

12-12-2008

Cedarville University Graduate Programs Task Force Report

Andrew A. Runyan

Cedarville University, arunyan@cedarville.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/extended_learning_publications



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Runyan, Andrew A., "Cedarville University Graduate Programs Task Force Report" (2008). *College of Extended Learning Faculty Publications*. 1.

http://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/extended_learning_publications/1

This Research Report is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@Cedarville, a service of the Centennial Library. It has been accepted for inclusion in College of Extended Learning Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Cedarville. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@cedarville.edu.

Cedarville University Graduate Programs Task Force Report

**Submitted by Dr. Andrew Runyan
Associate Vice President for Academic Administration
Chair, Graduate Programs Task Force**

December 12, 2008

Contents

1.0	Executive Summary.....	1
2.0	Graduate Programs Task Force Charge	2
3.0	The Application of Cedarville University’s Distinctives to Graduate Programs.....	3
3.1	Mission and Community Standards	4
3.2	Christians Educating Christians	4
3.3	Supporting Spiritual Development and the “Cedarville Community” within Graduate Programs	4
3.4	Program Selection	7
3.5	Accreditation	8
3.6	Program Delivery.....	8
3.7	Curriculum Considerations	8
3.8	Administrative Considerations.....	9
3.9	For Future Consideration by the Task Force	9
4.0	Governance Recommendations for CU Graduate Programs.....	9
4.1	Structural Elements of Graduate Education.....	10
5.0	Graduate Program Recommendations.....	15
6.0	Development of a Graduate Culture	16
	Appendix A—Benchmark Institution Data	17
	Appendix B—Graduate Programs Faculty Brainstorming Sessions.....	24

Tables

A-1	Enrollment by Level	17
A-2	Bachelor’s Degree Awards.....	17
A-3	Master’s Degree Awards.....	18
A-4	First Professional Degree Awards.....	19
A-5	Doctoral Degree Awards	19
A-6	Out-of-State Undergraduate Tuition and Fees.....	19
A-7	First-Time, Full-Time Undergraduate Financial Aid	20
A-8	Organizational Structure.....	21
A-9	Curriculum Process	22
B-1	First Brainstorming Session Suggestions for Program Sequence	31
B-2	Second Brainstorming Session Suggestions for Program Sequence .	32

Tables

A-1	Enrollment by Level	17
A-2	Bachelor’s Degree Awards.....	17
A-3	Master’s Degree Awards.....	18
A-4	First Professional Degree Awards.....	19
A-5	Doctoral Degree Awards	19
A-6	Out-of-State Undergraduate Tuition and Fees.....	19
A-7	First-Time, Full-Time Undergraduate Financial Aid	20
A-8	Organizational Structure.....	21
A-9	Curriculum Process	22
B-1	First Brainstorming Session Suggestions for Program Sequence	31
B-2	Second Brainstorming Session Suggestions for Program Sequence .	32

1.0 Executive Summary

The Graduate Programs Task Force distilled its charges into four major areas of review. The task force then studied and made recommendations in each of those areas as outlined below.

The Applications of Cedarville University's Distinctives to Graduate Programs

The 2006-2010 Strategic Planning Guidelines were used to determine the distinctives considered. A series of fifteen recommendations were made with highlights as follows:

- Requirements for adherence to doctrinal, community, and general workplace standards for students, faculty and staff comparable to those for undergraduate students, faculty, and staff.
- A commitment to diversity within our graduate programs.
- Recognition that graduate students are at a different stage in life and maturity than undergraduates.
 - An emphasis on graduate students' development of a relationship with a local church is encouraged.
 - On-campus chapel attendance for graduate students is encouraged but not required.
 - A graduate chapel should be provided once or twice a week as soon as graduate enrollments would merit.
- Requirement of a prerequisite background in Bible or bridge courses for those students lacking that background.
- A strong emphasis on integration within the classroom.
- Flexible modes of course delivery to ensure accessibility to graduate candidates.

Governance Recommendations for C.U. Graduate Programs

Based on recommendations from the Council of Graduate Schools and information from a survey of a select group of benchmark institutions, recommendations are made for refining our graduate governance structure. Many aspects of our current structure were affirmed including our graduate program committee which is recommended to be renamed and expanded to include representation from a broader group of programs. Recommendations for other revisions include the appointment of an administrator to oversee support functions and policy related to graduate programs. Our current practice of faculty teaching graduate courses on overload is believed to be unsustainable, and recommendations for graduate faculty load are presented.

Program Recommendations

Since inception of our task force, significant progress has been made in the planning and development of graduate programs. Our education program continues to grow and has recently added online courses increasing its outreach capabilities. Graduate programs in pharmacy, nursing, and bioethics are in various stages of development. Implementation of those programs will proceed through 2012. We believe that discussions initiated through the work of the task force have helped to encourage that development and that our existing departments will continue to initiate new graduate offerings. Those discussions are documented in the appendices of the report.

Development of a Graduate Culture

Resources from the Council of Graduate Schools were used to identify the support systems and policies needed to support the development of a graduate culture. It is believed that the implementation of recommendations made throughout this report along with the continued work of our Graduate Program Committee and the Graduate Admissions Committee will be effective in supporting a graduate culture at Cedarville University.

2.0 Graduate Programs Task Force Charge

Members:

Gene Apple (Trustee Emeritus)	David Gower (Trustee)
Stan Baczek	Evan Hellwig
Mark Clauson	Tim Norman
Greg Couser	Andy Runyan (Chair)

Purpose:

The purpose of the Graduate Study Task Force is to explore new graduate programs for Cedarville University. Those programs should build on the strength of undergraduate majors, clearly reflect University distinctives, and fulfill the University's goal to prepare Christian leaders to engage and influence their world from high-impact, society-influencing, gate-keeping areas. In order to support the expansion of graduate programs at the University, the Task Force will recommend a graduate governance model that will help build a graduate culture for the University consistent with the mission and vision for the institution. Specifically, the Task Force will seek to perform the following tasks:

1. Recommend graduate programs that will position Cedarville as a leader in those programs. Those selected should be consistent with the University's mission and conservative evangelical distinctiveness and be warranted by market demand.
2. Recommend a governance structure to maximize the development and management of graduate programs, support for learning, scholarship, and research, as well as the impact of CU graduate programs on the world for Christ.
3. Make recommendations on the shape and scope of graduate programs: Suggest delivery models and target markets.
4. Review the distinctive characteristics of a Cedarville education documented in the "Strategic Planning Guidelines for Cedarville University—2006-2010" and provide recommendations on which distinctives must be maintained within the graduate setting, and how that maintenance can be accomplished in view of the potential delivery models and markets.
5. Prioritize the list of future programs and recommend a timetable for implementation.
6. Recommend a strategy to create a graduate culture within the faculty and supporting organizations.

