

FINAL REPORT

OF THE

GRADUATE COLLEGE CAREER ADVISORY COMMITTEE

William Kelleher, Department of Anthropology (*chair*)
Kathleen Brinkmann, Biotechnology Center
Paul Diehl, Department of Political Science
Jennifer Ely, Department of Geography, Graduate Student Advisory Council Coordinator
Anna Maria Escobar, Department of Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese
Gregory Lambeth, Counseling Center
John Lammers, Department of Speech Communication
Erik Lund, School of Music
Karen Paulsen, Career Services Center
Kevin Quinn, Department of Sociology
Rashid Robinson, Department of Educational Policy Studies
Gardner Rogers, Department of English
Melba Velez, Institute for Communications Research
Debe Williams, Chemical Sciences Placement and Career Services
Amy Martin, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations (*project graduate assistant*)
Nora Few, Graduate College (*staff*)
Lamar Murphy, Graduate College (*staff*)

SUBMITTED TO

RICHARD P. WHEELER
DEAN OF THE GRADUATE COLLEGE

MAY 16, 2003

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Although doctoral education is, and must be, responsible for preparing graduate students for careers in research universities, in many disciplines most individuals who earn doctoral degrees will not secure tenure-track positions in research universities or in prestigious small colleges, and many others will pursue career paths outside the academy. This trend, which has been developing for years, may well be intensifying. Doctoral recipients are spending longer periods in postdoctoral positions. In fields with depressed job markets (such as humanities, social sciences, and fine arts) the current economic downturn could worsen employment prospects. Graduate students do, however, possess the tools to combat this slide. They acquire sophisticated skills in research, problem solving, and communicating complex ideas that could position them to take advantage of job possibilities beyond academia.

The Graduate College appointed a Career Advisory Committee to examine these opportunities and devise a means for addressing them. The committee has tried to identify how best to supplement the work of graduate programs in preparing students for the opportunities and challenges of a rapidly changing professional workplace. Dean Richard Wheeler asked the committee to issue a preliminary report by the end of the Fall 2002 semester and to provide a set of implementation recommendations no later than May 2003.

The committee pursued several objectives during the Fall 2002 and Spring 2003 semesters. It gathered and evaluated information about the current national conversation about doctoral education while examining career advising programs at peer institutions. It sought input from graduate students and faculty on the issues under discussion. It analyzed the information at hand and related it to the situation at Illinois in order to recommend specific steps to institute career advising services, with special attention to the needs of humanities, social sciences, and fine arts students who may wish to pursue careers outside of academia. It offered some pilot programs during the Spring 2003 semester, including a half-day symposium, two hands-on workshops, and a Web site. The committee's main findings are:

- There is a need to provide career advising and professional development programs and services for graduate students, especially – but not only – those in the humanities, social sciences, and fine arts. This need emerged clearly in the focus groups with graduate students, and was supported by conversations with directors of graduate study in these areas. Further reinforcement was provided by the Spring 2003 pilot programs, which were very well received.
- It is also clear that there is a gulf between faculty understandings of the situation the committee is addressing and graduate students' perceptions of it. The committee agrees with the advice given by directors of graduate study to work with and through them to reach out to faculty on these issues.
- To be effective, the programs and services envisioned by the Career Advisory Committee must include efforts to facilitate connections between graduate students and possible employers.
- Career advising services must be available to both master's and doctoral students. While the committee's work has focused primarily on the needs of doctoral students in the humanities, social sciences, and fine arts, the committee recognizes that many graduate students in the life sciences, physical sciences, agriculture, and engineering are also interested in these services.
- Over time it may be desirable to have career advisers with specialized training (a humanities adviser, a social sciences adviser, a fine arts adviser, etc.).
- The most logical home for these services, at least initially, is in the Graduate College.

- A phased approach to implementing career advising and professional development services should be used. At the recommendation of the committee, pilot programs and services were offered in the Spring 2003 semester. These included a half-day symposium for campus faculty, students, and staff; two hands-on workshops for graduate students; and a career advising Web site. All of these efforts were very well received, and have confirmed the need to provide these services on a permanent basis.

This report summarizes some of the major career issues facing doctoral students – especially those in the humanities, social sciences, and fine arts – both at Illinois and nationally. It addresses the needs of some of the stakeholders in graduate education, and it assesses current programs at Illinois and peer institutions. It provides information about the programs presented during the Spring 2003 semester, and makes recommendations for future programs and events. The report also includes detailed recommendations for program implementation.

CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	i
I. Introduction and Statement of Issues	1
II. Programs and Services at Peer Institutions	6
III. Assessment of the Need at Illinois	7
IV. Existing Programs and Services at Illinois	10
V. Conclusions and Recommendations	11
Appendices	
A. The Graduate Career Consortium	14
B. Graduate Student Focus Groups	15
C. Information Sessions with Directors of Graduate Study	16
D. Web Site	17
E. <i>Graduate Education: Promises, Purposes, Potentials</i> Symposium Held March 19, 2003	18
F. <i>From C.V. to Résumé</i> Workshop Held April 3, 2003	28
G. <i>Interviewing Skills</i> Workshop Held April 16, 2003	32
H. University of Illinois Campus Career Centers – Resources Currently Available	39

I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF ISSUES

The doctorate provides the basic academic qualification for tenure-track professorial positions at the university level. Most doctoral programs, at the University of Illinois and elsewhere, have been shaped to provide that qualification, in the expectation that successful doctoral candidates will proceed to university-based research and teaching. Faculty who teach in doctoral programs prepare their students for faculty positions in research universities, often with the assumption that all of their students are destined for such positions.

In turn, many students enrolling in doctoral programs do so in the belief that they will move on to such careers upon graduation. Many, in fact, do so. Many do not. Some will rethink their career plans, while others will opt out because of the realities of the academic job market in their fields.

Overview of Issues

National data indicate that in many disciplines most graduate students who earn doctoral degrees will not secure tenure-track positions in research universities or in prestigious small colleges, and many others will pursue career paths outside the academy. For instance, a 1995 study by Maresi Nerad and Joseph Cerny of the University of California at Berkeley (see "From Rumors to Facts: Career Outcomes of English Ph.D.s – Results from the Ph.D.'s-Ten Years Later Study," posted at www.cgsnet.org/PublicationsPolicyRes/Communicatorpdfs/1999/SeptSpecial.pdf) showed that only 53% of the 1,217 English Ph.D.s sampled had found tenure-track positions ten years after completing their degrees. According to a Modern Language Association (MLA) survey of nearly 2,200 graduate students who received degrees in English, foreign languages, comparative literature, linguistics, and classics in the 1996-97 academic year, only 33% of those in English found tenure-track jobs within a year of finishing. Those in foreign languages and comparative literature had slightly better luck (about 40% got tenure-track jobs), while those in linguistics and classics did worse (30%) (posted at www.rackham.umich.edu/StudentInfo/nonacadarticle2.html).

This trend, which has been developing for years, may well be intensifying. Graduate students are spending longer periods of time in postdoctoral positions, and in fields where the academic job market has been depressed for years – such as the humanities, social sciences, and fine arts – prospects could worsen due to current changes in the economy. For example, a November 29, 2001 article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* ("New College Graduates Face Tight Job Market, Survey Finds") states that job opportunities for master's and doctoral students graduating in 2002 will be down 20% from 2001.

It is very difficult to find meaningful statistics and other job placement information for alumni of Illinois graduate programs in the humanities, social sciences, and fine arts. Most departments do not systematically track alumni of their graduate programs beyond the first academic position. Anecdotal evidence from both students and graduate program directors, however, suggests that many Illinois graduate students face job market realities that are consistent with national trends.

Such job market realities provide the context within which a sustained national conversation about the nature of doctoral education is taking place. Four interrelated initiatives are shaping much of the current discussion. The first of these initiatives, the Preparing Future Faculties (PFF) project (www.preparing-faculty.org), grew out of the conviction that graduate students intending to pursue academic careers should be provided with opportunities to observe and experience faculty responsibilities at a variety of academic institutions with varying missions, diverse student bodies, and different faculty expectations. PFF's funding has come primarily from The Pew Charitable Trusts, the National Science Foundation, and the Atlantic Philanthropies. The second initiative, the Re-envisioning the Ph.D. Project (www.grad.washington.edu/envision), also funded by Pew, has brought together a wide variety of

academic and nonacademic stakeholders in doctoral education. These conversations have led to an inventory of concerns about doctoral education as well as the dissemination of promising practices to address those concerns. The Responsive Ph.D. Project (www.woodrow.org/responsivephd), which grew out of the Re-envisioning the Ph.D. Project, has brought together 14 research universities with funds from the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation to collaborate in fostering improvements in doctoral education. Innovations in six disciplines – chemistry, education, English, mathematics, neuroscience, and history – are being sought through the most recent initiative, the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (www.carnegiefoundation.org/CID), sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

In the October/November 2002 issue of *Change* magazine, Jody Nyquist summarizes the consensus emerging from these conversations. Educators, graduate students, and potential employers agree that doctoral education should fit the aspirations of graduate students and should respond to the needs and demands of a changing academy, broader society, and global economy. Graduate schools and programs should offer systematic supervision and professional preparation for a variety of careers within and outside the academy, and they should foster opportunities for creative interdisciplinary research within an intellectually rigorous program of study. At the same time, educators must continue to seek ways to reduce student attrition and time to degree.

Participants in these national conversations recognize that graduate students acquire sophisticated skills in research, problem solving, project management, and communicating complex ideas that are of great potential value beyond academia. As Robert Weisbuch, President of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation (www.woodrow.org), has pointed out, we should think of doctoral education not as simply producing “the next generation of scholars and teachers,” but as producing “the next generation of leaders and thinkers, which includes scholars and teachers.”

These conversations reflect a growing national recognition of the importance of professional development as part of graduate education. While graduate programs in the humanities, social sciences, and fine arts do typically provide assistance to graduate students seeking academic jobs, they are not generally well equipped to provide guidance to graduate students who are interested in exploring career alternatives.

National Survey Results

The need for career advising programs is clear, as the results from two recent surveys demonstrate. The Wisconsin Center for Education Research conducted a Survey on Doctoral Education and Career Preparation in the summer of 1999, with 4,114 doctoral students from 27 universities responding. Findings from the survey (www.phd-survey.org) include:

- The training doctoral students receive does not prepare them for the jobs they take. Although most Ph.D. students in the humanities want to become faculty members, no more than half of the students will be hired into full-time, tenure-track faculty positions. Of those faculty positions, only a small proportion will be in research universities.
- Students are less able to learn about nonacademic careers than about careers as faculty, and fewer report being encouraged to make such explorations.
- Fewer than 5% of Ph.D. recipients report being unemployed, yet it is taking doctorate holders much longer to find employment and more are beginning their careers in temporary positions, such as postdoctoral fellows or adjunct faculty. There are far more job seekers than tenure-track jobs available, and this imbalance is the new status quo. Although the number of faculty

positions is growing every year, the number of Ph.D.s granted is increasing at an even greater rate.

