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Background and Introduction

In 1999, Tony Filipovitch, then-Dean of Graduate Studies and Research at Minnesota State University, Mankato, initiated a study of 33 roughly comparable public universities, collecting data on key variables related to graduate education—including enrollment, admissions standards, tuition rates, and financial support for graduate students. Ten years later, this list served as a useful starting point for the current Task Force on Graduate Education (TFGE), which had been wrestling with how to identify institutions against which Minnesota State Mankato might benchmark its support for graduate education, as well as other key indicators of quality.

Working from the original list of 33 institutions, a subcommittee of the TFGE determined that roughly half of the institutions on the list differed from Minnesota State Mankato in ways that made true comparisons difficult. The most common differences were in size and mission, which ultimately resulted in research institutions, such as the University of North Dakota, and much larger or much smaller universities, such as Central Michigan University and the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, being eliminated from the list.

Further analysis of the list revealed that, of the remaining 17 institutions, about half (including Minnesota State Mankato) are in roughly the same position today as they were 10 years ago, while the other half have experienced what appears to be significant transformation: substantial growth in graduate enrollment, considerable increases in external funding, and/or externally validated increases in reputation and quality. The eight institutions that have experienced this kind of transformation might now be considered “aspirant peers” or benchmark institutions, while the remaining eight might still be considered comparable peers. The benchmark institutions are listed below.

Benchmark Institutions:

• Ball State University
• California State University-San Bernardino
• Eastern Kentucky University
• Missouri State University
• University of Nebraska/Omaha
• University of Northern Colorado
• University of Northern Iowa
• Western Kentucky University
It is important to acknowledge that the above list is neither scientifically constructed nor exhaustive. Given sufficient time and resources, the TFGE might identify any number of institutions that have experienced notable growth or increases in reputation and perceived quality over the past decade. By starting with a list developed 10 years ago, the TFGE was able to quickly identify a manageable number of institutions, compare their current positions relative to their positions 10 years ago, and distinguish between those institutions that have succeeded at differentiating themselves and those that have not. At some point, as we refine our strategic goals for graduate education and research at Minnesota State Mankato, we may want to identify additional (or other) aspirant peers.

It also is important to acknowledge that, at the level of individual graduate programs, academic reputation and quality can vary widely within a given institution. Thus, few graduate programs on our campus would identify their counterparts at the above institutions as aspirant peer programs. However, the TFGE was concerned with institutional reputation and performance—and how they are related to the success of the graduate enterprise more generally—rather than the quality of individual programs. The TFGE assumes that each graduate program on our campus has its own list of benchmark programs and quality indicators, against which it measures its performance and improvement.

Despite these caveats, the above list is instructive because it includes institutions that are similar to Minnesota State Mankato in fundamental ways. All are mid-size, public, predominantly undergraduate universities. Several have identities strongly influenced by their histories as Teachers Colleges. Most also identify primarily as master’s granting institutions, though all offer doctoral degrees. Only one offers the Ph.D., while the others offer exclusively applied doctorates. Most have offered doctoral degrees for fewer than 10 years. Many are situated 60-90 minutes from their states’ largest metropolitan areas and/or “flagship” or major research institutions. These and other key similarities are summarized in Table 1 on page 20 of this document.

In short, the Benchmark Institutions are similar enough to Minnesota State Mankato that we can reasonably aspire to attain their levels of quality and success. Equally important, given our relatively comparable positions 10 years ago, it may be possible to identify the key decisions, events, investments, and strategies that, despite our apparent similarities, have resulted in divergent outcomes.

In addition to benchmarking Minnesota State Mankato against its aspirant peers on key quantitative variables, the Task Force was interested in collecting qualitative data about the process by which these institutions had initiated and sustained transformative change. Thus, the Task Force charged Anne Blackhurst, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, with interviewing the Graduate Deans (or appropriate counterparts) at each of the Benchmark Institutions. All but one of the Deans readily agreed to be interviewed after receiving the following introductory questions:

• What were the primary contributors to your institution’s overall success during the past 10 years? (Please consider external as well as internal variables, and planned as well as serendipitous events.)
• How have these factors contributed to growth in graduate enrollment and external research funding?
• Aside from growth in graduate enrollment and research productivity, are there other important indications of your success over the past 10 years?
• What else is important for us to understand about your institution’s success story over the past 10 years?