In preparing recommendations, the Task Force should not consider itself constrained by practices and policies required of current undergraduate programs. Instead, it should select from existing distinctives those which it recommends be continued in our graduate programs, consistent with the mission and vision of the institution while serving the selected markets. Delivery models considered should include, but not be limited to, fifth-year residential programs, online courses and programs, and hybrid courses and programs. The committee may choose to visit other institutions in order to examine and assess exemplary programs, and to gain a better understanding of current best practices. The Task Force should provide regular updates on its progress to the president and the academic vice president, have a draft report available by the date of the May 2008 trustee meeting, and prepare a final report for the Academic Committee of the Board of Trustees no later than the date of the January 2009 meeting.

3.0 The Application of Cedarville University's Distinctives to Graduate Programs

Cedarville University's Administrative Council defined characteristics that distinguish Cedarville from its competitors in "Strategic Planning Guidelines for Cedarville University—2006-2010." The Graduate Programs Task Force was charged with reviewing that document and determining what distinctive characteristics must be maintained within the graduate setting and how that can be accomplished in view of the potential delivery models and markets. This summarizes the discussions and recommendations of that Task Force on those distinctives. *In the*

text below items in italics are paraphrased statements of those distinctives extracted from the strategic planning document.

3.1 Mission and community standards

Our mission as a Christ-centered learning community requires a biblical and common understanding of the standards we hold for ourselves as faculty and staff members.

- *Doctrinal Statement Adherence*
- *Community Covenant Adherence*
- *General Workplace Standards Adherence*

Recommendation #1: The requirements for adherence to the Doctrinal Statement, Community Covenant and General Workplace Standards should not change for graduate faculty. Graduate faculty should adhere to the current faculty handbook.

3.2 Christians educating Christians

- *Degrees offered only to professing Christians*
 - Non-Christian graduate students could put the environment we have created for our undergraduate programs at risk.
 - Our mission statement and objectives emphasize growth in Christian character, knowledge of scripture and its application to all aspects of the student's life. This implies our education is provided to Christians. This should also apply to our graduate programs.
 - The reputation of the University is based upon its graduates. They should reflect Christ.
 - This will serve as part of Cedarville's niche in graduate programs.

Recommendation #2: Our graduate students should be required to have a testimony of faith comparable to that of undergraduate students.

- *Global connections/diversity*
- *Priority to attract diversity*
 - The more flexible a program and more widely it is marketed, the more diversity it will attract.

Recommendation #3: Our graduate programs should remove barriers to, and ensure access for, diverse student groups while maintaining standards defined in recommendations 1 and 2 above.

3.3 Supporting spiritual development and the "Cedarville community" within graduate programs

- *Promotion of the Local Church*
 - We suggest that for our graduate students a transition needs to begin to occur from seeing how the University promotes the local church through programs such

as Chapel and Christian service opportunities to building their own value in belonging to a local church. It is likely that many, if not most, of our graduate students will live off campus. This should be the time in their lives when they transition to being active, adult members in a local church family. Our graduate programs should build a sense of value for that connection to a local church. As a result, the group believes that this distinctive for graduate students might be better stated as *Valuing the Local Church* and that could be supported through our graduate programs in various ways.

Recommendation #4: Our graduate students should be encouraged to be active members in a local church. Requirements on the doctrinal statement of the church should be no more stringent than those applied to our undergraduate students.

The integration of faith and learning should be at the core of graduate programs. The following objectives should therefore be maintained as an essential component of any graduate program:

- *Integrate faith and learning*
 - This distinctive should be at the core of graduate education
- *Evaluate knowledge in light of scriptural truth*
- *Faculty biblical knowledge and integration*
- *Demonstrated faculty growth*

Recommendation #5: Requirements for faculty in regard to the integration of faith and learning within their courses should apply to graduate faculty and courses as it does at the undergraduate level. The evaluation, promotion, and tenure of faculty should include an evaluation of integration in the discipline and the instructional setting.

- *Student chapel attendance*
 - Different modes of delivery and the variety of graduate programs will result in great variety in students' ability to participate in a chapel experience.
 - Graduate students are likely establishing families and have moved into adulthood. Additional responsibilities such as family and work must be considered more strongly for our graduate programs than for the undergraduate population.
 - Many of our chapels are appropriately geared toward the life experiences of undergraduate students. On one or two days each week it is suggested that a common graduate chapel experience for students from all graduate programs could be provided that is separate from the University chapel and that graduate students and faculty should be encouraged to attend. This experience should be coordinated by the Division of Christian Ministries as is the undergraduate chapel.
 - As noted in the section on the local church, graduate students should be transitioning to a connection to a local church. In recognition of this development within their lives, as well as their status as adults, chapel should not be

mandatory. The chapel experience can be encouraged for our graduate students without making it a requirement.

- Graduate students should get the “CU Experience” through the integration of faith and learning that occurs in the classroom. That integration should be a point of emphasis and will be a distinguishing factor drawing students to our graduate programs.
- The objectives for a graduate chapel experience should be developed prior to such a program being implemented.

Recommendation #6: Graduate students should be encouraged to personally attend the University Chapel experience. It should not be mandated.

Recommendation #7: When a critical mass of graduate students is on campus an optional graduate chapel should be provided once or twice a week for all graduate students.

- *Faculty chapel attendance*
 - Faculty attendance at chapel, whether the University chapel or a separate graduate chapel on selected days, gives that experience credibility and is necessary to encourage graduate students to attend.

Recommendation #8: To affirm the chapel experience as an important part of a Cedarville education, faculty members teaching graduate programs should have chapel attendance requirements comparable to those in the undergraduate program. Faculty members teaching primarily graduate courses should attend the graduate chapel when it is conducted. As with undergraduate faculty, consideration should be given for absences due to off-campus requirements of the program.

- *The Bible minor/theological background*
 - Students with insufficient or no background in the Bible should have a means of achieving a common understanding of Biblical principles that can be assumed by graduate faculty as a baseline.
 - The current courses used by the M.Ed. program may meet the need to prepare students for any graduate program. Those are being developed as online offerings which would allow great flexibility for students to prepare in advance of a graduate program.
 - This may be a detractor for some students, and companies may not pay for the additional coursework.
 - The baseline does not necessarily have to be equivalent to the content within our undergraduate Bible minor.

Recommendation #9: A baseline of Biblical and theological competency necessary for integration on the graduate level should be established for entering graduate students by the Graduate Program Committee in consultation with the Bible department and existing graduate

program faculty. Students not meeting that baseline should be required to take Bible courses (referred to hereafter as “bridge courses”) geared toward achieving that baseline.

Recommendation #10: Programs that do not require the bridge courses for all students should include a review of previous college transcripts prior to admission. Based on that review, it should be determined if students have adequate previous coursework to meet the established requirement for biblical knowledge. If not, the appropriate bridge course(s) should be required of that student. Preparation other than college-level coursework should not be considered sufficient.

3.4 Program selection

Our selection of programs should flow from the strategic plan of the Academic Division and the University.