- Students reported very few opportunities to explore career possibilities. Although 57.7% said a workshop on the academic job search is available to them, only 45.6% reported an available workshop on conducting a job search outside of academia. While 55.8% of students were encouraged to take part in academic job search training, only 31.8% felt encouraged to take part in the nonacademic job search workshop.

Similar results were reported for the National Doctoral Program Survey, an online assessment of educational practices in doctoral programs in the U.S. and Canada, which was conducted by the National Association of Graduate-Professional Students (NAGPS) between March 30 and August 15, 2000. Over 32,000 students completed surveys, representing nearly 5,000 doctoral programs at almost 400 graduate institutions across the U.S. and Canada. The largest proportion (37%) of doctoral recipients was in non-science and engineering fields, including health, humanities, education, and professional fields. Information about the survey, including results, is posted at <http://survey.nagps.org/index.php>.

Despite their overall satisfaction, survey participants expressed significant concerns about preparation for nonacademic careers. While 65-75% of respondents in all fields reported satisfaction with preparation for academic careers, satisfaction with preparation for nonacademic careers ranged widely, from 65% satisfied in engineering to only 21% in the humanities. Many students felt that those who express an interest in pursuing non-research careers would lose the favor of the department. This included those interested in nonacademic positions as well as academic positions at teaching colleges. As the survey's executive summary of results states, and as Nyquist reminds us in *Change*, "The common thread is that satisfaction is strongly linked to choice: Students want curricula broad enough to give them a choice of careers, they want information to ensure that their choices are informed, and they want the choices they make to be respected."

The National Doctoral Program Survey consisted of 48 questions in nine areas relevant to doctoral education, including professional development, career guidance and placement services, time to degree, faculty mentoring, program climate, and overall satisfaction. Each section posed questions to be answered on a four-point Likert scale. Results were calculated on a number of dimensions, including university program, and a grade (A-F, with A being the highest) was computed to reflect the overall score.

Students from a large number of graduate programs at Illinois participated in the survey. Since the number of respondents in most units was fairly small, it is not possible to provide a precise rating for those units. The composite results do, however, point to very low levels of satisfaction in the areas of preparation for a broad range of careers, professional development activities, and career guidance and placement services.

The remarks of individual students often reflect and particularize the broad findings of many recent studies. One University of Illinois History doctoral student who participated in the survey complained, "[T]he department's curriculum was intended to produce Ph.D. candidates who would replicate the academic interests and career choices of the department's faculty. For those interested in pursuing the grail of an academic appointment, the curriculum was suitable. Those who expressed interest in the possibility of seeking employment outside of academia were summarily dismissed as 'not serious' students."

An English doctoral student said, “Although our department has been among the most vocal in advertising the nebulous presence of careers outside of academe for Ph.D. recipients, it has never, to my knowledge, offered concrete examples of such careers as they were pursued by recent graduates. This lack of specific information makes extra-academic careers both difficult to imagine and even harder to obtain. Connecting students with a general humanities placement office would provide a positive first step in this direction.”

One Illinois Anthropology student said that “faculty members, while recognizing that some students may be interested in working in applied anthropology, tend to be pretty explicit about this program's focus on preparing graduate students for academic careers.”

Career Advising for Illinois Graduate Students

Many top universities – among them the University of Texas at Austin, the University of Chicago, and the University of California at Santa Barbara – have already developed career advising programs to help their graduate students prepare for a wider and more flexible array of career options. As Appendix H documents, there are currently 27 career services offices at Illinois. Each of these offices targets either a specific population (such as Business Career Services) or caters primarily to undergraduate students (such as The Career Center). Illinois graduate students in the sciences and in professionally oriented fields have access to career advising and professional development programs, but their peers in the humanities, social sciences, and fine arts have little to no access to such programs.

The Career Advisory Committee has been charged with advising the Graduate College on how best to supplement the work of graduate programs in preparing students for the opportunities and challenges of a rapidly changing professional workplace. The committee composition reflects many of the major stakeholders in doctoral education in the humanities, social sciences, and fine arts. There are five faculty members, including one current director of graduate study. There are five graduate students at varying stages of their graduate careers, two of whom have a significant amount of nonacademic work experience. One of the graduate students is the current coordinator of the Graduate Student Advisory Council. There are three career services professionals (drawn from chemical sciences, biotechnology, and The Career Center). There is one counseling professional, the designated Counseling Center liaison to the Graduate College, who conducts workshops on dissertation completion and works individually with a large number of advanced doctoral students. Staff support is provided by a project graduate assistant who is in her final year of graduate study in the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations and two Graduate College deans with doctoral degrees and extensive nonacademic work experience.

The committee was asked to issue a preliminary report by the end of the Fall 2002 semester, to be followed by a set of implementation recommendations no later than May 2003. If the committee were to determine that career advising and professional development programming for doctoral students would be desirable, then the goal was for some form of program to be in place no later than Fall 2003.

The committee pursued several objectives during the Fall 2002 semester. It gathered and evaluated information about the national conversation on doctoral education and programs at peer institutions. It sought input from Illinois graduate students and faculty. The committee analyzed the information at hand and offered the following conclusions in its December 2002 preliminary report:

- There is a need to provide career advising and professional development programs and services for graduate students, especially – but not only – those in the humanities, social sciences, and fine arts.

This need has emerged clearly in the focus groups with graduate students, and is supported by conversations with directors of graduate study in these areas.

- It is also clear that there is a gulf between faculty perceptions of the situation the committee is addressing and graduate students' perceptions of it. The committee agrees with the advice given by directors of graduate study to work with and through them to reach out to faculty.
- To be effective, the programs and services envisioned by the Career Advisory Committee must include efforts to facilitate connections between graduate students and possible employers.
- Career advising services must be available to both master's and doctoral students. While the committee's work has focused primarily on the needs of doctoral students in the humanities, social sciences, and fine arts, the committee recognizes that many graduate students in the life sciences, physical sciences, agriculture, and engineering are also interested in these services.
- Over time it may be desirable to have career advisers with specialized training (a humanities adviser, a social sciences adviser, a fine arts adviser, etc.).
- The most logical home for these services, at least initially, is in the Graduate College.
- Career advising and professional development services should be implemented through a phased approach. At the recommendation of the committee, pilot programs and services were offered in the Spring 2003 semester. These included a half-day symposium for campus faculty, students, and staff; two hands-on workshops for graduate students; and a career advising Web site. All of these efforts were very well received, and have confirmed the need to provide these services on a permanent basis.

II. PROGRAMS AND SERVICES AT PEER INSTITUTIONS

Many peer institutions offer career advising and professional development activities for their graduate students. These activities range from freestanding Web sites to full-fledged programs of integrated courses, workshops, one-on-one advising, and community involvement. Many of these universities participate in the Graduate Career Consortium (GCC), an organization of research universities that focus on developing career resources for doctoral students by pooling their resources, sharing promising practices, and cosponsoring events. GCC members seek to support students in both academic and nonacademic job searches. See Appendix A for more information about the GCC.

Some institutions – Berkeley, Michigan, Penn, Brown, Cornell, and MIT – provide Web sites specifically geared toward doctoral students contemplating nonacademic careers. Many of these Web sites simply link to other already-established sites that students can visit anonymously. These sites are an excellent starting point for students looking for information about nonacademic job possibilities. Some of the sites also offer information about transferable skills and abilities, as well as possible career ideas.

Other institutions have more extensive career advising and professional development programs for graduate students. Berkeley offers a four-part workshop series titled *Looking Beyond Academia*. Four universities in North Carolina have joined together to organize a Ph.D. career fair to provide an opportunity for doctoral students to explore employment opportunities in the government, non-profit, and business sectors. The Graduate Division at the University of California at Santa Barbara offers workshops on topics such as professional development, public speaking, and grant writing. It also has a Graduate Program in Management Practice, a certificate program that introduces students to the fundamentals of business management through four courses (Management Communications, Marketing, Business Management, and Financial Management) and a 160-hour internship.

Another extensive program is located at the University of Texas at Austin. The *Intellectual Entrepreneurship Program* creates relationships among the academic, private, and public sectors through interdisciplinary projects done by students, faculty, and community organizations. In addition, 16 cross-disciplinary graduate courses are offered, including Entrepreneurship, Academic and Professional Writing, the Academic Job Market, and Grant Writing.

The program at the University of Chicago occupies a middle ground, and offers an attractive model for Illinois. Three full-time graduate career counselors provide individual counseling, the *Beyond Ivory* e-mail list, and numerous programs on both academic and nonacademic careers. Workshops include topics such as internships, “*Getting What You Came For*,” and local alumni panel discussions. The office also offers a five-week career exploration seminar for students from all disciplines that teaches skill identification, interviewing, résumé and cover letter writing, and other relevant tools. The graduate career counselors have a national presence, publishing frequently in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and other higher education outlets.

III. ASSESSMENT OF THE NEED AT ILLINOIS

Although there is a great deal of national data available about the challenges of the academic job market, it has been difficult to find local data that are easily quantifiable. In Fall 2002 the committee used three primary approaches to assess the need at Illinois: graduate student focus groups; open discussions with directors of graduate study; and personal experience. The results led the committee to conclude that there is a need for career advising and professional development services for graduate students. This need is particularly acute in the areas initially identified as the target disciplines – the humanities, social sciences, and fine arts. But the committee also found strong indicators of a broader need to serve students ranging across the many areas of graduate study at Illinois. In Spring 2003 these preliminary conclusions were tested and reinforced through pilot programs: a half-day symposium, two hands-on workshops, and a Web site. Further affirmation came from the fourteen directors of graduate study who attended one of three additional open meetings in Spring 2003.

Graduate student focus groups

Four graduate student focus groups were conducted during November 2002. Thirty-one graduate students from fourteen different disciplines in the humanities, social sciences, and fine arts participated. See Appendix B for additional information. Several themes emerged from the focus groups:

- Almost all of the participants felt that a doctoral student who was pursuing a nonacademic career would be very poorly received in their departments. The assessment of the situation ranged from mild (*“My professor might understand why I would pursue a nonacademic career, but would probably not encourage me or have any idea how to help me”*) to extreme (*“I would be accused of stealing valuable resources away from more ‘serious’ students,” “I would be encouraged to leave the program,” “I would be scorned and ostracized.”*)
- Almost all of the students agreed that they would not feel comfortable telling anyone about their nonacademic career plans due to the fear of repercussions.
- Some students wondered why a doctoral student would even be interested in nonacademic careers, since they had come to Illinois with the goal of getting an academic job at a Research I university.
- All had an easy time identifying the skills they would need to obtain an academic job, but they had a much harder time delineating the skills they would need for a nonacademic job and explaining how the skills they gain as a graduate student might transfer to a nonacademic career.
- Many of the students felt that their departments did an acceptable job preparing them for **academic** employment, although some students said their departments did nothing at all to help them.
- The students agreed that their departments did nothing to prepare them for **nonacademic** careers, and most said they would not feel comfortable requesting or attending this sort of program, even if their departments offered it. Many said they felt “left out to dry” since the undergraduate career center does not serve them and they are barred from using the programs offered by units such as Business Career Services. Many suggested that the Graduate College offer programs on interviewing skills, job search skills, and writing *curriculum vitae*, résumés, and cover letters. Most agreed that they would feel comfortable attending programs organized by the Graduate College, saying that they see the Graduate College as a neutral unit that would offer appropriate programs of high quality.

