptions on the basis of the draft booklet and sample descriptions. The final compilation includes 65 program descriptions (72 percent of those listed in the ERIC Directory) and is being published by ASHE.

The five-page questionnaire asked for information on higher education programs similar to that reported by Dressel and Mayhew, including items on program organization and size, faculty, students and various requirements. The questionnaire was pilot-tested with three program directors prior to the October 1982 distribution to all directors. Follow up requests to non-respondents were sent in January and May 1983. Seventy-two programs or 80 percent of the useable ERIC program listings returned the questionnaires.

This paper is based on those program descriptions and questionnaire data. SPSS was used for frequency distributions and cross-tabulations of questionnaire items. Sections two through six report the study findings. The final section includes personal observations which reflect the views of the authors rather than those of the Committee on Curriculum, Instruction and Learning or of ASHE. Appendix A contains a copy of the questionnaire, Appendix B lists all institutions providing information for this project, and Appendix C lists the titles of the units in which higher education programs are located.

Program Organization and Structure

Dressel and Mayhew documented sixty-seven doctoral programs for the study of higher education in 1974. The first edition of the Directory of Higher Education Programs and Faculty compiled by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education listed eighty programs as of 1977. Johnson and Drewry (1982)

identified 70 institutions which as of 1978 offered a program which met the following definition:

> Doctoral Program in the Study of Higher Education: A course of study leading to a Doctor of Philosophy or Doctor of Education degree with a major or general emphasis in Higher Education as a field of study and which is designed to prepare leadership personnel for higher education institutions or related agencies. This excludes programs designed exclusively to prepare college teachers. (p. 9 emphasis in original)

The third edition (1982) of the ERIC Directory listed ninety-two programs. We used the ERIC Directory (1982) as a mailing list and included the following definitional note in the cover letter for the questionnaire.

> A note concerning the designation of Higher Education Program. There are still a number of different titles and configurations used for the organization of units concerned with higher education. We are interested in academic units which accept students for degrees and offer courses and related activities in the field of higher or postsecondary education, whether these be called a department, a program, a center, or some other designation, and whether these be a separate unit or part of some larger administrative configuration such as educational admini-

stration or educational policy. If your program fits this broad description, please complete the questionnaire.

Seventy-two programs provided useable responses to our survey and sixty-five programs provided program descriptions. Two of the ninety-two institutions listed in the Directory (1982) informed us that they no longer have doctoral higher education programs. It is impossible to know whether the others who did not complete the questionnaire do not have programs meeting our broad definition or whether they simply did not bother to fill out the questionnaire. We checked our non-respondents against data in the Johnson and Drewry (1982) study. Ten programs--some with more than five faculty members--existed in 1978 but did not respond to our survey. We are guessing, therefore, that there are somewhere between eighty and ninety higher education doctoral ograms in the United States.

All but one of the programs in our survey were located within a School or College or Department of Education but there continues to be considerable variety in organizational structure and title. In seventeen universities the higher education program is a free-standing unit within the school although it may be called a department, a program, a center, an institute or a concentration. In fifty-three universities the program for the study of higher education is part of a larger academic unit.[2] Although there is enormous variability of designation, higher education is usually a part of a department or division of educational administration, leadership, policy,

foundations or adult education or a designation combining two or more of these elements. (Appendix C) The head of the higher education program or concentration is usually called a program director or department chair or head.

Following the pattern of Dressel and Mayhew (1974) and Johnson and Drewry (1982), our study included only those programs offering doctoral degrees in higher education. We asked directors, however, to specify the degrees offered by their program. Table 1 reports the results. It is interesting to note that while some programs offer only the doctoral level degree, most offer one or more masters level degrees as well. While half of the programs offer both PhD and EdD degrees, the remainder are split almost evenly between the PhD degree and the EdD degree. Twelve programs offer the certificate of advanced graduate study (CAGS) in addition to the doctoral degree(s).

- INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE. -

Higher Education program faculty, like faculty in other departments and schools, are engaged in teaching, research and service activities. Eighteen universities responding to our survey, however, also have a separate entity--usually designated an Institute or Center--with responsibility for research and/or service activities. Eleven of these institutes (centers) are responsible for both research and service, four are exclusively research units and three are exclusively service centers. In most cases, the director of the center or institute reports to the Dean of the School of Education.

Missions, Goals, and Curricular Orientation

Dressel and Mayhew identified three distinct types of higher education programs. The first type includes programs with a national perspective. Such programs recruit students from all over the country--usually for full-time study; emphasize research and scholarly study of the field; and place graduates throughout the country in faculty and administrative positions. Faculty in such programs enjoy high status at their home institutions. The second type includes programs with a local or regional perspective. Many of the students in this type of program are administrators in area colleges and universities who pursue their graduate work on a part-time basis. Such programs often have a small full-time faculty but make extensive use of part-time faculty, usually administrators or other faculty members in the home institution. Course work is heavily oriented toward practical considerations. The third type of program includes those which are very small, have little formal structure and offer only a few courses--usually for junior college faculty. Dressel and Mayhew provided examples of each type of program but did not categorize all programs by type.

We started with the assumption that Dressel and Mayhew's typology would continue to accurately describe the field and attempted to "fit" programs to these types on the basis of program descriptions and questionnaire data. It was

impossible. Most program directors do not describe their programs as either national or local; as oriented towards either "researchers" or "practitioners". They describe their programs as combinations of these things. Program directors say that they recruit students on a local, regional, and national basis and that they prepare both administrative leaders and scholars for higher education. On the basis of their description then, programs in higher education appear to be more homogeneous than heterogeneous.

Most higher education program directors described program missions, goals and objectives in terms of the kind of preparation offered students. Of the sixty-five programs providing descriptions, fifty-five explicitly stated that the major purpose of their program was to prepare leaders for higher education. It was apparent that most directors intended leaders to imply administrative leadership for colleges and universities, although some directors may have also intended the term to include faculty leaders and/or higher education scholars. Thirty program directors, however, added a second objective--that of preparing people for faculty or research positions involving the scholarly study of higher education.[3] Twelve program directors stated as an objective the preparation of professionals for leadership in education-related agencies such as government agencies, foundations, or human service organizations.

Many directors further specified program objectives to include the preparation of personnel for academic administration, student affairs, community college teaching, financial management and planning and/or adult education, mentioning three or more of these elements. Nine directors stated that the primary focus of their program was the preparation of community college faculty and academic administrators, eight indicated student affairs as the major program emphasis, and eight specified adult or continuing education. All others either did not specify or indicated combinations of objectives

Ours was not a detailed study of higher education curriculum but many of the program descriptions contained statements about the curriculum which reveal orientations toward higher education as a field of study. The basic premise continues to be that higher education draws much of its content from the disciplines, particularly economics, history, philosophy, political science, psychology, sociology, and/or from other fields such as management, organizational studies, and business administration. Many programs (e.g. Stanford, Chicago, and Minnesota) emphasize that an extensive amount of course work is taken in the basic disciplines. Others emphasize the extent to which program faculty incorporate differing disciplinary perspectives in higher education courses.

Although the higher education program descriptions reveal the shared conviction that higher education is a derivative

field of study, they also show important differences among programs in what is considered the substance, or central concerns of the field. The following statements from three different program descriptions highlight some of the differences:

> (the field's central concerns) are the evolution of the contemporary similarities and differences among and the prospects for the various higher educational institutions in both their social roles and their internal functions and structures. (University of Chicago--ASHE, in press)
>
> (the focus of the program) is upon the development of postsecondary education in the United States and its relationship to the social, economic, and political growth of the nation. (University of Florida-ASHE, in press)
>
> (graduate studies in higher education) are designed to link knowledge developed in the sciences of human behavior and organization (economics, political science, psychology, management science, and sociology) to fundamental policy issues in the field of higher education. (University of Minnesota-ASHE, in press)

Since only a few program descriptions contained statements on the nature of the field of study, it was impossible to categorize programs in this way and we can not detect prevailing views or patterns.