- *High impact, society influencing programs*
- *“Gate keeping” programs emphasizing media and public life*
 - The concept of gate keeping programs and the perception of the limited definition this statement provides has been an issue of contention at the University. While faculty members from many programs do not feel that the emphasis on media and public life is descriptive of their program, they do feel that they are charged with producing Christian gatekeepers within their disciplines.
- *Widespread input on programs*
 - The Graduate Programs Task Force has solicited faculty input on programs through open brainstorming sessions with faculty.
- *Graduate programs enhance undergraduate*
 - If we are to aggressively pursue the growth of graduate programs, it is important that neither graduate nor undergraduate programs are put in the position of being the “step-child” to the other. They should neither detract from nor be detrimental to the other, and both should provide support to the other. It is suggested that this statement should be re-phrased to state that “*Undergraduate and graduate programs should be designed to be mutually beneficial.*”
 - Graduate programs can and should be built upon undergraduate or specialty programs at the institution that have demonstrated strength.
 - Undergraduate programs should not be the sole driver for which graduate programs are pursued or how they progress. While the existence of a related undergraduate program may be beneficial to the development of a graduate program, it should not be a requirement.

Recommendation #11: The terminology of “gate keeping programs” should be replaced with the concept of creating “Christian gatekeepers” within each of our academic disciplines.

3.5 Accreditation

Accreditation is essential for the university as a whole and for individual programs that have accreditation processes. It helps ensure the quality of programs, provides external assessment, and provides assurances to the higher education community that we are offering quality programs. This allows our students to pursue study beyond what Cedarville offers.

- *NCA Accreditation*
- *Program assessment and review required*
- *Faculty-to-student ratios managed for educational, economic, and accreditation needs*

Recommendation #12: Graduate programs should be developed in such a way that they would meet and, in some cases, exceed accreditation requirements from the Higher Learning Commission, the Ohio Board of Regents, and program-specific accrediting agencies. Program accreditation should be sought where applicable.

3.6 Program delivery

Cedarville must aim for distinctiveness in the programs we offer and be creative in the modes of delivery for those programs. Our competitors are offering programs that are flexible in regard to the students' time and accessible in regard to where they need to be to participate. Unless we meet those challenges we will not fully realize our potential as a university offering graduate programs.

- *Aggressive growth strategy for graduate programs*
- *Pedagogy supports various learning styles, abilities, and life skill development*
- *Pedagogy that effectively integrates technology*

Recommendation #13: Where appropriate, modes of instruction for graduate programs should include technology-based delivery as supported by the University so that our programs are flexible and accessible while maintaining academic and pedagogical excellence. The distinctive should be for technology-appropriate instruction versus technology-pervasive instruction.

3.7 Curriculum considerations

- *General education core*
- *Liberal arts core*
 - The degree to which a graduate program expands on the liberal arts disciplines or a set of general education requirements should depend on the subject area. Graduate programs are intended to increase knowledge within the student's chosen subject area. Additional content should be at the discretion of the program faculty.
 - We should assume that the basic core of liberal arts was received at the baccalaureate level.

- Each program should establish entrance requirements for their students and those requirements should be reviewed and approved as part of the program approval process.

Recommendation #14: Graduate programs should not be required to add general education or liberal arts coursework (other than the Bible requirement addressed above) beyond that which is deemed necessary by the program faculty. Entrance standards may be set to ensure sufficient background prior to beginning graduate study.

3.8 Administrative considerations

- *Manage growth to accomplish overall University enrollment strategy*
 - The overall University enrollment strategy seems to omit reference to graduate programs with the exception of the growth resulting from the Pharmacy program. Given that a separate objective calls for the aggressive growth of graduate programs it is the assumption of the task force that while growth must be managed and planned for, there is no limitation on the growth of graduate programs within the resources provided by the University.

Recommendation # 15: Outcomes of the Graduate Programs Task Force should inform future strategic planning processes. Objectives for the addition and growth of graduate programs should be included in such plans.

- *Undergraduate program accreditation*
 - Accreditation for both the University as a whole and for individual programs is valuable as was noted above. It is suggested that this statement should be inclusive of graduate programs.

3.9 For future consideration by the Task Force

The charge of the Graduate Programs Task Force includes an analysis and recommendations on structural and governance issues for our programs. The following items that are listed as distinctives within the referenced planning document will be addressed in the next section of this report.

- *School structure with deans as primary academic leaders*
- *Enhanced student advising*

4.0 Governance Recommendations for CU Graduate Programs

The recommendation of a governance structure that will support the development and growth of graduate programs at Cedarville University was one of the required outcomes of the Graduate Task Force. The group reviewed best practices by identifying and contacting benchmark institutions and by using resources available from the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS).

Information obtained from the benchmark institutions is attached. A 2004 pamphlet from the CGS, *Organization and Administration of Graduate Education*, was used as the outline for discussions and recommendations on governance.

Variations in institution size, the number and size of graduate programs, and differences in the type of institutions created great diversity in the structure supporting graduate programs at the benchmarks. The following recommendations take into consideration ideas obtained from those benchmarks as well as the characteristics and history of Cedarville and its existing programs.

4.1 Structural Elements of Graduate Education

(Categories below are based on *Organization and Administration of Graduate Education*, Council of Graduate Schools, 2004).

4.1.1 Governing board and administration that support graduate education

Given that we have been charged with this task by the governing board and administration we should assume their support. We cannot, however, assume they have thought through all the ways various departments will be impacted by additional graduate programs.

4.1.2 The Graduate Council

1. Recommendation

- a. The existing Graduate Program Committee should be renamed to the Graduate Council for consistency with other institutions. The makeup of the committee should be revised to have representation from each discipline that maintains responsibility for at least two graduate courses that have been taught in a graduate program within the past two years. That responsibility implies that the department that developed the course is responsible to take any revisions to the course forward through the curriculum process and has faculty teaching the course reporting to their department as regular or adjunct faculty. This revision would allow a department such as Biblical and Theological Studies to have representation even though they do not have a full program. They do teach graduate-level coursework within other programs. Terms for members should be established when revisions to the membership are enacted.

4.1.3 Basic faculty units that supervise graduate study and recommend degrees

1. Recommendation

- a. Graduate degree programs should reside in the same department in which the undergraduate program for that discipline is housed.
 - i. Our M.Ed. program has set a precedent for this and, while the M.Ed. may not have been supported to the point that it can be the ideal model

for us, keeping the M.Ed. program in the current Education department seems the most logical step.

- ii. Plans for the development of future graduate degree programs are coming from within existing departments. Nursing is proposing both the M.S.N. program as well as the D.N.P. program. It does not seem logical to separate those from the undergraduate program.

2. Other options

- a. An entirely separate Division of Graduate Studies comparable to Indiana Wesleyan.
 - i. Such a system would require high levels of budget for additional administrative support.
- b. Separate graduate departments reporting to the deans.