Students agreed that there should be a career services office dedicated to graduate students. They indicated that good publicity would be important, and suggested that services might be customized to address the needs of the different disciplines.

Open meetings with directors of graduate studies

Fourteen graduate program directors attended one of two discussion sessions in late October 2002. The same number of graduate program directors attended one of three sessions in early February 2003. See Appendix C for more information about these meetings. The general themes that emerged were:

- Although the graduate program directors generally confirmed the students' perspectives, several of them expressed surprise at hearing that graduate students would be fearful of approaching the faculty about nonacademic career alternatives.
- The graduate program directors agreed that faculty members would generally not be well equipped or expected to assist students who wanted to pursue nonacademic careers.
- The participants agreed that many, but not all, departments do a good job preparing students for the academic job market. They stated that it is primarily up to the students themselves if they choose to pursue nonacademic alternatives. Programs that are more applied in nature reported higher success in placing doctoral graduates in nonacademic positions. While some disciplines have clear nonacademic career paths, others do not. Participants agreed that many skills honed through graduate research and teaching are transferable, but observed that students do not always realize the value of these skills.
- It was observed that students at varying stages of their graduate programs may realize that the reality of the program does not match their expectations or long-term career goals. Giving students more exposure to professional development and career planning information during their first two years as graduate students would be helpful.
- There seemed to be a tentative consensus by the graduate program directors that programs and services should be situated in academic departments, in the Graduate College, or both. Graduate College programs and services could complement those offered in academic departments. Maintaining a link to the academic programs will be important. Such services could include workshops on particular types of skills or topics (résumé writing, interviewing skills), assistance with nonacademic internships, Web site information, and alumni presentations. They recommended that the workshops address academic job search issues as well.
- Participants agreed that it would be very helpful if the Graduate College could also help departments track their doctoral alumni five and ten years after graduation.

Experiences of committee members

Focus groups and open meetings reinforced the perspectives voiced by the members of the committee. The committee's placement professionals report that graduate students who seek advice frequently do so with the plea of "*Don't tell my adviser.*" Since most faculty see their role as that of training future professors, the culture reinforces the likelihood that advisers will seek to replicate themselves. Indeed, relatively few faculty advisers would be equipped to train students for alternate careers even if they

believed that such training would be useful to their students. There is also the sense that doctorates who pursue nonacademic career paths are failures, and a parallel sense that faculty feel betrayed when their students do not follow traditional academic careers or take pure teaching jobs. It would be unrealistic to expect immediate and pervasive transformations in these dominant departmental cultures.

In providing professional development and career advising programs, it is important to be cognizant of students' goals. Students enter graduate school with a variety of goals, some of which are very focused (“*I have wanted to be a professor of history since I was 10*”) and some of which are very unfocused (“*I couldn't get a job, so here I am*”). Students' goals may change over time, and their awareness of their interest in, or need for, certain programs and services may also shift. Several committee members strongly advocated that a safe space be created for graduate students to explore different career alternatives. In the current culture of many departments, it is difficult, if not impossible, for students to explore alternative careers with faculty, since their success as graduate students depends to a great extent on mentoring and support from advisers whose orientation is toward students pursuing faculty careers.

Spring 2003 programs and services

To test the committee's sense of the strong need for career advising programs and services for graduate students, a series of pilot activities took place in the Spring 2003 semester.

- February 2003: A career advising Web site was launched.
A basic career advising Web site provides information about nonacademic options, publicity about relevant programs, and links to campus and national resources. Eventually the Web site may include online assessment tests and other materials. See Appendix D for more information.
- March 19, 2003: The first annual campus-wide symposium to explore key issues in graduate education was held.
Led by keynote speaker Robert Weisbuch, President of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, the symposium focused on *Graduate Study: Promises, Purposes, Potentials*. Over 200 graduate students, faculty, and staff attended the half-day event. Further details about the symposium, which was very well received, may be found in Appendix E.
- April 3, 2003: The first hands-on workshop was held.
Kathleen Brinkmann, Placement Director for the Biotechnology Center and member of the Career Advisory Committee, conducted a workshop on converting the *curriculum vitae* into a résumé. The workshop filled quickly at its capacity of 45 graduate students. The evaluations were extremely positive. See Appendix F for additional information.
- April 16, 2003: The second hands-on workshop was held.
Debe Williams, Director of Placement and Student Services for the School of Chemical Sciences and a member of the Career Advisory Committee, conducted a workshop on interviewing skills. One hundred and fifteen students from across campus attended the workshop, which received very positive evaluations. See Appendix G for additional information.
- Spring semester 2003: Outreach to nonacademic recruiters was initiated.
Project graduate assistant Amy Martin attended several campus recruiting fairs to discuss the committee's work with nonacademic recruiters.

IV. EXISTING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES AT ILLINOIS

Career advising and professional development activities are valuable for all students. These programs and services, for instance, help students understand the formal requirements and unwritten rules of mounting a successful job search, whether academic or nonacademic. They also help students understand the skills, qualifications, and experiences that will be most desirable in attaining the kind of position that they seek. They help students identify and polish their own skills, and provide assistance to students in constructing strong applications.

There are currently 27 different career services offices on the University of Illinois campus. These offices serve a variety of undergraduate and graduate populations, and offer services ranging from direct job placements to information sessions, presentations, individual advising, career fairs, workshops, and resource centers. The largest office is The Career Center, which advises undergraduate students campus-wide about academic majors, provides career information, helps with internships and career preparation, provides graduate and professional school advice, and offers employment services and referrals.

Several of the career placement offices do exclusively serve graduate students, but they are restricted to the special populations designated by their various professional titles: business, education, labor and industrial relations, law, library and information science, and social work. Similarly, the Biotechnology Center serves graduate students with biological research interests, and the Chemical Sciences Placement and Career Services Office serves undergraduate and graduate students in chemical sciences. Appendix H lists the 27 career services offices, the populations they serve, and the programs and services they offer. A campus-wide Career Services Council provides an organizational structure that promotes collaboration and best professional practices among the academic professionals in the various career services offices.

Although several graduate programs in the humanities, social sciences, and fine arts have coordinators who assist students with academic job searches, there are presently no career services offices dedicated to helping these students with nonacademic job searches. Many of the students who participated in focus groups expressed their frustration at not having access to career services offices and not having a place of their own to assist them with job searches.

This rich network of career services offices on campus is a wonderful resource for the Graduate College career advising office that is envisioned. Staff in these career services offices could offer expertise and experience, and the graduate office will share features of some of the other career services offices already in existence.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Career Advisory Committee has examined different ways to meet the career advising and professional development needs of Illinois graduate students, especially – but not only – those in the social sciences, humanities, and fine arts. The committee concluded that a career advising and professional development office should be established in the Graduate College, and that it should begin working immediately to implement a phased approach directed in large part by graduate student needs and available resources.

It was initially tempting to recommend locating these services within an existing office, perhaps in The Career Center, which serves undergraduates campus-wide, or in one of the other career services offices on campus. After further examination, this seems neither practical nor appropriate. The existing offices have specialized services that target specialized populations. They are either focused primarily on undergraduate student needs or on mixed student groups within specific disciplinary areas. Graduate student feedback confirmed that graduate students do not want to be “second-class citizens” in an office devoted primarily to undergraduates or to a specific career path. Faculty feedback strongly encouraged maintaining a link between career advising and the academic mission of the campus. The committee recognizes that the mission and function of these various offices will evolve as a result of leadership changes and other factors, so there may be opportunities for reevaluation or for collaboration in the future.

A related option that was considered was to join forces with either the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences or the College of Fine and Applied Arts, both of which are in the initial stages of establishing career services offices. This does not seem practical or appropriate, at least at this point. Both colleges will be concentrating on the needs of undergraduate students. However, we envision that there could well be some joint programming or other collaborative activities in the future.

The committee also evaluated the level of programming that seems appropriate to meet graduate students’ needs in a manner that is sensitive to the institutional culture and to the current budgetary climate. The shoestring approach would be to provide ad hoc programming by asking staff to find time to plan suitable workshops in collaboration with campus administrators. At the other end of the spectrum, the committee considered the possibility of establishing a certificate or other noncredit program that would expose graduate students in a structured way to key concepts and skills that are useful in nonacademic career paths.

The committee is recommending an approach that falls in the middle of these two extremes. Furthermore, the committee is recommending an incremental approach, which it believes will maximize the likelihood of success. This incremental approach has allowed the Graduate College to use available resources in Spring 2003 to create programs and services of high quality. The committee’s hope is that a phased approach will generate goodwill and acceptance by demonstrating quality and appropriateness. The committee believes that the success of the Spring 2003 programs have laid a good foundation for a more full-fledged graduate career advising program starting in Fall 2003. The committee envisions the following general timetable.

- Spring/Summer 2003: Appoint a successor Career Advisory Committee and hire permanent staff. A Career Advisory Committee should be formed to oversee the implementation of graduate career advising programs and services. This committee should include faculty, graduate students, academic professionals, and representatives from potential nonacademic employers.

A full-time academic professional staff member has been appointed as the director, with primary responsibility for implementation, continuity, and ongoing evaluation of this program. The committee is delighted that the Graduate College has identified funding to retain Amy Martin as a full-time visiting assistant director for 2003-04. If funding is not available to make this position permanent, the committee strongly recommends that a 50% graduate assistant (GA) be appointed beginning in 2004-05. An administrative secretary will provide support for the work of the office. The Graduate College receptionist will also provide support.

- Fall 2003: Begin developing corporate relationships.

To be effective, the programs and services envisioned by the Career Advisory Committee must include efforts to facilitate connections between graduate students and possible employers. These programs and services should be available to both master's and doctoral students, and they should be tailored to their needs.

It will be important to get feedback from and develop relationships with key alumni of Illinois graduate programs and their nonacademic employers. Possible approaches include: (a) Conducting focus groups with a small but representative group of nonacademic employers who are on campus to do interviewing in the Fall 2003 semester; (b) Sending a survey to alumni of Illinois graduate programs using the Alumni Association's database and contact information developed by placement and career services offices on campus; and (c) Sending a survey to nonacademic employers using contact information developed by placement and career services offices on campus and contact information from national professional organizations.

The committee recommends that consideration be given to the possibility of holding a career fair for graduate students in Spring 2004. A long-term goal should be to be designated a Tier 1 campus by key employers in business, government agencies, and nonprofit organizations. In addition to increasing the likelihood that Illinois graduate students and degree candidates will be employed by those organizations, there are often funding opportunities through the various divisions of such organizations, including their foundation arms.

- Summer/Fall 2003: Continue to work on developing a feedback, assessment, and outreach process.

It will be important to establish mechanisms for ongoing feedback and evaluation from key constituents. Participants in Spring 2003 programs were asked to complete evaluation forms [see Appendices E, F, and G], and discussions are underway about how best to get feedback from visitors to the Web site. A proposal for an ongoing assessment and outreach process will be developed. This will include recommendations for ensuring appropriate coordination with other campus units. The committee recommends that a review of graduate career advising services be conducted no later than 2006-07 by a committee jointly appointed by the Provost and Dean of the Graduate College.