Many programs did list broad areas of knowledge such as foundations or history of higher education in which they expect their students to gain competence but we could discern no pattern in these statements.

More revealing information concerning the subject matter of the field comes from the questionnaire items on areas of specialization (concentration) and higher education core requirements. Sixty-three higher education programs have established areas of specialization or concentration which provide a focus for student course work. Table 2 lists the areas and the number of programs which offer them.

- INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE -

We also asked program directors to provide titles of core courses in higher education. Although the response rate for this item was quite low--only twenty-nine programs listed courses--the responses do provide further insight into the curricular orientation of higher education programs. Table 3 lists by title the core courses grouped by general subject area. Where the subject matter of the course is not clear from the title, courses are listed as possibly similar. Twenty-three additional courses weere listed which did not fit either the ten broad categories or any other logical grouping. It is clear that there is still minimum consensus among higher education programs about what constitutes the subject matter of the field.

- INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE.-

Despite these important differences, the following description is representative of a large number of higher education programs:

> It is expected that a student develop a thorough grounding in the major divisions of knowledge relating to higher education as a field of study-- issues, history, curriculum, administration, organizational theory, finance, student affairs--and must apply to this knowledge the analytical skills and judgment that lead to effective policy-making and execution. The study deals with the many forms of postsecondary education; the persons directly involved as students, faculty and administrators in the operations of those institutions, and agencies in the larger society directly concerned with the conduct of the enterprise. The methodologies are drawn from many of the established disciplines, but most often from education, history, psychology, sociology, philosophy and various sub-disciplines of business administration. (University of Denver-ASHE, in press).

Faculty

It is always risky to try to count the number of faculty members in higher education. As Dressel and Mayhew (1974) pointed out, faculty members affiliated with higher education

programs are not the only faculty who teach and conduct research in higher education. Furthermore, many individuals with formal appointments in higher education programs are primarily administrators who may not direct graduate students or conduct research in the field. Although both problems remain, we felt it important to obtain information on faculty members with formal appointments (as listed in catalogues) in doctoral higher education programs. Our figures can be compared with those of Dressel and Mayhew (1974), Johnson and Drewry (1982) and the ASHE-Directory of Higher Education Programs and Faculty (1982). Table 4 summarizes this information.

- INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE. -

Dressel and Mayhew (1974) did not define full-time faculty but implied those full-time personnel without administrative assignments. Johnson and Drewry (1982), collected their data in 1978 and used the following definition:

> Those persons supplying one-half or more of their total effort to the doctoral program in the study of higher education. This effort must include both teaching in the program and supervising doctoral students. (p. 9)

The ASHE Directory (1982) contains the following statement. "This directory is limited to part-time and full-time faculty within a higher education program as reported by their institutions." (Introduction) No definition of full-time and no response rate is given.[4]

In our survey we defined full-time faculty as faculty whose primary responsibility is with the higher education program and part-time faculty as faculty whose primary responsibility is outside the higher education program. Our findings are confused by the fact that the totals do not add up. We obtained one total--261--when we summed the responses to the item asking for the total number of full-time faculty, another--270--when we summed the numbers provided for the various ranks, and a third total--257--when we summed the numbers by racial and ethnic characteristics.

Our estimate of the current number of full-time faculty is between 315 and 330. We arrive at this by taking our highest total (270), adding to it 38 faculty members in the ten institutions which did not respond to our survey but who responded to the Johnson and Drewry survey. We then guessed that there has been modest growth in the ten Johnson and Drewry respondents since 1978, and that there are between ten and twenty faculty members in the eight "potential programs" that did not respond either to our survey on Johnson and Drewry's. Over a period of ten years, then, the full-time faculty in higher education doctoral programs has grown by approximately fifty percent.

Table 4 presents a similarly confusing picture for part-time faculty. While Johnson and Drewry did not study part-time faculty, the 1982 Directory lists many fewer part-time faculty than Dressel and Mayhew found in 1974. Our estimate of part-time faculty size is between 410 and 450. We

started with our base of 375 and guessed that each of our 18 non-respondent institutions has between two and four part-time faculty. Our estimate represents a growth on the order of 35 percent over the decade since the Mayhew and Dressel study.

Table 5 provides additional data on full-time faculty members. There has been little change over the years in rank distributions. Dressel and Mayhew (1974) reported that 55% of the full-time faculty in their survey were professors while 25 percent were associate professors, and 16 percent were assistant professors. Johnson and Drewry (1982) separated their data into tenured, tenure track and no-tenure track but when these are added for each rank, they found that 56 percent were professors, 28.5 percent were associate professors, and 13 percent were assistant professors. Our data show slightly lower percentages at the full and associate level, slightly higher at the level of assistant professor. It is interesting to note that while most programs have at least one faculty member at the rank of professor, and many have associate professors, the assistant professors are located in only twenty-six programs.

- INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE. -

Dressel and Mayhew (1974) did not report sex, race and ethnic distributions. Johnson and Drewry (1982) reported that 87.5 percent of higher education faculty were males (as of 1978 when they collected their data) and 97.0 percent were

caucasian. The three percent in their study who were not caucasian were all males. Our figures show 86 percent males, 14 percent females, 4 percent minority (predominantly male) and 1 percent foreign. Female faculty are distributed across twenty-eight programs while minority group members are distributed across nine programs.

Additional data on part-time faculty members is reported in Table 6. The part-time faculty ranks continue to be dominated by college and university administrators, especially those at the home institution. This phenomenon had also been noted by Dressel and Mayhew (1974) who commented that while such use may bring "respectability in the rest of the university, (it also tends) to give a department a definitely practitioner tone." (p. 70)

Table 7 shows the results of cross tabulations to determine the use of part-time faculty members by programs. Close to half of the higher education programs who use part-time faculty members use both administrators and faculty from other units and/or institutions, but twenty-five programs have only administrators in their part-time ranks.

- INSERT TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE. -

So far we have been examining the characteristics of higher education faculty as a whole. It is interesting as well to study faculty size variations among programs. Table 8 presents size ranges among programs for total faculty, and for full- and part-time faculty. Most programs still have a fairly

small faculty with a mean of 3.7 full-time faculty and of 5.5 part-time faculty. Cross tabulations of these data reveal that programs are dominated by part-time faculty. In fourteen programs, 25 percent or less of the total faculty is full-time; in 39 programs between 26 and 50 percent are full-time; while only in 18 programs does the full-time faculty represent more than 50 percent. (This figure includes five programs in which there are no part-time faculty) Assuming that the professors and associate professors in Dressel and Mayhew's (1974) study were tenured, (but assistant professors, lecturers and instructors were not), the tenure percentage a decade ago was 80. Johnson and Drewry (1982) found a 75 percent tenured full-time faculty. The mean response to our request for a tenure percentage was 76 percent. The range of responses among programs, however, was from zero to 100 percent. Thirty programs have a fully tenured faculty.

- INSERT TABLE 8 ABOUT HERE. -

Students

It is extremely difficult to obtain an accurate count of the number of current students in higher education doctoral programs. First, it is often difficult to sort out the higher education students in those programs which are part of a larger academic unit. Second, some institutions have separate programs for adult education, student personnel services and the like and would not list students in these programs as higher education students. Other programs would include them.[5]

Although we recognized the problems, we asked program directors for information on current higher education enrollments. We defined current students as those pursuing a degree (although they need not be enrolled each term) and within the statute of limitations (or granted an extension). We indicated that reasonably close estimates of enrollments were better than nothing and asked for the total number of full-time and part-time students and the numbers by degree candidacy, sex, race and ethnic origin.