4.1.4 Faculty committed to graduate programs and research

1. Recommendation

- a. Faculty members will be housed in current departments and the department will determine which faculty will teach various levels of classes.
- b. The ability to teach at the graduate level is on the basis of the minimum required credentials for the discipline as determined by the department and approved by the dean and academic vice president.
- c. The approval of graduate-level curriculum and programs should be that of the department, the dean, Graduate Council, academic vice president, and, when required, the Board of Trustees as is currently listed in policy.
 - i. Proposals for graduate curriculum and programs should be made available for all faculty to review. A time frame should be established in which any faculty member may provide feedback to a member of the Graduate Council, the dean, or the academic vice president.
 - ii. Proposals should be required to consider and document the impact on other programs as a result of added enrollments, new classes, facilities requirements, or other parameters. Costs of those impacts should be included in the financial analysis for the program or curriculum revision.
 - iii. It is recommended that the academic vice president review proposals with the Deans Council prior to approval.
 - iv. An implication of this recommendation that must be considered is that the current group of graduate faculty members is small and from a minority of programs across the institution. This would limit those voting on new graduate programs such as nursing and pharmacy.

- d. A load policy for graduate instruction is proposed that allows faculty to teach at the graduate level as part of their base load.
 - i. It is recommended that we keep the trustee-mandated requirement of 12 hours per term but give 1 hour of release for every 2 hours of graduate-level instruction to allow graduate faculty to pursue the additional research and advising requirements of a graduate faculty member. A full-time graduate faculty member would therefore teach 8 load hours with 4 hours of release per term.
 - ii. If a faculty member teaches a graduate course as part of overload they would not be granted the release indicated in item i. above, but would instead receive twice the undergraduate rate per credit hour.
 - iii. Overload teaching should be at the approval of the chair and the dean.
- 2. Other options
 - a. The Task Force discussed having a designation of “graduate faculty member” with criteria to be determined by the Graduate Council and enforced by the departments and/or that committee. It was felt that such a distinction was not necessary and could be divisive. We do not want to set up a “class system” with such designations.

4.1.5 Chief academic officer for graduate education

- 1. Recommendation
 - a. The current structure should support graduate programs as well as undergraduate.
 - b. An associate vice president for graduate programs should be appointed, reporting to the academic vice president, to carry out administrative functions of the graduate programs that are not specific to a particular school or department. Those responsibilities would include:
 - i. Chair and oversight of the research review board
 - 1. Approves routine proposals for research using human subjects
 - ii. Chair of the Graduate Council (current Graduate Program Committee)
 - 1. Oversight of graduate curriculum processes
 - 2. Oversight of graduate academic policy
 - iii. Co-chair of the Graduate Admissions Committee
 - iv. Oversight of processes and services for graduate programs within the academic division
 - 1. Liaison with the director of graduate admissions
 - 2. Graduate catalog oversight
 - 3. Support graduate registration in association with the registrar
 - 4. Support logistics for offerings of graduate programs

- v. Develop strategies to ensure retention of graduate students
- vi. Support new program development
- vii. Ensure that student learning is assessed and feedback is being used for program improvements within the graduate programs

4.1.6 Separate degree-granting graduate unit

1. Recommendation

- a. The recommended associate vice president for graduate programs would chair the Graduate Council (as stated in current policy) which would have oversight of policy and consistent application of that policy as related to graduate programs.
 - i. Current policy states “*Degrees are granted following the appropriate action by the faculty, the academic administrators, and the trustees. Faculty advisors have the central responsibility for the recommendation of students for graduation.*” This structure would continue. It places an emphasis on the importance of a faculty advisor for all students irrespective of the academic level of the student.
 - ii. Individual programs need to have the ability to set admissions standards that exceed those set by the Graduate Council. Accrediting agencies have varied requirements for admissions and even operation of the programs. The Graduate Council should consider minimum standards and recognize that departments may need to create standards that are more restrictive than those minimums.

4.1.7 Graduate program director in each academic unit

1. Recommendation

- a. The appointment of a graduate program director will be dependent on the status of the program, its need for resources, and its ability to financially support the role.
- b. Small programs or those under development may have the chair of the department serve as the graduate program director. Release or added compensation must be demonstrated as both necessary and financially feasible.
- c. Departments that provide primarily graduate programs (e.g. pharmacy) may propose alternate structures to the dean for final approval by the academic vice president.
- d. When demonstrated as financially feasible, release time and/or a financial stipend may be granted to a faculty member to provide administrative support

to the graduate program. The level of release and/or stipend must be justified by the chair to the dean for final approval by the academic vice president.

4.1.8 Graduate Student Representation

1. Recommendation
 - a. Student representation at the graduate level should be added to the Graduate Admissions Committee.
 - b. Individual departments should have a governance structure that provides students input to the delivery and curriculum of that program.

4.1.9 Implementation

In many ways the previous recommendations support the structure that exists for graduate education at Cedarville. They do, however, require that some modifications be made to those structures and that resources are made available to allow the development and growth of programs:

1. Revisions to the structure of the current Graduate Program Committee must be made through the approval of the faculty, administration, and Board of Trustees.
2. The types of changes recommended in the process of review of graduate curriculum can be made by action of the Graduate Council.
3. Having graduate and undergraduate faculty serving in the same department is the current model for the institution. This represents no major change in structure.
4. The proposed model for faculty load is within the authority of the academic division (provided budget funds can support the model as defined). These proposals should be included in the documentation of load standards that has already been initiated within the division. The proposal does not modify the annual load for faculty as mandated by the trustees, but does provide for release that allows the increased level of research and publication required within graduate programs. Our proposal is consistent with load policies at benchmark institutions but does represent increased costs for the M.Ed. program. It is consistent with proposals for load within the pharmacy program and will be used in the analysis of new graduate programs. Increased costs to the M.Ed. program may require increased levels of tuition along with increased enrollment to fund the additional faculty cost.
5. The recommendation for an associate vice president for graduate programs does represent additional administrative resources. The current associate vice president for academic administration is covering many of those responsibilities. Other responsibilities of that position, however, prevent the level of attention to graduate

- programs that is required. Proposals for new programs and plans for existing programs should include allocations of cost for these needed support services.
6. Administration of a program within the department will vary by department and by the financial status and maturity of the program. Recommendations in this document allow for great variation in how that support is configured and program plans need to reflect and fund the level of support required.
 7. The addition of student representation to the Graduate Admissions Committee can be implemented within policy by action of the Graduate Council and implemented functionally by the existing Admissions Committee.

5.0 Graduate Program Recommendations

Objectives within the charge to the Graduate Task Force related to the identification and prioritization of graduate programs and the creation of a graduate culture reflect areas that have changed significantly since the initiation of the Task Force:

- Through the support of the trustees, donors, and efforts of many departments across campus, the School of Pharmacy has moved toward implementation and now has enrolled pre-pharmacy students taking first steps toward this professional doctorate program. The professional-level program is schedule to begin in fall 2012.
- Our nursing department is developing curriculum and proposals for a Master's in Nursing program with multiple concentrations and is planning to begin that program in fall 2010.
- Our Center for Bioethics is developing a master's level course for delivery through our Master's in Education program and is planning to develop additional courses creating a full master's degree program in bioethics.
- Our existing Master's in Education program is developing online courses to expand their market through increased flexibility of offerings. Those will be offered for the first time in November 2008 as part of the Dayton regional conference of ACSI.
- The Engineering Advisory Council has urged that department to consider developing a master's degree in engineering management in association with the Department of Business Administration.