Telephone interviews were conducted during April 2009. The notes from nearly 12 hours of interviews are summarized below, followed by an Executive Summary of the findings.

**Enhancing Graduate Education**

Despite variability in the institutions’ missions, identities, and characteristics, there was considerable consistency in the strategies identified by their Graduate Deans as key to enhancing graduate education. These included (a) strong leadership from the President and Provost; (b) a small number of clearly articulated strategic priorities, with resource allocation tied to strategic goals; (c) the addition of doctoral programs; (d) a clear “niche” in the state system of graduate education; (e) an emphasis on “signature” graduate programs; (f) graduate offerings that are responsive to regional employment needs; (g) an aggressive and strategic effort to increase online and off-campus offerings; (g) a commitment to using every hiring opportunity to increase the scholarly productivity of the faculty; and (h) adequate financial support for graduate students.

**Leadership, Vision, and Strategic Priorities:**

As noted above, the 10-year period between 1999 and 2009 was a fairly arbitrary demarcation. Nonetheless, several Deans agreed that the past decade was, in fact, a period of transformation for their universities. These Deans noted that the 10-year mark roughly coincided with the hiring of a new President (who, in several cases was still at the institution after 8-12 years) and, subsequently, the development of a new institutional vision. These visions were clearly articulated (e.g., “To be a leading American university with international reach” and “To be a student-centered, metropolitan university of distinction”) and, while they were not always explicitly related to graduate education, they nonetheless transformed the institutions in ways that ultimately benefited graduate education by increasing institutional quality and reputation.

Having a strategic plan with a fairly small number (3-4) of clearly articulated strategic priorities was also identified as key to institutional transformation. In several cases, enhancing graduate education was explicitly articulated as a strategic goal; in others, graduate enrollment benefited from the increase in quality and reputation that resulted from achieving other goals (academic excellence, for example) or successfully branding the institution as a quality undergraduate institution. One Dean also stressed the importance of developing a strategic plan for each graduate program based on current enrollment, capacity, and projected demand.

Most Deans emphasized the importance of having a President who kept the strategic priorities in the forefront of conversations about mission, resource allocation, planning, and assessment. At the institutions that did not undergo strategic planning efforts or where graduate education was not a strategic priority, the Deans emphasized that they nonetheless felt the strong support of both the President and the Provost. One Dean in particular
emphasized that the President must be a “champion” of graduate education. At that institution, the number of graduate programs had increased from 20 to 48 during the President’s 10-year tenure. Another Dean stressed that his President had a clear interest in growing graduate education because of its connection to research and quality. As a result, graduate education is one of four institutional priorities at the institution and growing graduate enrollment is an explicitly stated goal.

In addition to strong support from the President and Provost, one Dean emphasized the importance of support from other top-level administrators—citing the recent restructuring of the President’s Cabinet to add a Vice President for Marketing. The same institution has just hired its first-ever graduate recruiter to focus on recruiting for the “top 10” graduate programs at the University.

**Becoming a Doctoral Institution:**

At several of the institutions, the strategic planning and visioning processes that had ultimately led to important institutional transformation had roughly coincided with the addition of the institutions’ first doctoral programs. Deans at these institutions stressed that the addition of doctoral programs gave graduate education more visibility and focus—though one Dean also emphasized the challenges of redefining institutional identity and making the “cultural shift” to becoming a doctoral institution. It is noteworthy that one of the most important benefits of doctoral programs, according to several Deans, was that they strengthened the institutions’ master’s programs by elevating their reputations and serving as an impetus for allocating resources to both graduate education and research. This was most effectively accomplished at the institutions that thought strategically about how to make the “cultural shift” described above.