- Fall 2003/Spring 2004: Implement a full year of workshops and one-on-one career advising activities.

These workshops will build on the two pilot workshops offered in Spring 2003. The Graduate College has created space on the second floor of Coble Hall to facilitate student exploration and one-on-one career advising. Office staff should explore the possibilities of collaboration with existing campus career services offices to maximize resources.

- Spring 2004: Hold the second annual career advising and professional development symposium.
The second annual symposium would again bring together faculty, graduate students, campus administrators, and representatives from nonacademic employers to discuss a topic of major importance. There may be advantages to holding the symposium in Fall 2003, if there is adequate time to plan such an event.

- Spring 2004: Consider implementation of a career fair or career placement activities for graduate students.
There is already strong interest in a graduate career fair from some campus career services directors, and we may be able to build on such activities as the LAS Career Nights for undergraduates. Other possibilities would be a virtual career fair or a résumé drop. Unless the event were a virtual career fair, it could be followed with interviewing opportunities with participating organizations and companies. A career fair should pay for itself, and can be organized largely through graduate student effort. This could be a good opportunity to collaborate with the Graduate Student Advisory Council (GSAC).

APPENDIX A

THE GRADUATE CAREER CONSORTIUM

The Graduate Career Consortium (GCC) is an organization of research universities that grant graduate degrees in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities. Members of the GCC focus primarily on developing career resources for doctoral students, pooling resources, sharing promising practices, and programming events. The goal is to support students seeking placement in academic and nonacademic positions. The universities listed below are members of the GCC with information available online about their career advising and professional development initiatives for doctoral students. The committee has recommended that Illinois seek to become a member of the Graduate Career Consortium. Graduate College career advising staff have joined the GCC listserv, and hope to attend the GCC annual meeting in Summer 2003.

Brown University	http://careerservices.brown.edu
California Institute of Technology	http://www.career.caltech.edu/
Cornell University	http://www.gradschool.cornell.edu/grad/students/careers.html
Dartmouth College	http://www.dartmouth.edu/~gradstdy/careers.shtml
Duke University	http://career.studentaffairs.duke.edu/grads/index.html
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	http://web.mit.edu/career/www/GraduateStudents/graduate.html
Northwestern University	http://www.northwestern.edu/careers/STUDENTS/APPLY/special-grad.htm
Princeton University	http://web.princeton.edu/sites/career/Grad/Index.html
Rice University	http://careers.rice.edu/students.cfm?doc_id=1158
UC Davis	http://icc.ucdavis.edu/iccdocs/gradpost.htm
UC Santa Barbara	http://www.graddiv.ucsb.edu/gradlife/
UC Berkeley	http://career.berkeley.edu/Phds/Phds.stm
University of Chicago	http://caps.uchicago.edu/grads
University of Michigan	http://www.cpp.umich.edu/cpp/students/grad/gradservice.htm
University of Pennsylvania	http://www.upenn.edu/careerservices/
University of Texas at Austin	http://www.utexas.edu/ogs/development.html

APPENDIX B

GRADUATE STUDENT FOCUS GROUPS

Four student focus groups were held in Coble Hall on November 4, November 6, November 12, and November 15, 2002. Thirty-one students participated from the following disciplines:

- Anthropology (4 students)
- Art History
- Educational Psychology
- English (2 students)
- Geography
- History (2 students)
- Musicology (2 students)
- Music Composition
- Music Performance
- Philosophy (2 students)
- Political Science (4 students)
- Psychology (3 students)
- Sociology (2 students)
- Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese (2 students)
- Speech Communications (2 students)
- Theater

Each focus group started with a brainstorming session, where every student spent a few minutes writing a response to the following scenario: *Suppose that a successful fifth-year doctoral student in your department wants to pursue a nonacademic career when he finishes his degree. How do you think his adviser and other faculty members would react to this?* Each student was then asked for his or her reactions to this question. The rest of the focus group was an open forum, where the following topics were discussed:

- What would the reaction be toward a student who was unable to find academic employment? How would the student feel after failing to find an academic job?
- What would the reaction be if a student wanted to teach at an undergraduate or liberal arts college?
- Do you think the culture in your department is different from other Illinois doctoral programs? What about in other departments across the country?
- What skills and abilities do you think would be needed for a doctoral student to be able to obtain an academic job?
- What skills and abilities would be needed to pursue nonacademic employment and how have your experiences as a doctoral student helped you to gain these skills and abilities?
- Do you think your department provides students with the resources and programs necessary to help them find academic employment? What about nonacademic employment?
- What types of programs do you think would be most helpful for someone in your department who is looking for nonacademic employment and who should provide these programs?

APPENDIX C

INFORMATION SESSIONS WITH DIRECTORS OF GRADUATE STUDY

Information sessions led by William Kelleher, committee chair and graduate coordinator in the Department of Anthropology, were held on October 29 and October 30, 2002. Directors of graduate studies who were present at the sessions were:

- Cheryl Berger, Psychology
- William Bernhard, Political Science
- Dale Brashers, Speech Communication
- Norman Denzin, Institute for Communications Research
- David Goodman, East Asian Languages and Cultures
- Robert Graves, Theatre
- Chin-Woo Kim, Linguistics
- Charlotte Mattax, Music
- Armine Mortimer, French
- Carol Neely, English
- Maryline Parca, Classics
- Joseph Pleck, Human and Community Development
- Jeff Shanholtzer, Comparative Literature
- Joyce Tolliver, Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese

Feedback was received separately from the directors of graduate study in History (Clare Crowston) and Philosophy (Gary Ebbs), who were unable to attend the October 2002 sessions.

The discussions with graduate program directors were based on the following questions:

- How satisfied do you think your doctoral students are with the jobs they get when they finish their doctorates? Do they get the tenure-track jobs they believed they worked for? Are they happy with any academic job?
- What types of skills and abilities do you think students in your department gain while working on their doctoral degrees? Does the accumulation of these skills lead to any employment outside of academia? Do you think they could transfer these skills to nonacademic employment?
- What are the job placement trends in your programs?
- What about attrition in your doctoral programs? What is your sense of why students do not complete their doctoral degrees or why some take a very long time?
- How would faculty members in your program respond to a student who indicated an interest in pursuing nonacademic employment, either while a student or after finishing the doctoral degree? Would students be taken seriously if they made their desires to seek nonacademic employment known early in their graduate careers?
- Do you believe that the career advising and professional development needs of graduate students are being met in your graduate programs? What kinds of programs and services are available to graduate students in your graduate programs?
- What types of programs and services do you think should be available to students who are interested in nonacademic employment? What about programs and services for students who want to go into academia?

APPENDIX D

WEB SITE

On the advice of the Career Advisory Committee, in February 2003 the Graduate College established a Web site, <http://www.grad.uiuc.edu/careeradvising>. The purpose of the Web site is to make basic career advising and professional development resources easily accessible to the campus community. The Web site has links to national initiatives and surveys, the 2002-2003 Career Advisory Committee membership roster, and this report. It also provides links to such local resources as the campus career centers, the Writer's Workshop, the College Teaching Effectiveness Network, and the Office of Instructional Resources. The site also lists some online and print graduate career advising resources divided into the following topics: self-assessment, skill identification, applying skills, and personal stories.

The Web site also highlights upcoming events. From the main page, there are links to all upcoming workshops and other events. Each event has as much information as possible provided about the topics, speaker, location, and how to register. There is also a link under *Upcoming Events* that allows people to subscribe to the Career Advising e-mail list. This listserv, which currently has more than 150 graduate students, faculty, and staff subscribers, is a way for the Graduate College career advising staff to notify interested individuals about events and information.

The Web site has had a great deal of use since its launch in early February 2003. Although it is difficult to track exact usage, the number of "hits" various parts of the site are receiving can be measured. As of April 11, 2003, the symposium information on the site had the highest number of hits at 1,260. The symposium schedule and speakers received 678 and 472 hits, respectively. The main career advising page has received 912 hits since February, and the upcoming events page has received 290 hits. The other pages have had hits ranging from 18 to 240.

The site will continue to evolve to meet the needs of the campus.

APPENDIX E

GRADUATE EDUCATION: PROMISES, PURPOSES, POTENTIALS **SYMPOSIUM HELD MARCH 19, 2003**

The idea for the symposium grew out of the work done during the Fall 2002 semester by the Graduate College Career Advisory Committee. The symposium was shaped in large part by the committee's recognition of significant gaps between how faculty and how student perceive students' career prospects after graduate study. There were three main goals for the event: to highlight the issues in a thoughtful, constructive way; to stimulate discussion on campus of these very important issues; and to begin to lay the groundwork for the opening of the Graduate College's career advising office in Fall 2003.

The symposium began with a keynote address by Robert Weisbuch, President of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation and a national leader in efforts to re-envision doctoral education. The response to Weisbuch came from Malaina Brown, Assistant Director for Graduate Services at the University of Chicago's Career and Placement Services, the office that the committee has identified as a general model for services at Illinois. William Kelleher, an Anthropology professor and chair of the Career Advisory Committee, moderated the session.

Debe Williams, director of the Chemical Sciences Placement and Career Services Office and a member of the Career Advisory Committee, moderated the second session, "Looking Around, Looking Ahead." The session featured presentations from a 1996 Ph.D. alumna in Anthropology, Denise Roth Allen, and three current graduate students, all members of the Career Advisory Committee: Kevin Quinn (Sociology); Rashid Robinson (Educational Policy Studies); and Gardner Rogers (English).

Following a short break, two discussion sessions were held, one for graduate students and one for faculty and staff. The graduate student session was led by Malaina Brown with assistance from Melba Velez, a graduate student in the Institute for Communications Research and a member of the Career Advisory Committee. Illinois doctoral alumni Karen Carney (English, 1999) and Keith Marshall (Sociology, 2001) were available as resources. The faculty/staff session was led by Robert Weisbuch with assistance from John Lammers, a faculty member in the Department of Speech Communication and a member of the Career Advisory Committee. Illinois doctoral alumni Larry Mann (Education, 1979) and Nora Few (Community Health, 2000) were available as resources. A wrap-up session followed the discussion groups, and a reception concluded the event.

Other members of the Career Advisory Committee served as greeters: Karen Paulsen, The Career Center; Kathe Brinkmann, Biotechnology Center Placement Office; Greg Lambeth, Counseling Center; and Anna Maria Escobar, Department of Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese. Amy Martin, Debbie Kemphues, Tammy Warf, Connie Carter, Nora Few, Rebecca Bryant, and Lamar Murphy provided staff support from the Graduate College.

Based on 51 evaluation forms received, the symposium was given an overall rating of a 4.0 out of 5.0.

Symposium attendance

According to the sign-in sheets, 170 students, faculty, and staff attended the symposium. At least 30 or so individuals attended but did not sign in, however, so more than 200 people attended the symposium. Of the 170 who signed in, there were 21 faculty members (12%), 12 academic professionals (7%), and 3 staff

members (2%). The remaining 134 attendees (79%) were either graduate students or were unable to be identified. Publicity for the symposium was quite extensive, and the majority of attendees said they found out about the event through their departments.