These initiatives have established a schedule for the development of graduate programs extending through 2012 and beyond. With the exception of pharmacy, the programs are being initiated from within the existing undergraduate departments. That strategy is consistent with previous recommendations made by the Task Force. We feel that as those programs demonstrate success and our prior recommendations on University distinctives and governance are implemented, a culture supportive of graduate programs will grow and additional programs will be proposed for implementation. Given these developments, the Task Force did not feel that

speculation on programs beyond 2012 would produce recommendations we could make with confidence. Appendix “B” of this document presents results obtained from open sessions conducted with the faculty collecting input on programs that were under consideration at that time. As noted above, some of these are being taken to the next step while others, if deemed feasible, will require further analysis and time to build support. The Task Force believes that future planning should be the responsibility of those involved in the proposed governance structure and the academic departments.

6.0 Development of a Graduate Culture

Resources such as *Organization and Administration of Graduate Education* by the Council of Graduate Schools that have been used extensively by our Task Force provide insights into the types of support an institution must provide to support and sustain graduate education at Cedarville University. The institutional framework on which those support mechanisms must be built has been the focus of the Task Force’s efforts to recommend a governance structure and distinctives that such programs would maintain in order to reflect what graduate education should look like at Cedarville. Implementation of those recommendations is the first step in creating that culture. We have one graduate program in operation at this point, plans in development for two to three additional programs to begin operation over the next four years, and discussions beginning for future programs beyond those. Those programs, supported by the proposed structure, have already planted seeds from which our graduate culture is developing and will grow.

New graduate faculty members will be hired to support the planned programs and existing faculty may shift responsibilities from undergraduate to graduate instruction as those programs develop. The Task Force has discussed the need to avoid a “we-they” attitude toward graduate and undergraduate programs and our recommendations reflect a number of measures intended to avoid such attitudes from proliferating. It will be the primary responsibility of the Graduate Council, the proposed associate vice president for graduate education as well as higher level administrators to support the development of that culture and ensure that its growth is a positive experience for the University. All faculty, administrators, and support staff across the University will feel the effect of graduate programs and their support will, at times, be needed to allow this relatively new form of education to grow at Cedarville. It is an important new direction for the University and must be approached with open minds.

Appendix A—Benchmark Institution Data

Table A-1 Enrollment by Level

Institution Name	Undergraduate	Graduate	First-professional	Grand Total	% Grad. Enrollment
Azusa Pacific University	4,602	3,532	193	8,327	44.7%
Biola University	3,774	1,535	349	5,658	33.3%
California Baptist University	2,415	690		3,105	22.2%
Cedarville University	3,090	24		3,114	0.8%
Elon University	4,702	254		4,956	5.1%
Gordon College	1,589	77		1,666	4.6%
Harding University	4,124	1,620		5,744	28.2%
Indiana Wesleyan University	8,447	4,185		12,632	33.1%
Liberty University	9,975	2,121	362	12,458	19.9%
Mount Vernon Nazarene Univ.	2,195	354		2,549	13.9%
Ohio Northern University	2,597	1	944	3,542	26.7%
Ohio University-Main Campus	17,207	2,824	430	20,461	15.9%
Palm Beach Atlantic University	2,487	394	291	3,172	21.6%
Samford University	2,941	400	1,166	4,507	34.7%
Taylor University	1,853	14		1,867	0.7%
Union University	2,084	780		2,864	27.2%
University of Akron	17,140	3,375	534	21,049	18.5%
University of Dayton	7,426	2,673	470	10,569	29.7%
Wheaton College	2,417	515		2,932	17.6%

Fall 2005 Data from the National Council for Educational Statistics – extracted December, 2007

Table A-2 Bachelor's Degree Awards

Institution name	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Ohio University-Main Campus	3971	3991	4148	4222	4243
University of Akron Main	2063	2050	2216	2271	2296
Indiana Wesleyan University	1144	1252	1476	1460	1789
Liberty University	1030	1085	1273	1292	1497
University of Dayton	1545	1654	1552	1423	1477
Azusa Pacific University	927	1114	1091	1101	1160
Elon University	842	874	889	965	1049

Institution name	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Harding University	714	769	753	777	798
Biola University	561	660	690	772	778
Cedarville University	590	623	620	603	625
Wheaton College	609	594	604	592	602
Samford University	577	626	627	593	571
California Baptist University	487	358	418	508	564
Palm Beach Atlantic University	396	493	530	524	523
Mount Vernon Nazarene Univ.	443	466	465	459	512
Ohio Northern University	400	539	482	406	418
Taylor University	372	463	406	417	399
Union University	459	396	433	480	399
Gordon College	364	334	388	376	374

Data from the National Council for Educational Statistics – extracted December, 2007

Table A-3 Master's Degree Awards

Institution name	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Indiana Wesleyan University	972	1024	1386	1436	1431
Azusa Pacific University	973	1091	1199	1050	1179
Ohio University-Main Campus	950	987	1050	980	924
University of Akron	961	933	861	1012	920
University of Dayton	902	735	733	817	791
Liberty University	260	283	299	351	551
Harding University	141	171	207	247	345
Union University	218	229	285	272	312
Biola University	237	233	239	276	279
Wheaton College	167	182	201	210	175
California Baptist University	102	90	84	145	140
Mount Vernon Nazarene Univ.	11	22	19	61	140
Palm Beach Atlantic University	87	82	103	147	127
Samford University	191	123	151	148	111
Elon University	76	50	60	52	75
Gordon College	12	30	18	13	29
Ohio Northern University				5	4
Cedarville University	2	2	3	3	3
Taylor University			1	5	

Data from the National Council for Educational Statistics – extracted December, 2007

Table A-4 First Professional Degree Awards

Institution name	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Samford University	304	290	302	320	329
Ohio Northern University	240	143	184	178	227
University of Dayton	126	122	133	163	163
University of Akron	157	123	171	189	141
Ohio University-Main Campus	94	104	102	97	104
Palm Beach Atlantic University				43	45
Biola University	50	33	27	45	43
Azusa Pacific University	22		25	24	42
Liberty University	30	27	38	35	37
Harding University			0		13

Data from the National Council for Educational Statistics – extracted December, 2007

Table A-5 Doctoral Degree Awards

Institution name	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Ohio University-Main Campus	112	111	111	147	124
University of Akron	80	82	100	114	119
Elon University				33	52
Azusa Pacific University	25	24	22	34	38
Liberty University	21	12	15	16	35
Biola University	38	45	39	33	33
Samford University	35	28	21	25	30
University of Dayton	41	21	25	16	29
Union University				29	22
Wheaton College	18	19	17	10	17
Harding University					3