**Developing a Niche and Identifying Signature Programs:**

Virtually all of the Deans emphasized the importance of having excellent programs and focusing on those programs that are key to the institution’s reputation. The designations given to such programs were varied—including “Programs of Distinction,” “Signature Programs,” “Niche Programs,” “Premiere Programs” and “Marquis Programs”—but all communicated that some programs were targeted for increased visibility and resources due to their high quality and centrality to the institutional mission. In some cases, these programs were identified primarily because of their ability to meet an important economic need in service to the institution’s state or region.

One Dean outlined the process used on her campus for identifying signature programs. The process began with a thorough assessment of every program on campus. Based on that assessment, programs were asked to submit rationale and supporting evidence for their placement in one of four tiers. Tier 1 included those programs designated as signature programs, which were targeted for increased resources and visibility. Tier 2 consisted of maintenance programs, which were strong programs with healthy enrollments and were targeted for sustained support. Programs in Tier 3 were candidates for reorganization (typically by combining with another small program in an innovative way) due to low current and projected enrollment. Finally, programs in Tier 4 were candidates for elimination due to poor quality and/or low enrollment. A campus-wide task force reviewed the reports and
made recommendations to the Provost in spring 2009. From this process, 5-6 graduate programs will be identified as signature programs and targeted for growth and visibility while others may be eliminated. Ultimately, the institution hopes to become “known” for its signature programs.

At several of the institutions, efforts to market signature programs had been so successful that applications to the programs far exceeded capacity. The Deans at these institutions—as well as others—emphasized the difficulty of adding or moving faculty lines to respond to demand at the graduate level. However, they also emphasized that, even when institutions cannot increase graduate enrollment because of staffing constraints, increasing the number of applications can be a useful strategy for increasing perceptions of quality by becoming increasingly selective. Several Deans pointed out that increasing selectivity and developing a reputation for being “hard to get in” had resulted in even more graduate applications.

Along with identifying signature programs, the Deans also emphasized the importance of meeting local employment needs. This was often cited in conjunction with the importance of establishing an institutional “niche” that allowed the institution to both serve regional needs and be distinctive. Often, this niche also fulfilled a historical or state-mandated purpose. One Dean described this as being strategic while “remaining true to the institution’s DNA.” In several cases, institutional identity was still closely tied to the institution’s history as a Teachers College. At these institutions, graduate enrollment was greatly affected by state-level requirements for K-12 and Community College Teachers and the Deans mentioned the importance of serving this market.

Several Deans also stressed that establishing their niche in the state was closely tied to acknowledging that they were not “the ‘U’” (i.e., the major research institution in the state). Rather than trying to establish themselves as research institutions and compete with their states’ flagship universities, these institutions attempted to differentiate themselves—typically by emphasizing applied research and career-focused graduate programs.

Increasing Online and Off-campus Offerings:

Online courses were also mentioned repeatedly as being key to increasing or maintaining graduate enrollment. Several Deans indicated that increasing online enrollment was the single biggest contributor to increases in total graduate enrollment. Only one Dean noted that her institution had not emphasized online education at the graduate level (and only one program, the MPA, has had success with online offerings at that institution). More than one Dean commented that on-campus enrollments were down but online enrollments were up significantly (“exponentially,” according to one Dean, who indicated that two doctoral programs—an Ed.D. and the DNP—were entirely online, as were 4-5 master’s programs, mostly in education). On one campus, 10-15 graduate programs, mostly in education, are entirely online.

One Dean stated her belief that online graduate programs would be the institution’s “future” and noted that the Provost had promised a new faculty line to departments that took their programs online, rather than expecting online programs to be an “add-on” to the workload of existing faculty. This same Dean commented that other, alternative models of course scheduling would also be critical, noting that enrollment in the university’s rehabilitation
counseling program skyrocketed when the department instituted a weekend program. Another Dean emphasized the importance of evening classes and other means of “increasing access” to graduate education. Several mentioned the development of off-campus centers near the borders of nearby metropolitan areas. On these campuses, Extended Education units were “aggressively” marketing both online and off-campus classes.