Acting on advice from graduate students and faculty, pre-registration for this event was encouraged but not required. There were 174 people who had pre-registered to attend the symposium. Of this group, 102 (58%) actually did attend and 72 (42%) did not. Sixty-eight (40%) of those who attended the symposium did not pre-register.

Of the group who did attend the symposium, 104 (61%) were from the humanities, social sciences, and fine arts, with the largest numbers coming from English (19), the Institute for Communications Research (11), and Anthropology (8). Another 41 (24%) were from the sciences, and 25 (15%) were from other disciplines or departments such as Library and Information Sciences, Labor and Industrial Relations, Human Resource Education, Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), the Chancellor's Office, or The Career Center.

Publicity

Many efforts were made to ensure that all graduate students on campus received information about the symposium. Student ambassadors from 19 programs in the humanities, fine arts, and social sciences played an especially important role. They sent e-mail messages about the event, as well as announced the event in meetings and newsletters. The student ambassadors were:

- Anthropology: Robin Bernstein, Phil Millhouse, Michelle Wibbelsman
- Art History: Kim Busby
- Classics: Tom Rohn
- East Asian Languages and Cultures: Rebecca Nickerson
- Educational Policy Studies: Rashid Robinson
- Educational Psychology: Anita Hund
- English: Gardner Rogers
- French: Geneviève Maheux-Pelletier
- Geography: Jennie Ely
- History: Karen Phoenix
- Institute for Communications Research: Melba Velez
- Music: Jason Hibbard, Ed Martin
- Philosophy: Erica Neely
- Political Science: Tim Ngo
- Psychology: Allison Groot
- Spanish, Italian, Portuguese: Erin O'Rourke
- Sociology: Kevin Quinn
- Speech Communications: Rebecca Nieto
- Theatre: Kate Roark

Directors of graduate study and graduate program contacts within departments also distributed information about the symposium. Each graduate student in the humanities, fine arts, and social sciences also received a symposium invitation in his or her mailbox. Graduate Student Advisory Council (GSAC) representatives also distributed information about the symposium, and a front-page story appeared in the inaugural GSAC print newsletter, which was distributed to every graduate student on campus.

Information was posted on the Graduate College Web site, as well as on other university Web sites, such as the campus events schedule. *Inside Illinois* publicized the symposium, and two ads were placed in the *Daily Illini*.

Of the people who pre-registered for the symposium, there were 207 responses to the question “How did you hear about the Symposium?” Fifty-five percent of those who responded said they heard about the symposium through their departments. Twelve percent said they learned about the symposium by seeing a poster, ten percent said they heard through GSAC, four percent said they saw the symposium on the Graduate College Web site, and three percent said they saw local publicity for the symposium. Sixteen percent of respondents said they heard about the symposium through “other sources.” These other sources ranged from e-mail messages circulated through departments to word-of-mouth from friends or symposium presenters/organizers. Several of the respondents said they heard about the symposium because they were involved in Graduate College focus groups, committees, or planning meetings for the symposium.

Summary of Symposium Evaluations

A. Numerical Data

Of the more than 170 attendees at the Graduate College Symposium on March 19, 2003, 51 returned evaluation forms. The participants' response to questions 1-5 are summarized below (5 = strong agreement or an excellent rating, 1 = strong disagreement or a poor rating)

1. The information presented in *Reenvisioning Opportunities* (session 1) was useful and appropriate.

Ratings	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Respondents	0	1	4	21	17	42
Percentages	0%	1%	9%	50%	40%	100%

Average Score: 4.3

2. The information presented in *Looking Around, Looking Ahead* (session 2) was useful and appropriate.

Ratings	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Respondents	0	1	7	16	14	38
Percentages	0%	3%	18%	42%	37%	100%

Average Score: 4.1

3. The information presented in *Negotiating Career Paths* (session 3) was useful and appropriate.

Ratings	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Respondents	0	3	7	14	4	28
Percentages	0%	11%	25%	50%	14%	100%

Average Score: 3.7

4. The information presented in *Shared Interests, Many Choices* (session 4) was useful and appropriate.

Ratings	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Respondents	0	1	5	9	6	21
Percentages	0%	5%	24%	43%	29%	100%

Average Score: 4.0

5. Overall Rating of the Symposium

Ratings	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Respondents	0	1	9	12	12	34
Percentages	0%	3%	27%	35%	35%	100%

Average Score: 4.0

B. March 19 Symposium Respondents' Comments

The 51 returned survey forms were numbered #1 - #51 for ease of reference. Under each question below, all of the respondents' comments have been matched with their respective numbered survey forms.

6. Identify two aspects of the symposium you found most useful/helpful.

- #1. Personal stories, great speakers, very responsive
- #2. Stimulating and very helpful, makes me think about my career future and career selection
- #3. Good advice was given.
- #4. I've been trying to tell the administrators in my department that the overall career training for us (i.e.: outside of industry of academics) sucks. It's nice to see that others agree with this. Ph.D.s are too insular!
- #6. Knowledge of panelists, diversity of speakers
- #7. Good organization
- #9. Conversational nature of break-out session, Resources in break-out.
- #10. Discussion of possibilities outside and how to market my skills for these markets.
- #11. Identification with Ph.D.'s who have pursued "alternative" careers, ideas for careers that are well-suited to Ph.D.s
- #12. Hearing about options and vocabulary that I need to consider.
- #14. Knowing that there are shared interests, openness.
- #15. Robert Weisbuch's presence and talk was most helpful and needed.
- #16. Emphasis that we have skills not limited to degree.
- #17. Gravity and substantial background knowledge of keynote speaker. Self-critical nature of discussion to enhance planning graduate programs and process to meaningful employment. Emphasis on volunteerism as important and places worthy of our own experiences.
- #18. Alternative options for the dissertation. New narrative - discourses to understand our doctoral endeavor.
- #19. The first 2 speakers.
- #20. In Negotiating Career Paths, I really appreciated learning how to translate the skills I've developed as a graduate student into appropriate corporate jargon. VERY useful. It was also great to be encouraged to think about what motivates me, and reminded that I can remain involved in my discipline without remaining in academia.
- #21. That the topic is raised and that the issues of concern were aired.
- #22. Weisbuch's discussion of the opportunities offered by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, grad student stories and discussions.
- #23. Getting to know how other people from different areas think about grad school.
- #24. Discussing different perspectives.
- #25. That it's ok to use graduate work outside of academia.
- #28. Rashid Robinson's biting realistic presentation. Some of Weisbuch's discussion of how Ph.D. programs should be more "responsive" - however, one of his comments about international students (working in labs) was somewhat troubling in its lack of consideration of the great value they bring to US universities and a lack of understanding of the very difficult situations that students face post-9/11. This was troubling, especially in light of the many insightful and intelligent comments in the rest of the talk.
- #29. Having the opportunity to listen to varied career paths of prospective Ph.D.s and degree-holding individuals. The diversity of panelists.
- #30. Specific books and web sites to check out. Reminders of my marketability. Worksheet on skills, etc.
- #31. Absolutely all the aspects of the symposium. The keynote speaker was of course a highlight.
- #32. I particularly liked the discussion around the notion of feeling like a failure and dispelling it. I left the symposium feeling better about myself.

- #33. The individual workshops and reports were very interesting. Keynote speaker was great!
- #34. Hearing about opportunities outside the academy. Discussion generated sense of community - "I'm not alone". Materials/handouts were great!
- #35. Weisbuch's remarks were terrific. Liked wrap-up, but it was kind of late in the day.
- #37. Good points that have great potential to improve graduate studies.
- #38. Presenters from different backgrounds. Emphasis on interaction between academia and the "outside world."
- #39. Recognition of and respect for the varied paths that lead to and from graduate education. Inspiration and encouragement to view grad education in a "larger" realm of civic service and commitment.
- #41. Excellent speaker from Woodrow Wilson!
- #43. The perspective of the Woodrow Wilson speech: using the Ph.D. for nonacademic purposes may still be an indicator of success. Something faculty should know. Rashid's speech also.
- #44. The keynote speaker's emphasis on minority Ph.D. students.
- #45. The idea that there ARE options open to Ph.D.s other than those of academia.
- #46. I liked Malaina Brown's talk about why we need to get different skills. I also liked the student talks.
- #47. Different perspectives from panelists in various markets.
- #48. Examples of applying skills in academic and nonacademic fields. Encouragement to look beyond faculty positions to other options.
- #49. Malaina Brown was excellent. She interacted/responded to comments posed by listeners. Bring her back. Her handout was excellent.
- #50. Shifting focus for job goal – broadening scope; others here are like me! Reorienting Ph.D.

7. Identify two aspects of the symposium you found least useful/helpful.

- #2. Microphone didn't work well, only a little problem.
- #3. Time is very important, maybe there should be a summary of the lectures in the packet.
- #4. Some of the "Winding Road" panelists seemed unprepared.
- #6. Lack of talk about practical approach; not having any voice from faculty body.
- #7. Too long, did not get to the point fast enough. Identified problems but did not show solutions.
- #8. Not a new idea, but same sort of rhetoric. Stress on transferable skills for getting job, sometimes off the path skill.
- #10. The sessions seemed unfocused. Details of the movement away from the university were not given.
- #12. Session 2 - it seemed very specific to the speakers. Session 3 got off track and reiterated first 2 sessions.
- #13. Session 2 panelists' experiences seemed irrelevant to my own (a fairly traditional grad student to earn a Ph.D.) How do their diverse and interesting backgrounds translate into new ways to move on from graduate education? Session 3 had too much focus on the abstract, on discourse, not enough on practicalities.
- #15. Some of the session 2 speakers were less helpful than others.
- #16. Weisbuch seemed like he was just reading an essay for much of his speech.
- #17. The discussion group session needed focus questions. We spent too much time on one question - The dilution of the Ph.D. The prepared packet was focused but not followed.
- #19. The grad student stories.
- #20. The long discussion in Negotiating Career Paths about dynamics and attitudes within academia. There was a lot of miscommunication focusing on people's use of specific words that could have been better mediated. Spent more time discussing the dynamics within academia, rather than transitioning to nonacademic positions.

- #21. Facilitation of small groups could have allowed time for one on one discussion by program, participants to "vent" frustrations with whole aura of Ph.D. and what it means and how it affects own feelings, self-esteem, etc.
- #22. I found the symposium, on the whole, to be useful.
- #23. Only talked about area of Humanity instead of science and other areas.
- #24. Encourage professors to attend, students coming doesn't change the source of most of the problem. It starts with our advisors.
- #25. While good in way of introduction, an explanation of "Graduate Program Landscape" was ironically a bit academic. Application may have been better.
- #27. Too much toward liberal arts students. As a science student, I didn't find it helpful.
- #28. Constant anecdotes about success stories (career-wise) from panelists (ex - Allen and Brown). We don't so much need inspiration as a sense of career options and how to assess these once we get our Ph.D.
- #29. More concrete ways to explore careers outside academia. Facilitators (should have been less talkative and do more audience engagement).
- #31. n/a
- #32. The audio system.
- #33. The second session was very interesting, but I'm not certain how helpful it would be.
- #35. Discussion group could use more focus.
- #37. Very much social-sciences oriented.
- #42. First session was not very substantive, especially the second part. These are things I already know, so what are we going to DO about them?
- #46. There seemed to be more stories about how people got where they are - I thought it would be more on advice on how to get through graduate school.
- #49. You keep telling me I have skills. So, help me clarify/acknowledge what those skills are and who wants them! How do I connect with these opportunities?
- #50. Still don't understand UIUC's commitment to graduate job services.