Table 9 presents the results. Again, and more dramatically, the totals were not consistent. The number of total current students provided by all respondents was 5767, but the sums of the other categories ranged from 4952 to 5728. The best we could do was estimate the number of higher education students. We base our estimates on our largest number-5767-because it represents sixty nine respondents and because directors may have been more confident providing totals than breakdowns. If we guess that the twenty one non-responding programs exist, are relatively small, and have between fifty and ninety students each, then the total number of current higher education students in doctoral-granting programs would be somewhere between 6800 and 7600.

- INSERT TABLE 9 ABOUT HERE. -

Dressel and Mayhew did not provide a total number or estimate of current students so there is no firm basis for comparison. We suspect, however, on the basis of the information they provided on program size, that overall current enrollments has grown dramatically during the past decade.

It is interesting to note from Table 9 the emphasis on part time study in higher education programs and the large number of PhD candidates as compared to EdD and Masters level students. We examined separately the 36 programs offering both doctoral degrees and found that PhD candidates heavily predominated in these programs as well. Twelve program directors did not provide information on student race, sex and ethnic characteristics. Based on the data we have, however, it is interesting to note that 50 percent of higher education students are women, 13 percent are minority group members and 8.5 percent are foreign.

There also appears to be a growth in program size over the past decade. While Dressel and Mayhew did not provide data on the size of all sixty nine programs in their study, they mentioned eight programs with more than 100 students, four programs with enrollments between 76 and 100, ten programs with between 51 and 75 students and seven between 26 and 50. Table 10provides information on the numbers of programs within various ranges of student body size for total and for full time and part time students. It is clear that most programs have a fairly small number of full time students and a larger number of part time students although there was wider distribution of programs across the ranges of part-time student size. Only one program indicated that it accepts only full-time student. The smallest number of full-time students reported was 1 and the largest was 150. Two programs indicated that they have only part-time students and the range of the part-time student body

- INSERT TABLE 10 ABOUT HERE. -

size was between 2 and 225. It is interesting that more than twice as many programs as noted by Dressel and Mayhew have more than 100 students and that four have more than 200 students.

Table 11 gives program total student body size by degree candidacy. While most programs have between 1 and 50 PhD candidates and 1 and 50 EdD candidates, five have more than 180 current PhD students and two have more than 100 EdD students. Programs falling within the upper ranges for PhD and EdD candidates tended to be those offering only that degree.

- INSERT TABLE 11 ABOUT HERE. -

We tried to examine the implications of faculty size and enrollment data by calculating student to total faculty (full-time and part-time) and student to full-time faculty ratios. The range of the student to total faculty ratio was from 1.4:1 to 40.5:1 and the range of the student to full-time faculty ratio was from 1.7:1 to 110:1. Table 12 shows how higher education programs cluster along these ranges. It is notable how high the ratios are for full-time faculty.

-INSERT TABLE 12 ABOUT HERE. -

We asked program directors to indicate the number of assistantships and/or fellowships awarded by their program each year. Table 13 provides that information and shows that most programs offer fewer than seven assistantships. The large number of non-respondents for this item suggests that many programs do not offer any assistantships or fellowships.

- INSERT TABLE 13 ABOUT HERE. -

Dressel and Mayhew estimated that as of 1973, between 3500 and 3600 PhD and EdD degrees had been awarded by higher education programs, although they noted that many programs did

not keep accurate records during early program years. We ask higher education program directors for the average number of doctoral degrees awarded each year for the past five years. The mean of the averages reported was 8.4 with a standard deviation of 6.7 and a range of 1 to 35. The sum of the averages was 549 for the 65 institutions who responded to this item. If this figure is multiplied by 5 for the five years for which they were asked to provide averages it yields 2745. We do not know the average degree production between 1973 and 1977 but an arbitrary and approximate average of 5 would yield 325 per year for our 65 institutions or a total of 1625.

If we guess, conservatively, that the twenty-five non-respondents each awarded 5 degrees for each of the 10 years since the Dressel/Mayhew study, we would add 1250 to the total. Our rough "guesstimate", therefore, of the number of degrees awarded during the past decade is between 5500 and 6000. This represents a dramatic increase in degree production over that reported by Dressel and Mayhew and suggests that between 9,000 and 9,600 higher education doctorates have been awarded.

Admissions Requirements

Dressel and Mayhew argued that not much of significance could be said about admissions requirements because of the wide variability in program purposes and clientele. They noted as an example "that programs catering to experienced faculty members and administrators reasonably give less attention to test scores than to career success and motivation for an advanced degree" (pp. 45-46). Without providing details as to numbers of programs they listed some requirements, among them a

Masters degree (preferably in an academic field), Graduate Record Examination Aptitude Test, Miller's Analogies Test, personal interview, prior experience in higher or secondary education or related endeavor, and letters of recommendation. They also noted that School of Education admission requirements might be operative in some cases.

Recognizing the continued variability among program goals and clientele and Dressel and Mayhew's important point that "flexibility in the admission of individuals to a practitioner-oriented program is better than rigid adherence to test scores or previous grade point averages" (p. 47), we nonetheless wanted to get some picture of the admission requirements employed by higher education programs. We therefore designed a question which allowed program directors to check off specific requirements for PhD, EdD, MEd and MA programs and add requirements not covered by the choices offered.

Table 14 shows that the following admission requirements are most common in higher education doctoral programs: letter of recommendation, Graduate Record Examination, proficiency in English language for foreign students; Masters degree; and a stated minimum QPA for Masters level work.

- INSERT TABLE 14 ABOUT HERE. -

There were no marked differences in admissions requirements between programs offering the Ph.D. degree and those offering the Ed.D. Programs offering both degrees tended

to have similar admissions requirements for both degrees. (See Table 15.) Among the admissions requirements we presented for selection, the Millers Analogies appeared least often and slightly less than half of the higher education programs required an interview for admission.

- INSERT TABLE 15 ABOUT HERE. -

We also asked directors of programs requiring a minimum QPA for Masters and/or baccalaureate level work to specify the required minimum. The response rate in both cases was quite low; but 17 programs require a minimum Masters level work of 3.0, while twenty-three programs require between 3.1 and 3.5. Twenty-three programs indicated that they had requirements other than those we listed. The list of most often mentioned included: career goal statements (10 programs required for both Ph.D. and Ed.D. programs), professional experience of 2 to 5 years duration (6 Ph.D. programs, 5 Ed.D. programs); and autobiographical statement (3 Ph.D., 4 Ed.D.).

In contrast to Dressel and Mayhew, we found a great deal of similarity regarding admission requirements. This was especially true regarding the high number of programs that relied on letters of recommendation, the Graduate Record Examination and English language proficiency from foreign students. Programs also tended to be similar in their use of the other requirements we listed.

Degree Requirements

Dressel and Mayhew investigated higher education program degree requirements with an open-ended question. They found a range of requirements but the most frequent were:

"requirements in total hours or credits, a residence requirement, and a dissertation." (p. 59) Our data indicate that programs continue to have the three requirements listed by Dressel and Mayhew, however, many have added a core requirement in higher education and a research/statistics requirement. Table 16 indicates the number and percentage of Ph.D. and Ed.D. programs requiring each of the listed formal degree requirements.

Table 16 reveals that there is little distinction between Ph.D. and Ed.D. degrees. However, a closer scrutiny of those programs, which offer both degrees reveals that only five of them have identical requirements for both. The distinctions, however, were often minimal. Ph.D.and Ed.D. degree programs are often minimal.