Responding to Regional Economic and Employment Needs:

Most Deans emphasized that, to the extent they are developing new graduate programs, their institutions are attempting to respond to local (and, in some cases, national) employment needs. At one institution, this strategy led to an explicit commitment to serve the local health care industry by producing employees. As a result, the institution introduced graduate programs in physical therapy and physician assistance—despite the fact that no undergraduate programs existed in those areas.

All the Deans stressed the importance of being strategic about the array of programs offered, especially new programs. One Dean stated that new programs are not encouraged unless they are creative and/or interdisciplinary. As an example, she pointed to the development of five new Professional Science Master’s (PSM) programs: Applied Physics, Industrial Mathematics (Quality Control), Applied Biochemistry, Biotechnology, and Ecosystem Management. Another Dean described an online master’s program in Homeland Security, which has had extremely strong enrollment since September 11, 2001. Success with this “niche” program has prompted the Dean to conduct a campus audit to determine which graduate programs are best suited for online delivery. The university plans to target a few appropriate programs rather than simply offering more courses online. Another institution (located in the south) has found a niche offering an online master’s program in speech pathology to New York City schoolteachers.

Those Deans whose institutions have capitalized on their ability to respond to local or regional employment demands stated that, whenever possible, they seek funding from their state legislatures in support of graduate programs that clearly address an economic development need. These Deans stressed the importance of selling legislators on the value of employment-focused programs to the state and regional economies.

Another Dean emphasized the importance of “connecting” undergraduate and graduate programs in ways that benefit students, programs, and the regional economy. Because most students are career focused, and because most undergraduate majors do not prepare students for a specific occupation, undergraduates can be “sold” on a particular career, with a graduate degree as the end point. Biology majors, for example, can be recruited by the possibility of entering the Physician Assistant program after graduation. This helps “sell” the biology major to undergraduates and helpssell the Physician Assistant program to undergraduate faculty and departments who seek more undergraduate majors.

Finally, certificate programs were mentioned repeatedly as one effective way to accomplish the goal of meeting regional employment needs. Such programs also serve as a “gateway” to master’s programs.
Increasing Hiring Aspirations:

The importance of using every hiring opportunity to improve the quality of the faculty was mentioned repeatedly as being key to enhancing both graduate education and research productivity. One Dean anticipates that 120-150 tenured faculty will be replaced at his institution due to retirements during the next several years. Generally, the Deans characterized retirement-age faculty members as less involved in both graduate education and research than newer faculty. Hiring new faculty who are productive researchers (and more willing to teach online) is key, according to the Deans—though several acknowledged it is difficult to reallocate faculty lines based on graduate program goals, given that most hiring decisions are undergraduate driven rather than graduate driven. Virtually all of the Deans stressed the importance of telling candidates during their on-campus interviews that expectations for faculty are changing and that the university aspires to be a different kind of institution. One Dean stated that he meets with all finalists for tenure-track faculty positions to discuss the institution’s aspirations for graduate education and research.

Enhancing Financial Support for Graduate Students:

The importance of financial support for graduate students was mentioned frequently—though, interestingly, few of the institutions had GA stipends significantly higher than Minnesota State Mankato’s. Stipends at the Benchmark Institutions range from $8,000 to $14,000 for university-funded assistantships, whereas those assistantships funded with grant dollars range from $18,000 to $30,000. While most Deans mentioned channeling resources toward high-performing, high profile programs (which were typically at capacity), one Dean mentioned the establishment of a “Graduate Dean’s Scholarship” of $750.00 per semester to support students in low enrollment programs with capacity. This same Dean commented on the need for graduate education to become more like undergraduate education in terms of thinking about how much to “discount” tuition through institutional aid in order to achieve the desired number and mix of students.