8. Are there any other topics you would like to see addressed at a future symposium or workshop?

- #4. More general discussion. Where are all the scientists and engineers? We need guidance too! (although they're not likely to come because their advisors believe that research is the only thing they should be doing!).
- #6. General concerns of international graduate students.
- #7. How to keep the high value of the Ph.D. while adding all the skills needed to make it marketable outside academia.
- #8. Please try to bring people from other departments such as Economics, Engineering, etc to share their thoughts as well.
- #9. How to sell your skills - entire workshop on that.
- #11. More information and/or opinions about HOW to prepare for alternative careers, i.e. how to get into university administration.
- #12. I would want small groups of people in similar areas of study to brainstorm skill sets! This is still an abstract and unfamiliar process, and I'd like to see it modeled on an individual level.
- #13. Specifically for faculty discussion: how should mentoring of grad students be measured and assessed.
- #14. Encourage more student participation.
- #15. Maybe have a dialogue between students and faculty, perhaps in small groups. Explore ways to get faculty to accept the idea that there are other legitimate paths for students. Explore ways to make the topic of nonacademic careers less taboo, secret, heretical, etc.

- #17. Ways of implementing mentoring relationships for underrepresented groups/individuals. Organized forums for minority students to discuss and brainstorm regarding retention struggles and surviving them. A student-centered/authored newsletter that reports on this symposium concerns and surviving them.
- #18. Finding out about the job market out of the U.S.
- #19. The possibility of balancing working both inside and outside of the academe. How minorities and women can seek mentorship inside and outside of the academe.
- #20. A discussion of doing something to change the system, in which so many are trained to fill so FEW tenure-track positions, and so many end up spending years doing similar work for much less money and prestige and little job security.
- #21. Yes, the feeling surrounding notion of failure associated with not pursuing tenure-track line.
- #22. Perhaps more discussion examples of those who've chosen to pursue opportunities outside the academy.
- #23. How international students fit in the context of grad career.
- #24. Specifics - who at the university can students talk to help establish more support for students and their life after school.
- #26. Have a "scientist" on the panel.
- #28. What jobs are out there outside academia and how to get them once we get our Ph.D.s. Less emphasis on what we can do if we are motivated and a more grounded discussion of what career paths outside academia are out there. More on how academic can be like any other business - Rogers and Robinson addressed these very interestingly. Seems to be a strange assumption in some talks, that academia is almost always a labor of love - which it often is not. Perhaps address some of the issues involved in navigating this strange business of academia (somewhat addressed in grad student session).
- #29. Starting institutions (community services, schools, nonprofit organizations, etc).
- #30. Specific jobs that correlate to specific disciplines.
- #31. Not at this time.
- #32. Locating nonacademic job opportunities. Finding career alternatives.
- #33. Selfishly, I would love a session that would deal with possibilities for the more abstract areas - philosophy of language, algebra, etc. It's harder to think of alternatives that would be relevant. Also, info on academic publishing as a career.
- #34. Job/recruitment fair - hear from employers.
- #35. Would have liked some small-group sessions.
- #37. Mix of international students. Mix in student group (variedness).
- #38. On finding jobs at academic institutions as Postdoc or faculty in USA and/or abroad (Europe).
- #39. Postdocs, fellowships, additional training opportunities.
- #43. Will the university help track job placement in and out of academia? How will "Reenvisioning the PhD" be measured in terms of meeting goals and achieving success?
- #45. More interested in discussing/hearing about practical guidance as to how to go about investigating options that exist.
- #46. How can we get jobs? Let people from academic job interviewing and from industry come in.
- #49. Graduate students need nuts and bolts information. Make it more immediately useable - what can we as grad students do and use NOW!
- #50. Getting word out to YOUNG grads, early in their program. Advice for how to prepare all along the way.

9. Other comments/feedback?

- #1. More hands-on? Skills, handouts, discussion tables, etc
- #3. Not enough people from the life sciences.
- #6. Thank you so much for arranging such a wonderful, informative session.

- #7. Representation mostly from humanities, need better overall representation as problems and issues are different in the various areas.
- #8. Almost no representation from technical and science college. Seems to me this program is more suitable for LAS people.
- #13. Could something like this be done at the departmental (or multi-departmental) level (i.e.: Foreign Languages) for more specific discussion?
- #15. THANK YOU for opening up this conversation, which is sure to open up many more productive ones! This was a much-needed and appreciated event.
- #17. Thank you. Very worthy pursuit and worthwhile investment of my time. I believe that we're on the road to something really good. I hope that we get there!
- #23. Good.
- #26. Left after session 2.
- #28. Thank you for organizing this kind of symposium - I hope this will be done again next year and that these ideas will be discussed more widely at UIUC.
- #30. Enjoyed. Very helpful.
- #33. Some things are interesting and may prove useful in the future, even if they aren't immediately obvious; I'd love to have the above questionnaire also record how interesting the sessions were, not just how useful. People who want to go into business, etc should not neglect the resources out there for non-grad students (i.e.- if you want to learn business terminology, glance at a business book and THEN try to translate your skills into those terms. Don't ignore useful resources just because they aren't specifically aimed at grad students. Anyone can benefit from interviewing help, etc).
- #34. We need electronic communication so that we can easily continue/carryout discussion. We need a database/web board.
- #35. Very worthwhile seminar - wish they'd had this 10 years ago!
- #42. The speakers didn't seem to be able to get to the points. I don't know how one would go about controlling this, at least getting outlines ahead of time might ensure better focus and coherence?
- #49. Graduate College really needs to shape/screen/guide what the speakers say. Allen took too long saying too little.
- #50. Really glad this is happening – very needed.
- #51. I like the way this seminar was set up to speak to issues of program design and student empowerment for both faculty and students. It is more respectful than had you split it up because it situated the whole big mess of issues as relevant for consideration by both parties. The problem, as I see it, is one of PR and initiative and the seminar goes a long way to exposing the problem in constructive ways. Students get to see that the ACADEMY is not perfect in its “high-brow” approach to pedagogy. Faculty get to consider some of the issues and realities about producing people with higher degrees. I would like to have gotten a more convincing case than the few statistics that were given of where most students end up (not in academia). I think the first two speakers were particularly appropriate in that they covered two realms of issues (changing the academy and empowering students to think outside the department). I can only hope that the graduate college will work to get graduate students exposed to these issues more. How about a required pre-enrollment (or soon after enrollment) seminar exploring how to “be your own best advocate” while still in grad school?

Recommendations and ideas for future symposia

Based on feedback from both the symposium participants and organizers, the following points might be considered when planning a future symposium or other such event:

- Bring in a nationally known figure as the keynote speaker, as was done for this symposium. This will be helpful in attracting a wide range and large number of participants.
- Strive to make the panel speakers as diverse and interesting as possible, as done for this symposium.
- Continue aggressive marketing efforts for the event to all graduate programs on campus. Using student ambassadors to spread the word again would probably be helpful.
- Give participants handouts and takeaways that they can use after the symposium. If consistent with the event goals, try to give students as much practical advice as possible about the issues discussed.
- Align the sessions and the speakers as closely as possible to the pre-event publicity so that the participants know what they will hear and the sessions do not get off-topic.
- Perhaps break out into smaller groups to facilitate discussion and interaction among students, faculty, and staff.
- If possible, analyze the expected audience before the event and determine how best to meet needs that may be divergent (concurrent discussions for specific groups [sciences, humanities, arts, etc.], very general discussion to appeal to very broad group, etc.).
- Try to increase faculty participation where appropriate.
- Consider having a portion of the symposium highlight the different issues that specific groups (such as international students and students from underrepresented groups) encounter.
- Have someone available to monitor the sound system.
- Hosting a reception at the end of the symposium may not be necessary, since many participants left before the end of this one. Shortening the symposium or putting some sort of big event at the end of the event might be a way to encourage participants to stay the entire time if it seems desirable to encourage discussion and networking.

APPENDIX F

FROM C.V. TO RÉSUMÉ WORKSHOP HELD APRIL 3, 2003

The Graduate College hosted its first career advising workshop on April 3, 2003. The idea to host such a workshop grew out of the Career Advisory Committee's recommendation to present two career advising workshops for graduate students on the Illinois campus during the Spring 2003 semester. The recommendation was that this workshop, *From C.V. to Résumé*, would be an appropriate first workshop. The workshop covered many topics, including how to write a résumé, what to include in a résumé, the different types of résumés, the difference between a C.V. and a résumé, how to transfer academic skills to a résumé, and common do's and don'ts. The presenter of this workshop was Kathleen Brinkmann, Placement Director for the Biotechnology Center and 2002-2003 Career Advisory Committee member. Amy Martin, Rebecca Bryant, and Lamar Murphy provided Graduate College staff support for the workshop.

Forty-five graduate students from across campus attended this workshop. Pre-registration for this event was required due to limited seats. Of the 65 students who were confirmed to attend the symposium, 42 (64%) actually did attend. Twenty students from this original group (31%) did not attend, but 12 out of those 20 (60%) contacted the Graduate College to cancel their registration. Three students (7%) attended the without registering in advance. There was also a waiting list of 23 graduate students who were unable to attend due to space constraints.

The majority of the students who attended (80%) were from the math, science, and engineering disciplines. Seven students (16%) were from the humanities, social sciences, and fine arts, with those students coming from such departments as Education (2), East Asian Languages and Cultures (2), Music (2), and Theatre. Two students (4%) were from the Advertising and Human Resource Education departments.

Thirty students returned evaluations after the workshop was completed, and gave the workshop an overall evaluation of a 4.2 out of 5.0.

From C.V. to Résumé Workshop Evaluations

A. Numerical Data

Of the 45 graduate students who attended the Graduate College Workshop on April 3, 2003, 30 returned evaluation forms. The participants' responses to questions 1-5 are summarized below (5 = strong agreement or an excellent rating, 1 = strong disagreement or a poor rating)

1. The workshop effectively taught me techniques to transfer my skills and abilities to a résumé.

Ratings	1	2	3	4	5	<u>Total</u>
Respondents	0	0	1	20	8	29
Percentages	0%	0%	3%	69%	28%	100%

Average Score: 4.2

2. After participating in the workshop, I feel more comfortable writing a résumé.

Ratings	1	2	3	4	5	<u>Total</u>
Respondents	0	0	6	12	11	29
Percentages	0%	0%	21%	41%	38%	100%

Average Score: 4.2

3. The information I learned in this workshop will assist me with attaining my career goals.

Ratings	1	2	3	4	5	<u>Total</u>
Respondents	0	0	10	9	10	29
Percentages	0%	11%	34%	32%	34%	100%

Average Score: 4.0

4. I felt the workshop presenter was knowledgeable and effective.

Ratings	1	2	3	4	5	<u>Total</u>
Respondents	0	0	1	11	17	29
Percentages	0%	0%	3%	38%	59%	100%

Average Score: 4.6

5. Overall Rating of the Workshop.

Ratings	1	2	3	4	5	<u>Total</u>
Respondents	0	0	3	16	10	29
Percentages	0%	0%	10%	55%	35%	100%

Average Score: 4.2

B. From C.V. to Résumé Respondents' Comments

The 30 returned survey forms were numbered #1 - #30 for ease of reference. Under each question below, all of the respondents' comments have been matched with their respective numbered survey forms.