- INSERT TABLE 16 ABOUT HERE. -

We also attempted to examine similarities in terms of the number of credit hours required for each degree requirement. First it should be noted that not all institutions who indicated a degree requirement also provided the requested number of credit hours associated with that requirement. Also 15 percent of all doctoral programs did not provide the information as requested, e.g. did not convert quarter hours to credit hours. We did not create a credit hour range for the foreign language, computer literacy, or foreign language or computer literacy items.

For all of the other formal degree requirements we listed the majority of both the Ph.D. and Ed.D. programs who had those

requirements provided the number of credit hours associated with each requirement. We found, in most instances, little difference between Ph.D. and Ed.D. programs. (See Appendix D.) The only exceptions were the maximum number of transfer credits permitted and the number of credit hours required in a research/statistics core requirement.

We found Ed.D. programs inclined to accept more transfer work than Ph.D. programs. Eighty-five percent of the Ed.D. programs who indicated they would accept more than 9 credit hours of transfer work. Only 68 percent of the Ph.D. programs would do the same.

More than fifty percent of the Ph.D. programs with a research/statistics core requirement required more than eleven credits of course work in this area compared to only eighteen percent of the Ed.D. programs. This represented the greatest variation we found between Ph.D. and Ed.D. programs regarding the number of credit hours required for a formal degree requirement.

Conclusions and Observations

It is not easy to describe a typical higher education program, but our findings suggest that it would look something like this. Our program is concerned with the preparation of educational leaders, located in the School of Education of a large university and part of a division of educational administration; however, we would define ourselves as a program in higher education.

We have 85 students: 60 part-time and 25 full-time. Seventy students are pursuing the doctorate and 15 the masters. We offer both Ph.D. and Ed.D. degrees, although most of our students are Ph.D. candidates. We know, however, that about half of the higher education programs around the country offer only the Ph.D. or only the Ed.D. degree. Half of our students are women and 11 of them are minority, mostly black. Many of our students are employed as administrators or faculty members at a nearby college or university and expect professional advancement following completion of the degree.

To be accepted in our typical doctoral program, students must have performed adequately at the undergraduate and masters levels, scored high on the graduate record examination, and convinced us, in writing and during an interview, as well as through at least two letters of recommendation, that their professional aspirations are in higher education or higher education-related activities.

We allow our students to develop a curricular plan suited to their individual needs and aspirations but we generally make it easiest for them to develop a specialization in administration, student affairs, community colleges, or curriculum and instruction. We require some course work in higher education and our core courses provide an overview of the field: historical and current treatment of institutional patterns and practices and relations with other societal institutions; and specific examinations of major constituencies--students, faculty, administrators and governing board members. We require some skill in research methods and expect our students

to be able to understand and use research in the field. We do not make distinctions between our Ph.D. and Ed.D. programs in terms of formal requirements, but know that most higher education programs require more course work in research methods for Ph.D. students.

We have 9 faculty members, 5 part-time and 4 full-time. Three of our part-time faculty members are administrators in our university and two are faculty members whose primary responsibilities are with another program, but they teach courses for us as well. Of our four full-time faculty, two are full professors, one is an associate professor and one is an assistant professor. Three of us are tenured and three of us are white males.

It is important to note that this typical program does not match the profiles of many programs, since there is considerable variation among programs. For each program characteristic, we found a predominant pattern among programs, but also found important variations. We noted earlier that the program descriptions suggest that programs are more homogeneous than heterogeneous. Our survey findings suggest both homogeneity and heterogeneity. We believe that Dressel and Mayhew's three-part program typology--"national reputation and perspective, research orientation"; "regional and local perspective, practitioner orientation"; and "small, collection of courses"--continues to accurately describe the field despite the fact that we cannot demonstrate this with our research results.[6] We would like, however, to offer some observations on each type of program and an agenda for future research.

Part of Johnson and Drewry's (1982) research and that of Keim (1983) concerned programs with a national reputation and perspective. Johnson and Drewry asked full-time higher education faculty members to rank the "five most outstanding doctoral programs in the study of higher education." (p. 29) The programs with the highest rankings were (in descending order):

1. University of Michigan
2. University of California/ Los Angeles
3. University of California/ Berkeley
4. Pennsylvania State University
5. Stanford University
6. University of Texas
7. Michigan State University
8. SUNY/Buffalo
9. Florida State University
10. Columbia/Teachers College

Keim (1983) discussed the problems of graduate program rankings, but asked full-time faculty in higher education programs (using the 1979 edition of the ASHE Directory and eliminating all program directors) to nominate five "exemplary" higher education programs. She did not provide further elaboration or specific criteria for "exemplary". Although she did not rank order her findings, Keim's ten "exemplary" programs were the same as Johnson and Drewry's "top ten" with one exception--Indiana University appears instead of SUNY/Buffalo.[7]

Without entering the debate on graduate program rankings or in anyway implying that the "best" higher education programs have been identified, we think that both studies suggest that there continue to be about a dozen programs that fit Dressel and Mayhew's national perspective, national reputation typology. We

re-examined our findings to see if we could determine what distinguishes those programs from others and could find little in the numbers or basic descriptions. These "national perspective" programs are not always those which exist as a separate department or program in the school; many of them are part of a larger academic unit. They do not have dramatically different degree offerings, admissions and degree requirements, or curricular offerings. While many are large, in terms both of faculty and student size, they are not the largest programs. Their faculty student ratios are not that different from others.

We suspect that "national reputation" programs are distinguished by qualitative rather than quantitative factors, and that they have more visible, active and "cosmopolitan" faculty and students. We suggest that there should be further research on higher education programs and that such research should attempt to examine qualitative factors. What makes a distinguished program? What type of program responds best to student aspirations and needs? What furthers the development of higher education as a field of study? These questions and others need to be addressed. Such research will require different and more costly methods but we believe that such research is important for higher education.

We think that programs of the "regional and local practitioner-oriented" type have changed a great deal during the past decade. It is these programs which have experienced dramatic growth in student body size. Faculty size has also increased but not as dramatically. Students come primarily from the surrounding area but students from further afield and from foreign countries apply as well. These programs are still oriented toward

administrators and practitioners but have many community college faculty as well. Over the decade, they have awarded large numbers of Ph.D. degrees. It is important for further research to ask qualitative questions about these programs. What does the degree mean? What program components respond best to student aspirations and needs? How strong are the relationships with the colleges and universities in the region? How similar are they to those programs with established national reputations?

The very small higher education program described by Dressel and Mayhew a decade ago also still exists, but we need to examine the meaning of "small". There are still many programs with only two or three full-time faculty members but the student bodies are not so small any more. It appears that in such programs the faculty delivers a full-fledged program through extensive borrowing of courses and faculty from other programs in education and from other departments in the university. It is not at all clear how such programs will fare if--as we suspect--there are major changes in schools and departments of education. We think that these programs too deserve careful examination and attention to qualitative dimensions.

We returned to Dressel and Mayhew's typology because we suspect that it continues to be accurate but also because we suspect that any qualitative assessment of higher education programs will need to take account of differences in purpose, clientele and curricular orientation. There are also other questions that we think deserve the attention of those concerned with the field of higher education.

** Have we reached the point of overproduction of doctoral degrees?

We have produced a large number of graduates and our rate of doctoral degree production appears to be increasing. At what point does it become too much? The need for new administrative and faculty peronnel for colleges and universities should diminish during this decade. Higher education programs typically have students who are already employed, hence we do not experience the "new entrants" problem to the same extent as do other graduate programs. We should be concerned, however, with the issue of credibility for Ph.D. and Ed.D. degrees in higher education and with the diminished opportunities for leadership positions in higher education.

** Do we have too many students?

We found in this research how difficult it is to obtain an accurate number of students and of faculty members in higher education. It appears, however, that we have increased the number of students without commensurate increases in faculty size. The student to full-time faculty ratios worry us. More than half of the doctoral programs in higher education have more than twenty students for each full-time faculty member and most of these students are Ph.D. candidates.