Increasing External Funding

As with strategies for enhancing graduate education, the strategies for increasing external funding were remarkably consistent across institutions: (a) explicitly identifying external funding as a strategic priority; (b) making external funding aspirations public; (c) strong leadership from the President and Provost; (d) using every hiring opportunity to increase the number of faculty who are productive researchers; (e) providing start-up packages for new faculty; (f) explicitly rewarding external research support in the tenure and promotion process; (g) developing incentive programs to encourage proposal development, submission, and resubmission; (h) cultivating “signature” or “niche” research centers, which are often tied to signature graduate programs; (i) increasing the research “infrastructure,” including faculty, facilities, resources, and staff; and (j) making the “cultural and identity shifts” commensurate with becoming a doctoral institution.
Identifying and Articulating External Funding as a Strategic Priority:

As with graduate education, most Deans began the conversation about external funding by emphasizing the importance of being strategic. At one institution, for example, the strategic plan explicitly calls for achieving $45 million annually by the year 2012. Last year, the institution brought in $20 million; this year, they are on pace for $27 million. Another Dean noted that external funding is identified as a key indicator of success in the university’s strategic plan.

Increasing Hiring Aspirations and Providing Start-Up Packages:

As noted above, virtually every Dean emphasized the importance of using hiring decisions to enhance the research productivity of the faculty. As one Dean stated, “Who you hire is a reflection of who you want to be.” Several Deans attributed increases in external funding to the turnover of faculty hired in the 1960s and the opportunity to replace them with highly productive researchers. Several Deans also stated that their institutions hire faculty with the explicit expectation they will bring in external funds and give them the start-up packages to make this possible. Most have programs in place to support new faculty as they develop their research agendas. Examples include the following:

- Fellowships of $20,000/year to support new faculty as they initiate their research agendas and work to position themselves to obtain external funding. In addition to the financial support, fellows are provided with professional development and training related to identifying potential funding sources, proposal development, and other grant-seeking skills.
- Internal “seed” grants intentionally designed to support projects with a high likelihood of receiving external funding.
- Start-up packages of $20,000-$30,000 for new faculty members
- Professional development programs in which pre-tenure faculty members apply to participate in a semester-long series of workshops about establishing a research agenda and seeking external support for that agenda. In the semester following the workshops, participants receive a research reassignment in order to focus on proposal writing.
- Summer fellowships offered through the Graduate College, in which faculty conduct research and write grant proposals.

Explicitly Rewarding External Research Support:

Several Deans also stressed that, in addition to hiring faculty members who have the desire and potential to bring in external funding, the institution must clearly state its expectations about seeking external funding and provide tangible rewards for meeting those expectations. In other words, seeking external research support must be explicitly valued by College Deans and tied to promotion and tenure decisions. Efforts to increase external funding will fail, according to these Deans, as long as external research support is in the “nice but not necessary” category.
Developing Incentive Programs:

In addition to programs for new faculty, several Deans described incentive programs designed to provide ongoing encouragement to seek external funding. Examples included the following:

- The Submit Program: Based on the premise that increasing the number of funded proposals requires increasing the number of submissions, this program is funded by Facilities and Administration costs. Every faculty member who submits a proposal receives a monetary award to use for research-related expenditures. The amount of the award scales (from $100 to $1,000) with the size of the grant.
- The Resubmit Program: This program is designed to turn large (> $100,000), favorably reviewed but rejected grant proposals into successful resubmissions by giving the PI “whatever it will take” (e.g., reassigned time, student research assistants) to revise and resubmit the proposal.
- The Cardinal Fellows Program: Designed to support faculty who write large (> $200,000) grant proposals, this program awards up to 15 fellowships annually, each of which provides one course reassignment during the proposal writing stage. Upon submission, the PI receives a monetary award for research-related expenses.