6. Identify two aspects of the workshop you found most useful/helpful.

- #1. Specific examples; do's and don'ts.
- #2. What should not be included in a résumé; other tips.
- #3. Contents of résumé; pet peeves.
- #4. Résumé tips; example résumés of different types.
- #6. Clearly told résumé format do's and don'ts.
- #9. Skills accompany wants; salary "negotiable"
- #11. Sample résumés; pet peeves list.
- #12. Process to identify skills; sample format for objectives.
- #15. Differences between CV and résumé; format.
- #16. Do's and don'ts.
- #17. Tips for writing a résumé.
- #18. The importance of concise format for a résumé. What should not be included in a résumé.
- #19. C.V. vs. Résumé (difference); what should be included in a résumé; language requirement of a résumé.
- #21. All of it.
- #26. Formatting options to identify goals and strengths.
- #27. Things to include/not include in résumé. Good examples.
- #28. Objective properties; scannable résumé tips.
- #29. Sample résumés.
- #30. C.V. handouts. "What employers look for."

7. Identify two aspects of the workshop you found least useful/helpful.

- #1. Room was small and hot! More handouts should be used.
- #3. None.
- #9. Résumé! I am looking for academic position. Three résumé formats.
- #11. Temperature of room; noise of ac.
- #21. None.
- #23. Do's and Don'ts to include in résumé.
- #30. The email notifying me of this workshop was misleading. This workshop barely covers C.V.s.

8. Are there any other topics you would like to see addressed at a future graduate career advising workshop?

- #1. Cover letter.
- #6. Interview skills.
- #9. How to write a C.V. for an academic position!
- #19. How to set career goals and how to build up relevant skills.
- #21. Interview skills.
- #23. Reading examples of skills for some activity and not having copies or slides.
- #26. Cover letter styles.
- #28. C.V. writing. Interview for academia.
- #29. Need handouts of presentation.

9. Other comments/feedback?

#9. Too hot inside.

#22. How about providing us with handouts of the transparencies in addition to the résumé examples?

#26. Handouts that included some of the lists on the overheads would be helpful. AC for the room would have been appreciated.

#30. Skills ID worksheet is somewhat confusing because it assumes a specific definition for “Activity and Skill.” “Activity” could mean grading, or facilitating. But on the worksheet, those things are “skills” and the “activity” is teaching. Also, (I’m in acting. I take voice classes) your voice is strained. I hope it doesn’t hurt after public speaking. For better vocal production, try breathing more fully and deeply. And “open up”...throat. Release tension in throat. Thank you.

Recommendations for future workshops

Based on feedback from both the symposium participants and organizers, the following points should be considered when planning future workshops:

- Use a bigger room so that attendance does not have to be so limited and participants are not as crowded and hot.
- Provide handouts of the presentation. Expand the handout packet to include other relevant information if possible.
- Address the topic of C.V.s, either in this workshop or in a separate workshop in the future. Many students were disappointed that this topic was not covered in depth. Although the Career Advisory Committee’s assumption was that students work on their C.V.s with their advisors, many students at this workshop seemed to want advice on basic principles, including what to include/not to include. Also, it is probably not wise to assume that all students have advisors who help them with their C.V.s.
- Clarify exactly what will and will not be covered in the workshop in all publicity materials to reduce any confusion and disappointment among workshop participants.

APPENDIX G

INTERVIEWING SKILLS WORKSHOP HELD APRIL 16, 2003

The workshop covered many topics, including how to prepare for an interview, interview etiquette, behavioral interviewing, and common interview questions. The presenter of this workshop was Debe Williams, Director of Placement and Student Services for the School of Chemical Sciences and 2002-2003 Career Advisory Committee member. Amy Martin, Rebecca Bryant, and Lamar Murphy provided Graduate College staff support for the workshop.

Pre-registration for this event was required due to limited seats. Of the 152 students who were confirmed to attend the symposium, 115 (75%) actually did attend. Several also contacted the Graduate College to cancel their registration prior to the workshop. Four students (3%) attended the workshop without registering in advance.

One hundred and fifteen graduate students from across campus attended this workshop. The majority of the students who attended (84%) were from math, science, engineering, and business-related fields. Nineteen (16%) were from the humanities, social sciences, and fine arts, with those students coming from such departments as Anthropology (2), Curriculum and Instruction, Education, Educational Policy Studies (2), East Asian Languages and Cultures, French (4), Geography, Musicology, and Political Science. The remaining students were from science, engineering, or business related fields such as Computer Science (6), Crop Science (4), Material Science (4), Mechanical Engineering (10), Agricultural Economics (8), Chemical Engineering (10), and Civil Engineering (12).

One hundred and three students returned evaluations after the workshop was completed, and gave the workshop an overall score of a 4.1 out of 5.0. Many of the evaluations reflected several common themes. Most of the students really enjoyed the workshop and the presenter, and were especially interested in learning more about the questions that interviewers might ask. The students especially enjoyed learning about and practicing the “STAR” technique for situational questions where they had to describe the situation, task, action, and result of a particular scenario. Many students commented that they wanted to learn more about interviewing for academic jobs, not just corporate jobs.

Interviewing Skills Workshop Evaluations

A. Numerical Data

Of the 115 graduate students who attended the Graduate College Workshop on April 3, 2003, 103 returned evaluation forms. The participants' responses to questions 1-5 are summarized below (5 = strong agreement or an excellent rating, 1 = strong disagreement or a poor rating)

1. The workshop effectively taught me techniques to use in an interview.

Ratings	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Respondents	0	0	5	52	46	103
Percentages	0%	0%	5%	50%	45%	100%

Average Score: 4.4

2. After participating in the workshop, I feel more comfortable doing a job interview.

Ratings	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Respondents	0	3	14	59	27	103
Percentages	0%	3%	14%	57%	26%	100%

Average Score: 4.1

3. The information I learned in this workshop will assist me with attaining my career goals.

Ratings	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Respondents	0	1	20	61	21	103
Percentages	0%	1%	19%	60%	20%	100%

Average Score: 4.0

4. I felt the workshop presenter was knowledgeable and effective.

Ratings	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Respondents	0	0	1	32	70	103
Percentages	0%	0%	1%	31%	68%	100%

Average Score: 4.7

5. Overall Rating of the Workshop.

Ratings	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Respondents	0	1	17	56	29	103
Percentages	0%	1%	17%	54%	28%	100%

Average Score: 4.1

B. Interviewing Skills Workshop Respondents' Comments

The 103 returned survey forms were numbered #1 - #103 for ease of reference. Under each question below, all of the respondents' comments have been matched with their respective numbered survey forms.

6. Identify two aspects of the workshop you found most useful/helpful.

#1. The presenter went through the whole list of things that the job candidate should be prepared with; the "star answer" section is very helpful.

#3. STAR, how to answer questions.

#4. Practical; clear in organizing the topics.

#5. Lots of information that we might never know. Corrected some common misimpressions—I'm just looking for a *job* (not a career)

#6. Speaker was great! She made it interesting. Examples; evaluation form.

#7. Suggested responses to questions; role-playing.

#8. STAR techniques for answering questions' the presenter was excellent and extremely knowledgeable.

#9. Answer to situational questions; STAR answer

#10. Very nice presenter.

#11. The nonverbal movements that were appropriate; the STAR answer.

#12. Speaker responding to audience's questions.

#13. The lecture is very impressive; learn everybody has the same trouble, not just myself.

#15. All the topics covered were very helpful. Thank you.

#16. Practice interviewing with partner; the dynamic, knowledgeable speaker.

#17. Specific questions and answers asked and how to answer.

#18. Debe was excellent. She is a great facilitator. Handout was good.

#19. When the presenter included examples of sample questions or when she provided example of a STAR answer.

#20. List of employer's questions; do's and don'ts.

#21. Presenter was excellent!

#23. Discussion of body language; attire; interactive.

#24. Practice and analysis for a STAR answer.

#26. STAR; how to handle situation.

#27. STAR technique – excellent. The real-life examples provided by the presenter.

#28. The STAR answer; prep for questions.

#29. Clear; thorough.

#30. Idea to be prepared to answer specific questions; recruiter's evaluation form.

#31. The STAR answer; body language.

#32. How to respond to behavioral questions – STAR answer.

#33. STAR answer; questions asked.

#34. The STAR answer; your questions.

#35. STAR

#37. All of it.

#38. STAR answer; friendly and knowledgeable presenter.

#39. Handout: A Recruiter's Evaluation; STAR answer; practice with partner.

#40. Good explanations; engaging presentation.

#41. Organized; less boring with the interactions – interactive

#42. Info meeting; thank you note; STAR answer.

#42. The explanation of the STAR answer; discussion of details to watch in preparation for interview and during interview (handshake, non-verbals)

#43. Practical and experiences.

- #44. Demonstration of handshake. STAR answer.
- #45. Research company; information meetings.
- #46. Tips
- #47. Non-verbals; preparation for behavioral/situational questions.
- #48. STAR answer.
- #49. My questions to the interviewers.
- #50. Some details in the interviews. How to answer questions in good way.
- #51. Answer questions; preparation for the interview.
- #52. Speaker and situational questions.
- #53. Practical, close to reality.
- #54. Funny, very enjoyable, animated speaker. We did not even feel the time. A lot of tips, examples, organization of the topic.
- #55. In class practice; examples.
- #56. Telling how it is supposed to work and how to handle it.
- #57. Part D of the interview and Debe's numerous concrete examples.
- #58. How to be more communicatively effective.
- #59. Questions from interviewer.
- #60. Examples/tips from interviewer.
- #61. List of additional materials to bring; how to ask people to be references.
- #62. The speaker is experienced and her presentation is vivid and relevant. Many good examples.
- #63. STAR answer; non-verbals
- #64. Questions of us to the seminar leader, Debe; situations she gave and answers.
- #65. I was particularly interested in the STAR answer routine and addressing behavioral questions.
- #66. How to handle behavioral interview questions.
- #67. Examples from both bad and good interviews. How to ask people to be references. "Think of it as a conversation."
- #68. I think it was a useful event because it was a workshop, therefore I figured that I have to practice my interview skills with a friend!
- #69. Interview expectations and STAR responses.
- #71. Handouts, the STAR answer.
- #72. Various questions you might get during an interview.
- #73. Section 2: D, E, and F
- #74. Examples of possible questions.
- #75. Appropriate manners; dealing with embarrassing situations.
- #76. Useful hints; very comfortable discussions.
- #77. Types of questions expected from recruiter. How to answer specific questions – ie: weakest points.