** Can we preserve dynamism among our faculty?

We were pleased to discover that overall rank and tenure distributions have not changed substantially during the past ten years, but we are concerned that thirty programs have fully tenured faculty. Student data shows that we have taken seriously our responsibilities to help prepare women and minority group

students for leadership positions in higher education, but our faculty--like that of other academic departments and graduate programs--is not nearly so representative. We wonder whether programs will have opportunities to address these issues and to promote deserving assistant professors in the coming decade.

** What is the distinction between Ph.D. and Ed.D. programs and degrees?

Our study only allowed us to examine distinctions between the Ph.D. and Ed.D. as they related to formal admissions and degree requirements. We found few such distinctions. This does not mean, however, that there are not important and substantive distinctions. We think it time to reexamine this issue in higher education.

** Do higher education programs occupy a strong enough position within the Schools of Education?

We were surprised to discover that so many programs are part of larger academic units and so few programs are distinctly separate academic entities. Some of the amalgamation into larger units may have occurred within the last few years. We worry about this phenomenon in terms of the identity of higher education as a field of study.

It was beyond the scope of our research to examine higher education as a field of study. Developments in the field clearly affect the nature of programs and most especially the nature of the curriculum. The converse is also true. Program curricula, particularly core curricula to some extent define the nature of the field. Our review of descriptive statements and of core requirements and courses suggest the continuing absence of a clear

consensus about the nature of the field and its major knowledge components. But compared to a decade ago, as described by Dressel and Mayhew, we may at least be moving in this direction. There seems to be a growing consensus about the disciplines from which we draw our research methods and the complexities of applying them to the study of higher education. We have defined a number of areas of knowledge and developed areas as of specialization. We have begun important discussions in the journals and at conferences. Let's hope that we can preserve enough distinct identity within Schools of Education to allow these developments in the field to continue.

We have taken huge liberties with these observations and often gone beyond the data. We, therefore, hasten to repeat in closing, that the observations are intended to provoke discussions in the field and do not implicate ASHE or its Committee on Curriculum, Learning and Instruction.

FOOTNOTES

This project has been very much a joint effort. It has also depended upon the help of many people. We wish to thank other members of the ASHE Committee on Curriculum, Instruction and Learning--especially Bob Birnbaum, Jack Schuster, Charles Adams and John Thelin--for their help in reviewing drafts of the questionnaire. Robert Sweitzer and Mary Ann Sagaria also helped with this task. Carol Baker, Director of the Office of Measurement and Evaluation at the University of Pittsburgh, spent many hours helping us with our data. Jonathan Fife and Marilyn Shorr at the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education provided continuing guidance for the project. Peggy Kartanas of the Institute for Higher Education at the University of Pittsburgh kept us organized and produced draft after draft of the questionnaire and this report. We are indebted to all these colleagues and to all the directors of higher education programs without whose cooperation this project would not have been possible.

1. The ASHE Directory includes listings for three Canadian universities. All three responded and the data from them are included among our findings.
2. The fact that fifty-three programs are part of larger units presented a number of difficulties for our research. Often directors provided data that pertained to the entire unit as opposed to the higher education program or concentration.

We did our best to interpret these and select only higher education numbers but in some cases we had to rely on guesses.

3. It should be noted that these distinctions bear little relation to degree offerings and do not constitute a distinction between the Ed.D. and Ph.D. degrees.
4. It seems to us that the large discrepancy between our numbers and those in the ASHE Directory is accounted for only in part by the larger number of reported programs. We suspect that the Directory listings suffer from the same difficulty we experienced, that of "sorting out" higher education faculty members from others within a more comprehensive unit. In addition, different definitions of full-time and part-time appear to have been used.
5. From our responses it is clear that while we usually obtained information for just the higher education program, an occasional director provided enrollment data for a larger academic unit. Where this was obvious, we made adjustments, but there may have been some cases that escaped us. There was no way to adjust our data to respond to the second problem.
6. A different kind of examination of higher education programs with less reliance on "program-provided" description and survey data might well have produced a different profile of higher education programs.
7. Of the combined list of twelve programs, two did not respond to our survey.

REFERENCES

Baker, Curtis O. 1981. Earned Degrees Conferred 1979-80. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.

Baker, Curtis O., and Wells, Agnes O. 1977. Earned Degrees Conferred 1974-75. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.

Carr, W.D. 1974. "A survey analysis of doctoral graduates in higher education as a specialized field of study." Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University.

Cooper, J. 1980. "Special problems of the professor of higher education." Review of Higher Education. Fall, 1980.

[illegible] Patricia H. 1983. "Core Seminar in Higher Education." [illegible]view of Higher Education. Vol. 6, No. 2.

Dressel, Paul L. and Mayhew, Lewis B. 1974. Higher education as a field of study. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Francis, J.B., and Hobbs, W.C. 1974. "The isolation of higher educationists as scholars." In J.L. Miller, Jr. (Ed.) Scholarship and teaching in the field of higher education. Iowa City: The Association of Professors of Higher Education.

Hobbs, W.C., and Francis, J.B. 1973. "On the scholarly activity of higher educationists." Journal of Higher Education 44(1), January 1973.

Johnson, John A. and Drewry, Galen, N. 1982. A profile of faculty of doctoral programs in the study of higher education in the United States. University, Alabama: Institute of Higher Education Research and Services.

Keim, Marybelle C. 1983. "Exemplary graduate programs in higher education." Educational Ressearch Quarterly.

Wetzman, John C., Nelson, Glenn M., and Radzyminski, Walter J. (in press). "Books perceived to be basic reading for students in higher education." Review of Higher Education.

TABLE 1

Number of Institutions Offering Different Types of Degrees in Higher Education

Type of Degree	Number of Programs	Percentage
Ph.D. and Ed.D.	36	50
Ph.D. only	17	24
Ed.D. only	19	26
Total offering a doctoral degree	72	100%
M.A. and M.Ed.	16	28
M.A.	18	32
M.Ed.	23	40
Total offering a doctoral degree and a masters'[1] degree[2]	57	100%

[1]Ten programs offer an Educational Specialist Degree and seven offer a Masters of Science Degree.

[2]Thirteen programs offer a Ph.D., Ed.D., M.A. and M.Ed.

TABLE 2

Areas of Specialization Offered by
Doctoral Higher Education Programs

Specialization/Concentration	Number of Programs[1]
Student Personnel Administration/ Student Affairs	47
Administration and/or Management	46
Academic Administration	42
Community College Administration/ Community College	42
Curriculum and Instruction/Teaching	38
Adult Education	32
Foundations/History/Philosophy of Higher Education	27
Institutional Research	26
Policy Analysis	25
Financial Administration/Finance	19
Planning	17
Comparative/International Higher Education	16

N = 63

TABLE 3

Higher Education Core Courses

Subject Areas and Title	Number of Institutions
I Administration/Management	
Administration of Higher Education/ Management of Higher Education	8
Possibly Similar	
Principles and Practices of Administration	1
Administration & Finance in Higher and Adult Education	1
College Organization & Administration	4
Seminar in Administration of Higher Education	1
Administrative Theory	1
	16
II General Higher Education	
Higher Education in U.S./Higher Education as Field of Study/Overview of Higher Education	9
Possibly Similar	
Seminar in Higher Education	3
Professional Seminar	1
Higher Education and Society	1
Nature of Higher Education	1
	15
III History	
History of Higher Education	5
History and Philosophy of Higher Education	3
Development and Scope of Higher Education	2
Development and Structure of Higher Education	1
Foundations of Higher Education	1
	12
IV Students	
The Contemporary (American) College Student	3
Student Support Services in Higher Education	2
Minorities in Higher and Adult Education	1
Learners in Higher and Adult Education	1
Student Development in Higher Education	1
Student Personnel Work in Higher Education	3
	11