Data from the National Council for Educational Statistics – extracted December, 2007

Table A-6 Out-of-State Undergraduate Tuition and Fees

Institution name	2006 Price
Ohio Northern University	\$ 28,260
Gordon College	\$ 24,278
University of Dayton	\$ 23,970
Biola University	\$ 23,782
Azusa Pacific University	\$ 23,050
Wheaton College	\$ 22,450
Taylor University	\$ 21,800
Elon University	\$ 20,441

Institution name	2006 Price
California Baptist University	\$ 19,030
Palm Beach Atlantic Univ.	\$ 18,740
Cedarville University	\$ 18,400
Union University	\$ 17,790
Ohio University	\$ 17,691
University of Akron	\$ 17,631
Indiana Wesleyan University	\$ 17,164
Mount Vernon Nazarene Univ.	\$ 16,366
Samford University	\$ 16,000
Liberty University	\$ 15,350
Harding University	\$ 11,250

Data from the National Council for Educational Statistics – extracted December, 2007

Table A-7 First-Time, Full-Time Undergraduate Financial Aid

Aid Type:	Any aid	Federal grants		Institutional grants		Loans		State/Local grants	
		% Recvng.	Avg. Amt.	% Recvng.	Avg. Amt.	% Recvng.	Avg. Amt.	% Recvng.	Avg. Amt.
Institution Name									
Azusa Pacific University	95%	3,646	29%	4,766	91%	10,295	52%	6,044	25%
Biola University	81%	2,596	24%	6,327	68%	7,803	65%	9,199	23%
California Baptist University	95%	3,257	29%	6,017	85%	4,662	75%	6,798	29%
Cedarville University	91%	2,931	42%	3,925	83%	4,058	59%	1,291	40%
Elon University	78%	3,232	8%	5,214	54%	4,799	37%	3,891	26%
Gordon College	93%	2,911	18%	9,395	86%	4,363	54%	1,139	17%
Harding University	95%	3,202	24%	4,500	83%	5,747	62%	3,357	7%
Indiana Wesleyan University	80%	3,114	28%	5,736	46%	5,519	63%	3,309	21%
Liberty University	99%	2,971	31%	6,934	99%	7,878	64%	2,406	28%
Mount Vernon Nazarene Univ.	100%	2,964	33%	4,340	95%	3,741	79%	1,511	86%
Ohio Northern University	100%	4,707	19%	14,097	99%	9,270	76%	1,456	88%
Ohio University-Main Campus	72%	2,772	17%	4,287	33%	4,855	53%	1,525	13%
Palm Beach Atlantic University	91%	1,980	24%	2,976	91%	3,205	68%	2,043	55%
Samford University	84%	3,172	10%	4,608	76%	3,488	42%	758	34%
Taylor University	91%	3,567	19%	6,759	84%	4,864	50%	2,832	22%
Union University	96%	2,804	25%	5,452	91%	3,723	51%	4,603	49%
University of Akron	85%	3,051	44%	3,717	29%	4,928	64%	1,316	31%
University of Dayton	96%	3,704	12%	7,941	96%	6,816	60%	1,200	63%

Aid Type:	Any aid		Federal grants		Institutional grants		Loans		State/Local grants	
	% Recvng.	Avg. Amt.	% Recvng.	Avg. Amt.	% Recvng.	Avg. Amt.	% Recvng.	Avg. Amt.	% Recvng.	
Wheaton College	70%	4,523	16%	8,501	59%	4,571	45%	2,256	12%	

2004-2005 Data from the National Council for Educational Statistics – extracted December, 2007

Table A-8 Organizational Structure

Institution Name	% Grad. Enrollment	Organizational Structure
Biola University	33.3%	Combined – 7 schools “grad supervises undergrad”; Separate provost for undergraduate studies; no graduate dean
California Baptist University	22.2%	Combined – Both grad and undergrad report to the same deans; faculty teach in both areas. Load does not differentiate, all faculty teach 12 load hours.
Cedarville University	0.8%	
Elon University	5.1%	Combined - With the exception of the “graduate only” programs of Law and Physical Therapy, faculty teach both graduate and undergraduate classes. Load is 24 credits for the year but teaching a 3 credit grad class gets faculty 4 load credits. There is a Graduate Program Committee, elected by the full faculty, that governs grad programs including curriculum review and policy setting. There is no separate graduate administrator such as a graduate dean. Support organizations cover both grad and undergrad with the exception of one graduate admissions officer that sets in their admissions office. They do not have combined grad & undergrad classes. Their M.Ed. program has significant online components with some summer on-campus work. Everything else is on campus.
Gordon College	4.6%	Combined – Grad & Undergrad programs are under discipline-specific deans.
Indiana Wesleyan University	33.1%	Separate – Grad & adult completion programs are much like their own institution. There is a combined University Senate but nearly all governance is within the individual “college” (Arts & Sciences, Graduate College, Adult & Professional Studies). Faculty are not generally shared between colleges unless on and adjunct basis.
University of Akron	18.5%	Combined - Have a VP for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. Faculty report within the departments but are appointed as graduate faculty. A Graduate Council is elected by the Graduate faculty & chaired by the VP.
University of Dayton	29.7%	Combined – Faculty teach both in grad and undergrad programs and report to the same Chair/Dean. Each unit (school) has its own graduate council and one or more

Institution Name	% Grad. Enrollment	Organizational Structure
		members also sits on a University Graduate Leadership Council (GLC) (usually an Associate Dean). The Dean of Graduate Studies chairs the GLC. That body handles both policy & curriculum. Faculty (bacc. & grad.) generally teach 3 courses per term although there is no university-wide load policy. There is some release for research but primarily at the Doctoral level. They are pursuing more consistency in tenure requirements and have established a new policy to that end. Online grad programs include two options in Educational Leadership and one in Engineering Management. They have some combined bacc. & grad. classes but discourage it. 6 hrs max of 400 level courses are allowed for a grad program.
Wheaton College	17.6%	Combined – Both grad and undergrad faculty in same departments. All faculty teach 12 load hours but Ph.D. & Psy.D. faculty have 6 load hours for mentoring grad students. There is a Grad Advisory Council but it is more an administrative communication group.

Table A-9 Curriculum Process

Institution Name	% Grad. Enrollment	Curriculum process
Azusa Pacific University	44.7%	Separate – has undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral curriculum committees elected by the faculty
Biola University	33.3%	Separate – one common committee for undergrad, each school does their own graduate curriculum except for new programs which goes to a University Graduate Curriculum Committee
California Baptist University	22.2%	Separate – There are separate graduate and undergrad curriculum committees. The graduate committee consists of deans & chairs; degree program approval would go from there to the equivalent of our Admin. Council and Trustees. Faculty senate is not generally involved in curriculum.
Cedarville University	0.8%	
Elon University	5.1%	Combined* - All curriculum goes through the same process and same curriculum committee. *Graduate curriculum has an added Graduate Program Committee that reviews the curriculum in addition to the steps that undergrad curriculum go through.
Indiana Wesleyan University	33.1%	Separate* – Each of the three colleges has their own curriculum committees. *The combined University Senate

		does review and approve new degrees and majors.
University of Akron	18.5%	Separate - Grad Council handles curriculum and recommendations for appointment to the graduate faculty.
University of Dayton	29.7%	Separate – Minor proposals from departments go to the unit (school) graduate committee, and then to the Graduate Leadership Council for final approval. Major proposals (programs) do the same but go on to Provost Council, Academic Senate (representative body), and Trustees.
Wheaton College	17.6%	Combined - Curricular proposals come from departments that have both grad and undergrad faculty and move to a campus-wide curriculum committee.

