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Introduction
We have recently been asked to present results of surveys to a number of various educational institutions, including both public and private universities. The surveys were designed to assess the quality and effectiveness of the institutions, as well as to identify areas where improvement is needed. The results of the surveys were then used to make recommendations for future improvements.

The surveys were conducted using a variety of methods, including questionnaires, interviews, and focus groups. The results were then analyzed using a variety of statistical methods, including correlation analysis and regression analysis.

The results of the surveys were then used to make recommendations for future improvements. These recommendations included increasing the number of faculty members, improving the quality of the courses offered, and improving the overall infrastructure of the institutions.

2-Year Programs

Undergraduate Programs

Masters Programs

Doctoral Programs

Doctoral Programs > 20 FTEs

Most Important Factor in Departmental Success

- At 1-year and master’s institutions curricular, recruitment, enrollment, and partnerships were the most important factors for the 1-year and master’s institutions.
- At PhD-granting institutions less than 15 FTEs and greater than 20 FTEs the biggest influence was partnerships and curricular, respectively.
- At PhD-granting institutions greater than 20 FTEs was the most important factor for success.

Comments

- At PhD-granting institutions less than the 15 FTE the recruitment and faculty success were the two most important factors.
- At PhD-granting institutions greater than 20 FTEs the recruitment and faculty success were the two most important factors.

Percent of Teaching by Full-Time Faculty

- At 1-year and master’s institutions curricular, recruitment, enrollment, and partnerships were the most important factors for the 1-year and master’s institutions.
- At PhD-granting institutions less than 15 FTEs and greater than 20 FTEs the biggest influence was partnerships and curricular, respectively.
- At PhD-granting institutions greater than 20 FTEs was the most important factor for success.

Comments

- At PhD-granting institutions less than the 15 FTE the recruitment and faculty success were the two most important factors for the 1-year and master’s institutions.
- At PhD-granting institutions greater than 20 FTEs the recruitment and faculty success were the two most important factors for the 1-year and master’s institutions.

Variation in Undergraduate Majors Over the Last 5 Years

- At 1-year and master’s institutions curricular, recruitment, enrollment, and partnerships were the most important factors for the 1-year and master’s institutions.
- At PhD-granting institutions less than 15 FTEs and greater than 20 FTEs the biggest influence was partnerships and curricular, respectively.
- At PhD-granting institutions greater than 20 FTEs was the most important factor for success.

Comments

- At PhD-granting institutions less than the 15 FTE the recruitment and faculty success were the two most important factors for the 1-year and master’s institutions.
- At PhD-granting institutions greater than 20 FTEs the recruitment and faculty success were the two most important factors for the 1-year and master’s institutions.

Do You Fear Losing Faculty to Other Departments?

- At 1-year and master’s institutions curricular, recruitment, enrollment, and partnerships were the most important factors for the 1-year and master’s institutions.
- At PhD-granting institutions less than 15 FTEs and greater than 20 FTEs the biggest influence was partnerships and curricular, respectively.
- At PhD-granting institutions greater than 20 FTEs was the most important factor for success.

Comments

- At PhD-granting institutions less than the 15 FTE the recruitment and faculty success were the two most important factors for the 1-year and master’s institutions.
- At PhD-granting institutions greater than 20 FTEs the recruitment and faculty success were the two most important factors for the 1-year and master’s institutions.

Opportunities Over the Next 3-5 Years

- At 1-year and master’s institutions curricular, recruitment, enrollment, and partnerships were the most important factors for the 1-year and master’s institutions.
- At PhD-granting institutions less than 15 FTEs and greater than 20 FTEs the biggest influence was partnerships and curricular, respectively.
- At PhD-granting institutions greater than 20 FTEs was the most important factor for success.

Comments

- At PhD-granting institutions less than the 15 FTE the recruitment and faculty success were the two most important factors for the 1-year and master’s institutions.
- At PhD-granting institutions greater than 20 FTEs the recruitment and faculty success were the two most important factors for the 1-year and master’s institutions.

Threats Over the Next 3-5 Years

- At 1-year and master’s institutions curricular, recruitment, enrollment, and partnerships were the most important factors for the 1-year and master’s institutions.
- At PhD-granting institutions less than 15 FTEs and greater than 20 FTEs the biggest influence was partnerships and curricular, respectively.
- At PhD-granting institutions greater than 20 FTEs was the most important factor for success.

Comments

- At PhD-granting institutions less than the 15 FTE the recruitment and faculty success were the two most important factors for the 1-year and master’s institutions.
- At PhD-granting institutions greater than 20 FTEs the recruitment and faculty success were the two most important factors for the 1-year and master’s institutions.

Conclusions

The surveys, which included a sample of approximately 45% response rate, resulted in a limited representation of two year, four-year, master’s, and doctoral departments, with public and private universities equally represented. From the survey, there was evidence of concern about the rapid decline of Geoscience graduate students and departments, as compared to other fields. The results of the surveys were then used to make recommendations for future improvements.

The results of the surveys were then used to make recommendations for future improvements. These recommendations included increasing the number of faculty members, improving the quality of the courses offered, and improving the overall infrastructure of the institutions.
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