Table 3 (continued)

V Curriculum	
Curriculum of (in) Higher Education	7
Possibly Similar	
Academic Programs	1
Program Development in Higher & Adult Education	1
Curriculum Evaluation in Higher Education	1
	10
VI Finance	
Finance/Budgeting/Financial Administration	7
Possibly Similar	
Administration and Finance	1
Economics of Higher Education	1
	9
VII Teaching/Instruction	
Improvement of Instruction/Effective Teaching	3
Possibly Similar	
Programs and Instructional Processes	1
Instructing Adults	1
Roles & Responsibilities of Instructional Personnel	1
Principles and Problems of Instruction	1
The Learning Environment	1
	8
VIII Current Issues	
Current/Critical Issues in Higher Education	5
Possibly Similar	
Recurring Issues	1
Critical Issues and Concepts of Change	1
	7
IX Community College	
Community College/Junior College/Junior and Community College	4
Possibly Similar	
Community College Curriculum	2
Community College Administration	1
	7
X Legal Aspects	
Law/Legal Aspects	5
Possibly Similar	
Law and Administration	1
Law and Governance	1
	7

TABLE 4

Studies Reporting Higher Education
Doctoral Program Faculty

Study and Year	Number of Programs Reporting	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty	Total Faculty
Dressel and Mayhew (1974)	62	213	321	534
Johnson and Drewry (1978)	70	271	-[1]	-[1]
ASHE Directory (1982)	92	453	254	707
Crosson/Nelson	72	270	375	645

[1]No part-time faculty reported.

TABLE 5

Type of Full-Time Faculty in Higher Education Doctoral Programs

Full-Time by Rank	Number of Faculty	Percentage
Professor	138	51.1
Associate Professor	73	27.0
Assistant Professor	44	16.3
Instructor	1	.3
Lecturer	14	5.2
Total	270[1]	99.9%

Full-Time by Sex and Ethnic Origin	Number of Faculty	Percentage
Caucasian men	212	82.5
Caucasian women	33	12.8
Minority men	9	3.5
Minority women	1	.4
Foreign men	0	.0
Foreign women	2	.8
Total	257[2]	100.0%

[1]This total exceeds the reported total number of faculty by nine.

[2]Not all programs provided this information.

TABLE 6

Type of Part-Time Faculty in Higher Education Doctoral Programs

Part-Time by Assignment	Location	Number of Faculty	Percentage
Administrator	Home campus	184	49.3
Administrator	Other campus	32	8.6
Faculty	Other academic unit home campus	118	31.6
Faculty	Other institution	8	2.1
Other		31	8.3
Total		373[1]	99.9%

[1]This total is two less than the reported total of part-time faculty.

TABLE 7

Program Utilization of Part-Time Faculty
by Their Primary Assignment

Primary Assignment	Number of Programs	Percentage
Administrators and Faculty	33	48.5
Administrators only	25	36.8
Faculty only	7	10.3
Other combinations	3	4.4
Total	68	100 %

TABLE 8

Faculty Size and Tenure Percentage in Higher Education Doctoral Programs

Total Faculty Size	Number of Programs
0 - 4	13
5 - 8	24
9 - 12	25
13 - 16	7
16 +	3

(N=72, $\bar{x}$ = 8.6, S = 4.1)

Full-Time Faculty Size	Number of Programs
0 - 2	24
3 - 4	28
5 - 6	11
7 - 8	6
9 - 10	2

(N=71, $\bar{x}$ = 3.7, s = 2.0)

Part-Time Faculty Size	Number of Programs
0 - 4	32
5 - 8	23
9 - 12	8
13 - 16	1
16 +	2

(N=68, $\bar{x}$ = 5.5, S = 3.9)

Full-Time Faculty Tenure Percentage	Number of Programs
0	5
1 - 49	2
50 - 74	17
75 - 99	15
100	30

(N-69, $\bar{x}$ = 75.7%, S = 30%)

N = Number of programs reporting

$\bar{x}$ = Mean

S = Standard deviation

TABLE 9

Type of Students[1] in
Higher Education Programs

Students by Time Status	Number of Students	Percentage
Full Time	1755	33
Part Time	3451	66.3
Total	5206[2]	100.0

Students by Degree Status	Number of Students	Percentage
Ph.D. Candidates	2447	42.7
Ed.D. Candidates	1689	29.5
M.Ed. Candidates	706	12.3
M.A. Candidates	557	9.7
CAGS or equivalent	82	1.4
Other	247	4.3
Total	5728	99.9

Students by Sex and Historical Origin	Number of Students	Percentage
Caucasian men	1897	38.3
Caucasian women	1975	39.9
Minority men	304	6.1
Minority women	355	7.2
Foreign men	251	5.1
Foreign women	170	3.4
Total	4952[2]	100.0

[1] The reported number of total students was 5767.

[2] Not all programs provided this information.

TABLE 10

Student Size of Higher Education Program

Total Student Size	Number of Programs
1 - 25	9
26 - 50	13
51 - 75	14
76 - 100	15
101 - 200	14
201 +	4

(N=69, $\bar{x}$ = 83.6, S = 55.9)

Full-Time Student Size	Number of Programs
1 - 25	39
26 - 50	14
51 - 75	2
76 - 100	3
101 = 200	3
201 +	0

(N=61, $\bar{x}$ = 29.3, S = 31.4)

Part-Time Student Size	Number of Programs
1 - 25	14
26 - 50	17
51 - 75	17
76 - 100	6
101 - 200	5
201 +	1

(N=60, $\bar{x}$ = 57.5 = 43.5)

N = Number of programs reporting
$\bar{x}$ = Mean
S = Standard deviation

TABLE 11

Student Body Size of
Higher Education Programs by Degree

Range of Student Body Size	Number of Programs within Range
Ph.D. Candidates	
1 - 25	18
26 - 50	21
51 - 75	9
76 - 100	0
101 +	5
	($\bar{x}$ = 46.2 S = 43.5 N = 53)
Ed.D. Candidates	
1 - 25	24
26 - 50	15
51 - 75	8
76 - 100	1
101 +	2
	($\bar{x}$ = 33.8 S = 30.2 N = 50)
M.Ed. Candidates	
1 - 25	22
26 - 50	4
51 - 75	3
76 - 100	2
101 +	0
	($\bar{x}$ = 22.8 S = 24.8 N = 31)
M.A. Candidates	
1 - 25	26
26 - 50	3
51 - 75	2
76 - 100	1
101 +	0
	($\bar{x}$ = 17.4 S = 20.1 N = 32)

N = Number of programs reporting
$\bar{x}$ = Mean
S = Standard deviation

TABLE 12

Student/Faculty Ratios in Higher Education Programs

Student: Total Faculty Ratio	Number of Programs
< 6:1	15
6:1 - 10:1	26
11:1 - 15:1	15
16:1 - 20:1	8
> 21:1	5
Total	69[1]

Student: Full-Time Faculty Ratio	Number of Programs
< 6:1	4
6:1 - 10:1	4
11:1 - 15:1	6
16:1 - 20:1	15
21:1 - 25:1	15
26:1 - 30:1	7
31:1 - 35:1	4
36:1 - 40:1	3
> 40:1	9
Total	67[1]

[1] Numbers of programs responding.