Appendix B — Graduate Programs Faculty Brainstorming Sessions

December 14, 2007, and January 11, 2008

Brainstorming sessions open to all faculty were conducted on December 14, 2007, and January 11, 2008. Approximately nine faculty/academic administrators attended the first session and eleven attended the second. These notes are the result of those sessions.

Purposes of this session were presented as:

- Brainstorming potential program titles
- Identifying the level of planning to date
- Gathering information for the Task Force
- Exploring the fit between proposed programs and our mission
- Collecting initial thoughts from the faculty on priorities

It was suggested that this session was not the proper forum for discussions such as:

- Debating if we should offer graduate programs
- Discussing graduate governance
- Recounting historic precedents
- Determining detailed resource requirements

The group was asked to list ideas they had for future graduate programs and were then asked to respond to questions regarding planning to date for each of those programs. Those questions were:

- In what forums has the idea been discussed to this point?
- How would the mission of the institution be furthered by offering those programs?
- What would you offer (data or anecdotal evidence) that such a program would be attractive to students?
- What would indicate that the program would be feasible for implementation at Cedarville?

Those programs suggested and responses to the questions are provided below. The final activity of the session was to use stickers provided to suggest in what sequence the programs should be developed should it be decided to proceed. Results are provided below.

1. Program Title: Master of Science in Nursing (M.S.N.)

2. Program Title: Doctor of Nursing Practice (D.N.P.)

These programs have been discussed both in department meetings and with the Nursing Advisory Council. Initially the M.S.N. program would have two areas of concentration, one being in advanced practice and the other in nursing education. Over time the department would like to transition the advanced practice concentration to a doctor of nursing practice degree which is consistent with the direction of many health careers (including pharmacy). Their current plans would call for that transition by 2015.

Mission Fit:

- We have a long standing B.S. program with a strong missions focus. The addition of the M.S.N. and especially the concentration in nursing education would allow us to grow our own faculty.
- Programs represent a natural progression and would give our students the highest quality of preparation.
- In mission settings nurses are often the primary health care providers. This level of preparation provides higher quality of care.

Evidences of Demand:

- By the year 2020 1 million new registered nurses will be needed. Cedarville needs faculty trained to meet this need.
- There is evidence that increased levels of preparation for nursing staff increases the quality of care to patients and lowers morbidity rates.
- The number of physicians is inadequate to meet the healthcare needs in underserved areas.
- The aging of the US population drives additional demand.
- The average age of nursing faculty is very high resulting in more retirements and demand for replacements.
- Wright State University is beginning a Doctor of Nursing Practice program and will be the only one in our area.

Thoughts on feasibility:

- Cedarville has a core nucleus of Ph.Ds. in our nursing department now that could serve to begin these programs.
- We would need to have faculty members with the D.N.P. credential to offer the program.
- The nursing program hopes to get additional space in ENS when the Biblical and Theological Studies building opens and are hoping to be part of a the new Pharmacy/Allied Health building.
- Cedarville currently has 120 freshmen nursing students but can only admit 80 juniors with the current number of clinical sites available.
- The department feels we could begin the program with our current faculty, especially if portions of the new program would be delivered on line.
- The department has considered offering both an on-campus program and a distance program with some residency requirement.
- The program would need additional simulations and advanced practice media.

3. Program Title: M.S. in Bioethics

It was indicated that this program has been discussed both in department meetings and with an advisory council. There was discussion that an M.S. was preferred over an M.A. to add credibility to the scientific aspects of the program and because initiatives toward creating accreditation standards were moving in that direction.

Mission Fit:

- The program would have great impact in creating gate-keepers within the field. It would be a faith-based program grounded upon the principles of scripture.
- Current Christian resources centered on the subject are mostly opinion based, housed within lobby groups and not a university.
- The program would be interdisciplinary.
- The masters would build on the existing bioethics minor.

Evidences of Demand:

- Examples were provided of a number of local hospitals that are seeking help with their ethics boards and in dealing with specific situations. This has resulted in a need for formal ethics analysis capabilities that do not generally exist.
- Trinity's bioethics program is growing but cannot keep up with the demand. It is also interdisciplinary in nature. The director of that program would like to help us start a program.
- The bioethics minor at Cedarville is growing. It started at 17 and is now up to 25 students.
- CU's Center for Bioethics is one of only two faith-based centers in the country. All other centers are secular.
- Alumni have expressed interest in such a program.

Thoughts on feasibility:

- The program would not require much in regard to additional facilities. No labs would be needed.
- The delivery of the program would likely consist of summer and weekend seminars.
- Faculty would likely focus in specialized topic areas and could be brought in for short-term classes.
- We currently have three faculty members that could teach in the program.
- The M.S. is needed to provide the science and human biology background. Science components would not be taught at the pre-med level.
- Students would be required to have Bible and science backgrounds before entering the program.
- Seed money would be needed to allow the director more release time.
- The Center is planning to launch a peer-reviewed journal yet this academic year.

4. Program Title: Master's in Engineering Management

Discussions on this major are in the very early stages. A similar bachelor's degree program was proposed to the Engineering Advisory Council. That group recommended a master's program instead. At the second session one representative from the Department of Engineering requested that the program be discussed as he felt more information should be added. He indicated that the departments would not be interested in non-traditional delivery methods for the program. It would serve as a fifth-year program for our engineering students. Students may need to take a specific set of electives in the baccalaureate program.

Mission Fit:

- The program would be interdisciplinary between engineering and business.
- Our engineering graduates would be able to take advantage of opportunities to move to management positions.
- It was suggested that the program would be consistent with the concept of a gatekeeper program.
- This is not another M.B.A. program but is for our engineering majors.
- The program would relate to University objectives 4-6.

Evidences of Demand:

- The University of Dayton has a similar program and is getting high enrollments.
- 5% of current engineering students complete a minor in business.
- One third of the students that leave engineering shift to a business degree. They want to combine the two.

Thoughts on feasibility:

- Delivery could be at corporate sites.
- Engineering faculty felt there is strong support from the business department.

5. Program Title: Doctor of Psychology in Counseling Psychology

Discussions on this major have been ongoing within the department. It was suggested it would be an on-campus program.

Mission Fit:

- The program would have a Christian worldview on human anthropology and the sinfulness of man.