Heavy teaching loads were mentioned frequently as potential disincentives to conduct research and seek external funding. However, teaching loads varied considerably from institution to institution and more than one Dean remarked that there did not seem to be an obvious connection between research release and research productivity at his/her institution. At one institution, faculty workloads include as few as 6 units of teaching (2 courses) per semester, while faculty at several other universities have 4-4 course loads. At most of the institutions, no credit in load is given for graduate teaching or advising.

Developing and Sustaining Signature Research Centers:

Several Deans mentioned the importance of Research Centers to increasing external funding and attracting highly productive faculty. Often, post docs who devote 100% of their time to research are hired to staff the Centers. In several cases, Research Centers are afforded a higher return of Facilities and Administration costs (e.g., 90% instead of the standard 30%) to ensure their sustainability. In some cases, these Centers are tied to the university’s graduate “programs of distinction.” For example, the online Homeland Security program mentioned above is offered through the Justice and Safety Center, which received $20 million in federal funding last year and, in addition to focusing on homeland security, offers first responder training. In several instances, one or two centers are responsible for the vast majority of external dollars—often in state contracts ($25-$30 million at one university Center alone) or earmarks.

Increasing the Research Infrastructure:

As one Dean stated, “You can’t out-fund your infrastructure.” Other Deans agreed: Faculty, programs, equipment, and reputation must all be improved before external funding will increase. The number and quality of staff in the sponsored programs office were frequently mentioned as important parts of the infrastructure. One Dean explicitly
attributed his institution’s success, in part, to the increase in RASP staff during his four years as Dean. During his tenure, staffing has increased from 2 pre-award staff and 1.5 post-award staff to 4 pre-award and 5 post-award staff (with efforts underway to hire 2 more).

Interestingly, various (and opposing) administrative models were touted as conducive to enhancing research productivity and funding. One institution, for example, has recently combined graduate education and research under a newly created Associate Provost position, while another has separated graduate education and research so that research has more prominence and focused attention.

Thinking and Acting Like a Doctoral Institution:

Finally, becoming a doctoral institution was frequently mentioned as key to enhancing institutional capacity for externally funded research. This is not surprising, given the connection between doctoral education and many of the variables cited above. In particular, the advent of doctoral programs was associated with increased institutional support for graduate education and research, reduced teaching loads, increased expectations for faculty research, an increase in the quality of faculty attracted to the institution, an increase in institutional reputation, and an increase in the number of “advanced learners and scholars” on campus.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

KEY FINDINGS FROM CONVERSATIONS WITH GRADUATE DEANS AT SEVEN ASPIRANT PEER INSTITUTIONS

Keys to Enhancing Graduate Education and Increasing Graduate Enrollment:

- A small number of clearly articulated strategic priorities
- Strong leadership from the President and Provost
- Resource allocation tied to strategic goals
- Offering doctoral programs
- Identifying and cultivating a “niche” in the state system of graduate education
- Identifying and emphasizing “signature” graduate programs
- Developing graduate offerings in response to regional employment needs
- Strategically increasing online and off-campus offerings
- Using every hiring opportunity to increase the number of faculty who are productive researchers

Keys to Increasing External Funding:

- Explicitly identifying external funding as a strategic priority
- Making external funding aspirations public
- Strong leadership from the President and Provost
- Using every hiring opportunity to increase the number of faculty who are productive researchers
- Providing start-up packages for new faculty
- Explicitly rewarding external research support in the tenure and promotion process
- Developing incentive programs to encourage proposal development, submission, and resubmission
- Cultivating “signature” or “niche” research centers, which are often tied to signature graduate programs
- Increasing the research “infrastructure,” including faculty, facilities, resources, and staff
- Adding doctoral programs and making the “cultural and identity shift” necessary to become a doctoral institution
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Graduate Enrollment (% of Total)</th>
<th>Doctoral Programs</th>
<th>Annual External Funding</th>
<th>Indicators of Success, Quality, and/or Reputation</th>
<th>Key Similarities to Minnesota State Mankato</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ball State University</td>
<td>3411 (17%)</td>
<td>15 doctoral programs Some applied programs (Ed.D, AuD, DNP) and some Ph.D. programs</td>
<td>$27 million</td>
<td>Named one of the best universities in the Midwest by the Princeton Review Recognized by U.S. News &amp; World Report for innovative programming (ranked the 14th best “School to Watch”) Graduate enrollment grew 67% from 2,040 in 1999 (11% of total enrollment) to 3,411 in 2009 (17% of total enrollment)</td>
<td>Located approximately 1 hour from the state’s major metropolitan area (Indianapolis) Attempting to recruit students from Indianapolis by establishing sites at the outer edges of the metro area Strong history and identity as a Teacher’s College; graduate enrollment tied to education programs Teaching load of 12 credits per semester with no adjustment for graduate teaching or advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Kentucky University</td>
<td>2192 (14%)</td>
<td>1 Ed.D. in Educational Policy Studies</td>
<td>$69 million</td>
<td>Approximately $70 million in external support for research every year for the past four years</td>
<td>Recently launched first doctoral degree—an Ed.D. in Educational Policy Studies Teaching load of 12 credits per semester with no adjustment for graduate teaching or advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri State University</td>
<td>3216 (17%)</td>
<td>3 applied doctoral programs: Ed.D, AuD, and DPT</td>
<td>$22 million</td>
<td>Ranked in the top tier (45th) of Midwestern master’s universities by U.S. News and World Report</td>
<td>Underwent a name change 10 years ago (formerly Southwest Missouri State) Similar portfolio of graduate programs; 48 master’s programs; 3 applied doctoral programs Part of a state system of regional universities; attempting to distinguish itself from other institutions in the system as well as from the state’s major research institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Kentucky University</td>
<td>2850 (15%)</td>
<td>Ed.D. in Educational Leadership</td>
<td>$32 million</td>
<td>Ranked in the top tier of Southern master’s universities by U.S. News and World Report</td>
<td>Emphasizes applied research as its niche in the state; focused on solving “real world problems”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Graduate Enrollment (% of Total)</td>
<td>Doctoral Programs</td>
<td>Annual External Funding</td>
<td>Indicators of Success, Quality, and/or Reputation</td>
<td>Key Similarities to Minnesota State Mankato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska, Omaha</td>
<td>2886 (19%)</td>
<td>3 stand-alone doctoral programs</td>
<td>$23 million</td>
<td>Eight graduate programs recognized in <em>U.S. News and World Report’s Best Graduate Schools</em> Name one of the best universities in the Midwest by the Princeton Review Graduate enrollment nearly 20% of total enrollment</td>
<td>Began first stand-alone doctoral programs within the last 10 years Total enrollment of approximately 15,000 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Colorado</td>
<td>2074 (17%)</td>
<td>19 doctoral programs</td>
<td>$14 million</td>
<td>Graduate enrollment grew 33% from 1,500 in 1999 (14% of total enrollment) to 2,074 in 2009 (17% of total enrollment)</td>
<td>Located approximately 1 hour from the state’s major metropolitan area (Denver) and the state’s major research university (University of Colorado, Boulder) Strong history and identity as a Teacher’s College Similar graduate “portfolio” (55 master’s programs; primary programs are (a) education master’s and doctoral programs, (b) applied master’s programs with a career focus, and (c) a small number of “bench science” programs that enroll students en route to Ph.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Iowa</td>
<td>1861 (14%)</td>
<td>5 applied doctoral programs (4 Ed.D programs and a Doctor of Industrial Technology)</td>
<td>$26 million</td>
<td>Named one of the best universities in the Midwest by the Princeton Review Ranked in the top tier (2nd) of Midwestern public master’s universities by <em>U.S. News and World Report</em> (one of 3 public institutions on the list of top 20 Midwest regional universities)</td>
<td>Located in a city of 40,000 approximately 90 minutes from the state’s major research/land grant universities (University of Iowa and Iowa State University) Strong identity as an undergraduate institution; small number of doctoral programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>