TABLE 13

Yearly Number of Assistantships/Fellowships Awarded by Higher Education Programs

Number of Assistantships/Fellowships	Number of Programs
1 - 3	20
4 - 6	20
7 - 9	3
10 - 15	8
16 +	7
Total	58[1]

N = Number of programs reporting

TABLE 14

Number and Percentage of Stated Admission Requirements by Type of Doctoral Program

(1) Ph.D. Programs		Admission Requirement	(2) Ed.D. Programs	
Number	Percentage		Number	Percentage
36	69	Masters Degree	41	77
44	85	Graduate Record Examination	47	89
20	38	Millers Analogies	23	43
33	63	Minimum Baccalaureate GPA	32	60
34	65	Minimum Masters GPA	36	68
44	85	Proficiency in English Language for Foreign Students	43	81
23	44	Interview	26	49
49	94	Letter of Recommendation	49	92
25	48	Sample of Writing	29	55

(1) N = 52 (One program didn't answer)

(2) N = 53 (Two programs didn't answer)

TABLE 15

Comparison of Admission Requirements in Institutions[1] Offering Both A Ph.D. and Ed.D. Degree in Higher Education

Admission Requirement	Ph.D. Program	Ed.D. Program
Masters Degree	24	23
Graduate Record Examination	31	29
Millers Analogies	24	15
Minimum Baccalaureate GPA	22	22
Minimum Masters GPA	23	23
Proficiency in English Language for Foreign Students	31	29
Interview	16	15
Letter of Recommendation	34	32
Sample of Writing	20	17

[1]Thirty-Six institutions offer both degrees.

TABLE 16

Number and Percentage of Mandated Degree Requirements According to Type of Doctoral Program

Ph.D. Programs[1]		Degree Requirements	Ed.D. Programs[2]	
Number	%		Number	%
49	92	Minimum total credit hours	49	89
35	66	Maximum transfer credit limit	38	69
49	92	Residency requirement	49	89
		Core Requirements		
31	58	Education	31	56
45	85	Higher Education	44	80
26	49	Cognate Area	22	40
47	89	Research/Statistics	44	80
21	40	Practicum or Internship	28	51
16	30	Minor	15	27
26	49	Area of specialization	19	35
10	19	Foreign language	2	4
9	17	Computer literacy	7	13
10	19	Foreign language or computer	1	2
		Literacy		
53	100	Dissertation	49	89

[1] N = 53

[2] N = 55

APPENDIX A

PROGRAM STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION

1. If the Higher Education Program is located within a School of Education, please check here____ and check the statement which best describes the structure of your program.

____a. The Higher Education Program is a free standing unit within the School of Education.

____b. The Higher Education Program is part of a larger (___Academic ___Administrative) unit within the School of Education. (Please check appropriate response.)

Unit Name:_____

2. If the Higher Education Program is located elsewhere in the University, please check here____ and indicate to whom the Director reports.

Reports to:_____

3. Please check all degrees offered by your Higher Education Program.

____a. MEd. ____d. PhD.

____b. M.A. ____e. CAGS(Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study) or equivalent

____c. Ed.D. ____f. Other, please specify:_____

4. Please check here____ if your institution has a separate unit (e.g. Institute or Center) for research on Higher Education.

a. Unit Name:_____

b. Unit Director reports to: (Please check appropriate statement.)

____Director, Higher Education Program ____Provost, University

____Dean, School of Education ____Other, please specify:

_____

5. Please check here____ if your institution has a separate unit (e.g. Institute or Center) for service to the higher education community.

a. Unit Name:_____

b. Unit Director reports to: (Please check appropriate statement.)

____Director, Higher Education Program ____Provost, University

____Dean, School of Education ____Other, please specify:

_____

STUDENTS

6. Please characterize your student body mix (local - national - foreign) and describe your recruitment processes.

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. Please indicate the total number of current students in Higher Education:___
(Students who are pursuing a degree although they need not be enrolled each term. Students within the statute of limitations or granted an extension.)
REASONABLY CLOSE ESTIMATES ARE BETTER THAN NOTHING.

A. Of the total current students, how many are:

___PhD candidates ___M.A. candidates

___EdD candidates ___CAGS or equivalent candidates

___MEd candidates ___Other, please specify

b. Of the total current students, how many are:

___caucasian men ___minority men ___foreign men

___caucasian women ___minority women ___foreign women

c. Of the total current students, how many are:
(according to program definition)

___full time ___part time

8. How many assistantships/fellowships are awarded by your program each year?___

During the past five years, what has been the average number of degrees awarded by your program each year?

___doctoral degrees ___masters degrees

FACULTY

9. Please indicate the total number of Higher Education faculty members (as listed in catalogue or similar descriptive material):___

a. Of the total faculty, how many are full time:___

(Faculty whose primary responsibility is with the Higher Education Program.)

b. Of the full time faculty, how many are: (Please fill in all appropriate spaces.)

___Professors ___Assistant Professors

___Associate Professors ___Instructors

___Lecturers

c. Of the full time faculty, what percentage is tenured:___

d. Of the full time faculty, how many are:

___caucasian men ___minority men ___foreign men

___caucasian women ___minority women ___foreign women

e. Of the total faculty, how many are part time:___
(Faculty whose primary responsibility is outside of the Higher Ed.Program)

f. Of the part time faculty, how many are:

___Administrators at home institution

___Administrators with primary obligation at another institution

___Faculty members with primary appointment in another academic unit

___Faculty members with primary appointment at another institution

___Other (Specify)_____

_____

_____

ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENTS

10. For each degree offered by your program, please check all items which represent formal admissions requirements (as stated in catalogues etc.). If your program requirements cannot be accommodated by the choices, please attach a separate description.

PhD. Requirements		EdD Requirements (Please check here if same as for PhD. If different, please check specific requirements below.)
_____	a. Master's Degree	_____
_____	b. Graduate Record Examination	_____
_____	c. Miller's Analogies	_____
_____	d. Minimum Baccalaureate GPA Specify min. GPA:____	_____
_____	e. Minimum Masters GPA Specify min. GPA:____	_____
_____	f. Proficiency in English language for foreign students	_____
_____	g. Interview	_____
_____	h. Letter of Recommendation	_____
_____	i. Sample of writing	_____
_____	j. Other requirements, please specify by filling in appropriate blanks.	_____
_____		_____
_____		_____

MEd. Requirements		M.A. Requirements (Please check here if same as for MEd. If different, please check specific requirements below.)
_____	a. Graduate Record Examination	_____
_____	b. Miller's Analogies	_____
_____	c. Minimum Baccalaureate GPA Specify min. GPA:_____	_____
_____	d. Interview	_____
_____	e. Proficiency in English language for foreign students	_____
_____	f. Letter of Recommendation	_____
_____	g. Sample of writing	_____
_____	h. Other requirements, please specify by filling in appropriate blanks.	_____
_____		_____
_____		_____

DEGREE REQUIREMENTS

11. For each degree offered by your program, please check in left column all items which represent formal degree requirements and fill in the blanks on the right column with semester credit hour information (or equivalent for other credit systems.)

PhD			EdD	
Degree Requirements	Credit Hour #		Degree Requirements	Credit Hour #
____	____	a. Minimum Total Credit Hours	____	____
____	____	b. Maximum Transfer Credit	____	____
____	____	c. Residency Requirements	____	____
		d. Core Requirement		
____	____	(1) Education	____	____
____	____	(2) Higher Education	____	____
		(Please list by course title.)		
		_____		
		_____		
		_____		
____	____	(3) Cognate Area	____	____
____	____	(4) Research/Statistics	____	____
____	____	e. Practicum or Internship	____	____
____	____	f. Minor	____	____
____	____	g. Area of Specialization	____	____
____	____	h. Foreign Language	____	____
____	____	i. Computer Literacy	____	____
____	____	j. Foreign Language or Computer Literacy	____	____
____	____	k. Dissertation	____	____
____	____	l. Other. Please specify:	____	____
		_____		
		_____		

M.A.				
		a. Minimum Total Credit Hours		
____	____	b. Maximum Transfer Credits	____	____
____	____	c. Core Requirement	____	____
		(1) Education		
____	____	(2) Higher Education	____	____
____	____	(Please list by course title.)	____	____
		_____		
		_____		
		_____		
____	____	(3) Cognate Area	____	____
____	____	(4) Research/Statistics	____	____
____	____	d. Practicum or Internship	____	____
____	____	e. Area of Specialization	____	____
____	____	f. Foreign Language or Computer Literacy	____	____
____	____	g. Thesis	____	____
____	____	h. Other. Please specify:	____	____
		_____		
		_____		

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION/CONCENTRATION

12. Whether required or optional, many programs have established areas of specialization which provide a focus for student course work and are described in catalogues and handbooks. Please check all such areas offered in your Higher Education program.