Evidences of Demand:

- At present there are six Christian graduate programs but all are in clinical psychology. None are in counseling psychology. This would be our distinctive.
- Existing master's programs in counseling could be a feeder for our program.

Thoughts on feasibility:

- Offering graduate assistantships would make the program attractive.
- American Psychological Association accreditation would be needed.

6. Program Title: M.Ed. in International Teaching

This would not be a new major but a new emphasis within the existing major.

Mission Fit:

- There is an increasing student awareness of needs around the world.
- Our students are interacting with others on a global level.
- More and more missionaries are in a bi-vocational setting with a teaching role.

Evidences of Demand:

- There are no similar programs.
- Would meet the need of current international teachers to get a master's degree.
- Overseas teachers cannot get a master's degree locally to obtain or continue licensure.

Thoughts on feasibility:

- We have been contacted by the Association of Christian Schools International to partner with them to create a focus on international teaching.
- We are already certified for the present program
- We can use visiting professors to teach electives
- The current faculty have the vision to move the program to support international teaching
- The core courses are already in place

7. Program Title: Ph.D. in Chemistry

This was the suggestion of one faculty member at the meeting from the discipline. It has not been discussed at the department level. It was noted that it would need to be a residential program as a result of the lab requirements and that it would likely need to start with the offering of a Master's degree in the discipline. The faculty member felt that the concept could apply to any of the hard sciences but since his discipline was Chemistry he would propose that at our session.

Mission Fit:

- No other Christian school with our view of scripture offers this level of degree program in the hard sciences.

Evidences of Demand:

- We would be the only creation school with a Ph.D. in Chemistry.

Thoughts on feasibility:

- We have the basics in regard to equipment. We would need more faculty and lab space.
- We would need funding for graduate students. At this level they are generally fully funded.
- Traditional government sources of funding would not be available to us but the Institute in Creation Research and Answers in Genesis might be willing to help with funding.

8. Program Title: Master's in Christian Leadership

There has been a task team discussing this degree program. The Bible or Business departments have had representatives on that team but have not discussed it as a department. Delivery of the program could include on-line instruction but would likely be blended between that and face to face sessions. Courses would include instruction from both the Bible department and Business Administration.

Mission Fit:

- It was felt to be intuitively obvious.

Evidences of Demand:

- There are no courses on the management of volunteers at the present—even within secular schools.
- There are six similar programs within the CCCU although most are taught within ministry departments where faculty members are not trained in organizational leadership. Ours would include instruction from our business faculty.

Thoughts on feasibility:

- We have the expertise on campus already but would need additional faculty.

9. Program Title: Master of Arts in Ministry

The program was suggested by one member of the Bible Department with experience in a similar program at another school. The concept has been discussed in meetings with the Greater Dayton Association of Baptists. It would likely be an evening/Saturday program for those already within ministry in some capacity.

Mission Fit:

- It was felt to be intuitively obvious.
- This was not suggested as part of a seminary but a logical extension of our existing department.
- There would be the potential of reaching out to and supporting individuals from other ethnic groups with the program that may not have seminary training.
- This is an opportunity to support our local church leaders.

Evidences of Demand:

- There are no similar evangelical programs in this area.

Thoughts on feasibility:

- Without a degree completion program for non-traditional students we do not have a natural baccalaureate feeder for this program.

10. Program Title: Juris Doctor (J.D.)

This has been considered by the administration, and Duane Wood was asked to investigate.

Mission Fit:

- The legal profession is a gate-keeping one in society.

Evidences of Demand:

- The only Christian schools offering the J.D. are Regent and Liberty.
- Based on Duane's investigation there seems to be an overabundance of law programs out there.

Thoughts on feasibility:

- Library resources would be a major cost/obstacle to our implementing the program.

11. Program Title: Master of Social Work (M.S.W.)

Because it was identified as a priority of enrollment management, Andy Runyan explored the possibility of the MSW with Nelson Henning on January 31, 2008. Nelson has been investigating that possibility and is interested in proceeding with further investigation and justification.

Mission Fit:

- The role of a social worker is one that fits well with the Cedarville mission. That has been demonstrated by the success of the undergraduate program (41 majors in 2004 has grown to 83 in 2007).

Evidences of Demand:

- Enrollment management lists the M.S.W. as one of the top three priorities. Their market research indicates a strong need and growth rate for the profession. It was stated that the need for professionals with this degree with a Christian college background is great.
- The Bureau of Labor Statistics expects a 22 percent increase in employment of social workers from 2006-2016 which is much faster than the average for all occupations. This represents an additional 132,000 social workers over that ten year period.
- While the bachelor's is the most common degree, the M.S.W. has become the standard for many positions and is typically required for positions in health settings and clinical work.

Thoughts on feasibility:

- The major cost is for faculty. The accrediting agency requires 6 full-time faculty members that teach the majority of their classes in the Master’s program to begin such a program. Of those six, four need to have both the M.S.W. and a Ph.D.
- Individuals with a bachelor’s in social work could complete the MSW in a year (32 semester credits). Other backgrounds would require 45 semester credits.
- Can lead to a Ph.D. but that degree is not accredited (which makes the Ph.D. program easier to develop).
- 12/1 student to faculty ratio is required.
- Big issue is getting faculty. Wright State is in process of starting a program and is working with Ohio State. For the first few years students at Wright State will receive an O.S.U. degree.
- 900 hours of practical experience is required for the degree. That would likely be handled in a one-semester block-placement experience.
- Probable delivery methods would be a mix of on-campus, weekend, and online classes.
- Facility requirements are not a major issue.
- Nelson feels it would be a 3-4 year project to get this in operation.

Program Sequence

Table B-1 First Brainstorming Session Suggestions for Program Sequence

Program	Suggested Sequence			
	First	Second	Third	Fourth
M.S. - Bioethics	4	2		
M.S.N. - Nursing	2	3	1	
M.S. - Engineering Mgmt.		1	1	3
D.N.P. - Nursing				2

It was noted that the D.N.P. was an outgrowth of the M.S.N. program and would naturally come later in the sequence.

Table B-2 Second Session Suggestions for Program Sequence

Program	Suggested Sequence			
	First	Second	Third	Fourth
M.Ed. International Teaching	5		4	
M.S. – Engineering Mgmt.	1	9		
Master of Arts in Ministry	1		3	2
Psy.D. Counseling Psychology	1	1	1	3
Master’s in Christian Leadership	1		2	1
Ph.D. in Chemistry				2
J.D. - Law				1

Additional Comments

At the end of the second session the following comments were provided:

- A question was raised as to the reasons for pursuing graduate studies. The group was reminded that this was not the forum for that discussion
- Concern was expressed that the timeline for the activities of the Task Force is too long. The Nursing program is working diligently on developing the M.S.N. and is ready for a feasibility study to be conducted. It was stated that the dates suggested for the results from this task force would be “too late.”
- The question was raised as to where the results from this Task Force would be sent. There was concern that the trustees and not the faculty would deal with the outcomes from the Task Force.