7. Identify two aspects of the workshop you found least useful/helpful.

- #1. The group of audience is pretty large; related to the above aspect, I thought it might be better if we could talk one-on-one to the advisor(s).
- #6. Attire
- #7. Appearance info and preparing for interview section was too basic.
- #8. Discussing informational meetings; salary/benefit discussion.
- #9. "Umm" problem (better way to solve it).
- #10. Live situation
- #11. Better way to place hands; better way to eliminate bad habits.
- #13. Slow pace; common things you can read from a book.
- #16. What to wear – a bit too obvious.

- #17. I have had previous classes in interviewing and knew about attire and handshaking.
- #18. STAR – hard to pair up with people.
- #19. I felt that the session was dragging along sometimes.
- #20. Not very specific.
- #21. Too much time spent on “handshake.”
- #23. More of an undergraduate-style focus.
- #29. A little too long.
- #30. Only some aspects such as grooming and attire, which are somewhat obvious.
- #34. Punctual, etiquette – common sense.
- #35. The generalities were common to me.
- #38. Long time spent on grooming; asking for volunteers.
- #39. Too lecture-ish; More hands-on/practice please.
- #41. Some of the points were common sense or I had heard of them before – hygiene, handshake, etc.
- #42. Research company; belt-shoe match.
- #44. Research company; non-verbals.
- #47. Practice with STAR answer – because not all the students prepare for the questions. I prefer to discuss more specific questions.
- #48. Thank you note.
- #49. Handshake. Non-verbals.
- #52. Clothing.
- #53. More detailed written materials.
- #56. Didn’t address how it really works. Acted as if everyone was after a “suit and tie” job.
- #61. Attire/hygiene, but some need it.
- #63. Punctual.
- #64. Grooming – I basically knew about.
- #65. I can’t say, really...it was all pretty helpful.
- #66. Hygiene
- #68. There are things, basic things mentioned I already knew about, but still it was totally a very positive workshop.
- #69. Even things that are obvious or that I was already aware of were still worth going over so nothing was unhelpful.
- #71. Too concentrated on corporate jobs.
- #73. Section 1 and 2: A, B, C
- #77. Informational meetings because I’m probably staying in academics. Attire/hygiene.

8. Are there any other topics you would like to see addressed at a future graduate career advising workshop?

- #1. Case studies of interviewing, especially the hard situations.
- #2. Sample questions-answers for STAR questions.
- #5. Interviewing for an academic position (any difference from companies?)
- #6. More example interview questions, more on specific research to do on a company.
- #7. Would like to see presentation/workshop on etiquette.
- #8. Interviewing for other audiences aside from companies (ex: as a grad student in a scientific field, approaches for contact with faculty/fellow students).
- #11. More time on the “little” habits and how to effectively eliminate them.
- #12. The process for actually looking for job opportunities, especially if you are looking for a job outside the Midwest region such as on the east coast. What is the best way to find companies in a region you want to live in but are not familiar with the companies there?

- #13. Specific details or special requirement for a foreigner. Do non-natives have the same start line with natives?
- #16. Making the transition from academic to nonacademic careers.
- #18. Site visit – 2-day interview strategies. Negotiation for Salary – next step.
- #20. Little bit more specific. Good and bad samples of real interviews.
- #21. Might be better to have more of a “workshop” – get groups of people together with an expert (from your office) and do mock interviews – especially to test and train STAR skills.
- #22. Info for more technical fields.
- #23. Technical interviews.
- #25. Is it possible to collect common questions during the interview and STAR answers?
- #28. Something that helps people narrow down what they want to do with their lives.
- #29. Telephone interviews
- #33. Getting a job – where to look, websites, newspapers.
- #34. More discussion on interviewing for faculty positions and how this differs from interviews for companies.
- #38. How to appropriately follow-up after an interviewing – calling, writing, emailing; How to discuss salary/benefits (negotiate)
- #39. Smaller workshops – more one-on-one; workshop on company research.
- #42. Academic position interview
- #44. Academic interviews – in-depth tips on 1 and 2-day interviews.
- #45. How to deal with interview questions (behavioral). I’d like more and more concert examples. How to deal with on-site interview if they ask same questions?
- #46. Presentation skills.
- #48. How to do plant trip.
- #49. Talk about dinner or lunch during the interview.
- #53. General humor management practices; benefits
- #55. So far, so good.
- #56. In 2 hours? Needs to be longer.
- #57. I’d like to attend a workshop dedicated to academic interviews.
- #60. Etiquette/manners at dinner, etc.
- #61. Questions interviewers shouldn’t ask; after interviewing and haven’t heard from them – how and when do you contact.
- #62. Better have more detailed handout.
- #63. More typical interview questions.
- #65. I think perhaps possibly by department workshops that concentrate on the resume/interview/opportunity in a particular field. Also, perhaps a course on typical employment packages?
- #66. Information about other career resources on campus.
- #67. D. Situational/Improv Interviews – Examples of Good/Bad Discussions.
- #68. More specific things such as the colors of your clothes, maybe explained with graphic images or with a slide show.
- #71. Format on an academic job (2 day) interview; writing academic application letters.
- #73. Differentiate the interviewing skills for academic position, public position, and corporate jobs.
- #76. Interviews for faculty positions.

9. Other comments/feedback?

- #1. Small group; would a video demo help?
- #4. More handouts provided.

- #7. Found helpful listening to question/answer
- #8. Would be helpful to have workshops pertaining to giving presentations/public speaking.
- #13. Please go faster; arrange it during work time because single parents may have trouble attending it.
- #14. Looked overconfident. Domineering impressions?
- #16. Thank you!
- #18. Very good. More, more!
- #23. Could be more structured.
- #33. Interviewing booklet – questions to expect.
- #36. Thank you!
- #39 Organizing career fairs for grads/alumni network/career database
- #41. Good workshop
- #49. Schedule some practice interviews.
- #55. Can we please have an email address so that we can ask a question after the workshop?
- #61. Maybe do situational/improv interviews. Have students ask questions and you respond bad and good.
- #70. I was expecting a section on negotiation.
- #71. Divide academic vs. nonacademic job seekers.
- #72. I wish there would be separate workshops for academic and nonacademic careers.
- #77. I would have found it helpful to cover some things specific to academic jobs.

Recommendations for Future Workshops

Based on feedback from both the symposium participants and organizers, the following points should be considered when planning future Graduate College workshops:

- Consider providing detailed handouts of the presentation. Perhaps also include examples of typical interview questions and of behavioral questions.
- Address the topic of academic interviews, either in this workshop or in a separate workshop in the future. Some students were disappointed that this was not covered in more depth. Perhaps explain the similarities and differences between the types of interviews.
- If the group were kept smaller, it might be possible to do more one-on-one interviewing practicing and critiques. The students sounded like they would like to see something like that.
- Clarify exactly what will and will not be covered in the workshop in all publicity materials to reduce any confusion and disappointment among workshop participants.
- Make it a priority to hold workshops in space that is comfortable (adequate lighting, good seating, appropriate ventilation and acoustics, good size and location for the expected audience, appropriate access to audiovisual equipment).
- Consider ways to increase the number of students from humanities, social sciences, and fine arts. Ideas include working directly with graduate program directors and student ambassadors; cosponsoring events with specific academic units or in departments associated with those units; and tailoring some programs to the needs of students in those areas.
- Evaluate the needs of international students, who have comprised a large percentage of the two workshop audiences.

APPENDIX H
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS CAMPUS CAREER CENTERS - RESOURCES CURRENTLY AVAILABLE
 Information is from www.careercenter.uiuc.edu, updated 5/03

Department	Population Served	Contact Name	Presentations from Alumni	Individual Advising/Résumé Review	Employer Info Sessions	Workshops	Resource Center	Career Fairs	Alumni Networks	Job Postings	Résumé Book/Referrals	Career Guidance & Outside Exploration
ACES	Students in agricultural, consumer, and environmental sciences, including graduate students	Charles Olson	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Advertising	Advertising majors in the College of Communications	Steven Hall	X	X	X	X	X				X	
Architecture	Undergraduate and graduate students majoring in architecture	Art Kaha		X	X	X	X	X		X		
Biological Sciences	Undergraduate students in the Schools of Integrative Biology and Molecular and Cellular Biology	Tim Bowers		X	X		X	X		X		

Department	Population Served	Contact Name	Presentations from Alumni	Individual Advising/Résumé Review	Employer Info Sessions	Workshops	Resource Center	Career Fairs	Alumni Networks	Job Postings	Résumé Book/Referrals	Career Guidance & Outside Exploration
Biotechnology Center	B.S., M.S., Ph.D., and postdoctoral candidates with biological research interests	Kathleen Brinkmann		X	X		X	X	X			X
Business	Graduate and undergraduate students in the College of Commerce and Business Administration (and economics majors in ACES and LAS)	Lois Meerdink	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
The Career Center	All UIUC students, with primary focus on undergraduates	David Bechtel		X		X	X	X			X	X
Chemical Sciences	All graduate and undergraduate students in the School of Chemical Sciences	Debe Williams	X	X	X		X		X	X		

Department	Population Served	Contact Name	Presentations from Alumni	Individual Advising/Résumé Review	Employer Info Sessions	Workshops	Resource Center	Career Fairs	Alumni Networks	Job Postings	Résumé Book/Referrals	Career Guidance & Outside Exploration
Education	Students from ACES, Applied Life Studies, Education, Fine and Applied Arts, and LAS, who are seeking education-related positions	Mildred Trent		X		X				X		X
Engineering	Students in engineering, math, statistics, and the MBA program	Richard Coddington			X	X	X	X			X	
Fine and Applied Arts	Undergraduate FAA students	Sara Jane Patterson		X		X	X		X	X	X	X
Intercollegiate Athletics	All student athletes and cheerleaders		X	X		X					X	
Journalism	Undergraduate and graduate students in Journalism	Dana Ewell	X	X			X	X	X	X		
Law	Students in the College of Law	Virginia Vermillion	X			X	X	X			X	
Labor and Industrial Relations	Graduate students in Labor and Industrial Relations	Nell Madigan	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	

Department	Population Served	Contact Name	Presentations from Alumni	Individual Advising/Résumé Review	Employer Info Sessions	Workshops	Resource Center	Career Fairs	Alumni Networks	Job Postings	Résumé Book/Referrals	Career Guidance & Outside Exploration
Library and Information Science	Graduate students in Library and Information Science	Curt McKay		X	X	X						
Minority Student Affairs	All minority students, of all levels	Donald Tyler	X	X		X	X			X	X	
Pre-Law	Any undergraduate in any college interested in law	Stephen Shafer		X			X					
Leisure Studies/Recreation and Tourism Development	Students in selected departments of the College of Applied Life Studies	Tracey Gower								X		
Social Work	Interested undergraduates and graduate students enrolled in the School of Social Work	Tonya Manselle		X						X		
Urban and Regional Planning	All graduate and undergraduate students majoring in Urban and Regional Planning	Zorica Budic		X						X	X	