_____a. Academic Administration
_____b. Administration and/or Management
_____c. Adult Education
_____d. Community College Administration or Community Colleges
_____e. Comparative/International Higher Education
_____f. Curriculum and Instruction or Teaching
_____g. Financial Administration or Finance
_____h. Foundations/History/Philosophy of Higher Education
_____i. Institutional Research
_____j. Planning
_____k. Policy Analysis
_____l. Student Personnel Administration or Student Affairs
_____m. Other, please specify: _____

13. Some Higher Education programs have established formal joint programs with other academic units or professional schools. Please describe any joint programs.

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. If you would care to provide us with descriptive materials concerning your program we would appreciate the opportunity to read them.

APPENDIX B

HIGHER EDUCATION DOCTORAL PROGRAMS PARTICIPATING IN STUDY

Institution	Descriptions	Surveys
Arizona State University	x	
Northern Arizona University	x	x
University of Arizona	x	
University of Arkansas	x	x
Claremont Graduate School	x	x
Stanford University	x	x
University of California at Los Angeles	x	x
University of Southern California	x	x
University of Denver	x	x
University of Connecticut	x	x
The American University	x	x
The George Washington University	x	x
Florida Atlantic University	x	x
University of Florida	x	x
The University of Georgia	x	x
Illinois State University	x	x
Loyola University of Chicago	x	x
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale	x	x
University of Chicago	x	x
Ball State University	x	x
Indiana University	x	x
Iowa State University	x	x
University of Iowa	x	x
University of Kansas	x	x
University of Kentucky	x	x
University of Maryland	x	x
Boston College	x	x
Northeastern University	x	x
University of Massachusetts	x	x
Michigan State University	x	x
University of Michigan	x	x
Western Michigan University	x	x
University of Minnesota	x	x
University of Mississippi	x	x
University of Southern Mississippi	x	x
St. Louis University	x	x
University of Missousi-Columbia	x	x
University of Missouri-Kansas City	x	x
Montana State University	x	x
The University of Nebraska-Lincoln	x	x
New York University	x	x
State University of New York-Albany	x	x
State University of New York-Buffalo	x	x
Syracuse University	x	x
Teachers College, Columbia University	x	x
University of North Carolina	x	x
Ohio State University	x	x
The University of Toledo	x	x

Institution	Descriptions	Surveys
Oklahoma State University	x	x
University of Oklahoma	x	x
University of Oregon	x	x
Temple University	x	x
The Pennsylvania State University	x	x
University of Pennsylvania	x	x
University of Pittsburgh	x	x
University of South Carolina	x	x
Memphis State University	x	x
Vanderbilt University	x	x
Texas A & M University	x	x
Texas Tech University	x	x
The University of Texas-Austin	x	x
University of Houston	x	x
The College of William and Mary	x	x
University of Virginia	x	x
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	x	x
University of Washington	x	x
Washington State University	x	x
West Virginia University	x	x
University of Wisconsin-Madison	x	x
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education	x	x
University of Alberta	x	x
University of British Columbia	x	x
	N = 65	N = 72

APPENDIX C

TITLES USED FOR HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS[1]

Higher Education

Higher Education Program/Department (17)
Department of Higher and Adult Education
Center for the Study of Higher Education

Larger Academic Entities

Department/Division of Educational Administration (10)
Department/Division of Educational Leadership (4)
Education Department (3)
Curriculum and Instruction Department (2)
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies (2)
Educational Policy and Administration (2)
Administration and Policy Analysis
School Services
Department of Higher, Technical and Adult Education
Adult, Secondary and Higher Education
Department of Educational Administration and Foundations
Department of Guidance and Counseling
Professional Studies in Education
Division of Foundations, Postsecondary and Continuing Education
Department of Secondary and Higher Education
Department of Educational Policy Planning and Administration
Department of Administration and Curriculum
Department of Higher and Adult Continuing Education
Department of Administration, Counseling Psychology and Higher Education
Department of Higher, Adult and Foundations
Area of Administration, Curriculum and Instruction
Department of Organizational and Administrative Studies
Department of Educational Organization, Administration and Policy
Administration and Adult Studies
Higher and Adult Education
Division of Organizational Development and Institutional Studies
Educational Administration and Higher Education
Division of Educational Policy and Management
Division of Educational Policy Studies
Department of Educational Leadership and Cultural Studies
Division of Educational Planning
Administration and Educational Services Division
Policy, Governance and Administrative Studies
Administrative, Adult and Higher Education

---

[1]Except where otherwise indicated title appears only once.

APPENDIX D

Number of Credit Hours Required to Meet Formal Degree Requirements in Higher Education Doctoral Programs

Degree Requirement	Ph.D.		Ed.D.	
Minimum Total Credit Hours	N	%	N	%
< 60	8	19.5	5	13
60 - 90	30	73.2	27	71
> 90	3	7.3	6	15
Total	41	100.0	38	99
Maximum Transfer Credit	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
< 6	1	3.5	0	0
6 - 9	8	28.6	4	14.8
> 9	19	67.9	23	85.2
Total	28	100.0	27	100.0
Residency Requirements	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
< 18	8	29.6	7	26.9
18 - 30	15	55.6	15	57.7
> 30	4	14.8	4	15.4
Total	27	100.0	26	100.0
Core Requirement in Education	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
< 6	1	4.5	2	9.1
6 - 9	13	59.1	11	50.0
> 9	8	36.4	9	40.9
Total	22	100.0	22	100.0

Appendix D (continued)

Core Requirement in Higher Education	N	%	N	%
<12	5	15.2	6	18.8
12 - 18	14	42.4	15	46.8
19 - 24	8	24.2	5	15.6
>24	6	18.2	6	18.8
Total	33	100.0	32	100.0

Cognate Area Core Requirement	N	%	N	%
<6	0	0	0	0
6 - 8	2	9.5	2	11.8
9 - 11	5	23.8	4	23.5
>11	14	66.7	11	64.7
Total	21	100.0	17	100.0

Research/Statistics Core Requirement	N	%	N	%
<6	2	5.7	2	5.9
6 - 8	8	22.9	12	35.3
9 - 11	7	20.0	14	41.2
>11	18	51.4	6	17.6
Total	35	100.0	34	100.0

Practicum or Internship	N	%	N	%
<6	6	46.2	7	41.2
6 - 12	7	53.8	10	58.8
>12	0	0	0	0
Total	13	100.0	17	100.0

Appendix D (continued)

Minor	N	%	N	%
<12	3	25.0	2	20
12 - 18	4	33.3	3	30
>18	5	41.6	5	50
Total	12	99.9	10	100

Area of Specialization	N	%	N	%
< 6	1	6.7	1	7.2
6 - 12	4	26.7	2	14.2
>12	10	66.6	11	78.6
Total	15	100.0	14	100.0

Dissertation	N	%	N	%
<12	7	25.0	6	20.7
12 - 15	11	39.3	11	37.9
16 - 18	4	14.3	6	20.7
>18	6	21.4	6	20.7
Total	28	100.0	29	100.0

N = Number of programs responding