USE OF A WEB-BASED DELPHI FOR IDENTIFYING CRITICAL COMPONENTS OF A PROFESSIONAL SCIENCE MASTER'S PROGRAM

IN BIOTECHNOLOGY

A Dissertation

by

JEANNINE WELLS KANTZ

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of Texas A&M University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

December 2004

Major Subject: Agricultural Education

USE OF A WEB-BASED DELPHI FOR IDENTIFYING CRITICAL

COMPONENTS OF A PROFESSIONAL SCIENCE MASTER'S PROGRAM

IN BIOTECHNOLOGY

A Dissertation

by

JEANNINE WELLS KANTZ

Submitted to Texas A&M University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved as to style and content by:

Timothy Murphy (Chair of Committee) Scott Cummings (Member)

Edward Funkhouser (Member) Linda Guarino (Member)

Glen Shinn (Head of Department)

December 2004

Major Subject: Agricultural Education

ABSTRACT

Use of a Web-based Delphi for Identifying Critical Components of a Professional Science Master's Program in Biotechnology. (December 2004) Jeannine Wells Kantz, B.S., Tarleton State University; M.S., Tarleton State University Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Timothy Murphy

The primary purpose of this research was to develop a model for a professional science master's program combining biotechnology and business. The objectives were to identify stakeholder preferences for various dimensions of a professional science master's program combining biotechnology and business and to identify differences in priorities between subgroups. A secondary purpose was to examine user preferences between Web-based and traditional methods of conducting a Delphi study and the panelist's impressions of its usefulness for program development.

Prior to the first round, demographic data were collected on panelists regarding their gender, age, years experience in their current field, position title and education levels. Round 1 started with eight open-ended questions designed to investigate (a) learning objectives, (b) internships, (c) thesis vs. nonthesis degrees, (d) program focus (e) possible entry level positions, (f) roles for the industry advisory board, (g) recommended hours of hands-on experience and (h) other issues of importance. The final round ended with three questions to assess the panelists' perception of the usefulness of the Delphi for program development in higher education. Twenty-four panelists started Round 1 and participation in subsequent rounds varied from 17 in Round 2 to 11 in Round 4. Education level varied and included all levels of education in science and business.

Issues emerged early in the study regarding development of different program tracks and the program goals, which were clarified in subsequent rounds. Significant differences occurred between industry and academic subgroups for two tracks, six skills designated for tracks, method of evaluating the internship, and entry-level positions appropriate for new graduates. When analyzed by level of confidence (high confidence vs. low confidence), significant differences occurred for (a) the number of semesters of hands-on experience students should have upon graduation, (b) skills recommended for core curriculum, (c) skills recommended for tracks, (d) compensation level and (e) entry level positions for new graduates. Perceived usefulness of the Delphi for program development was varied with only 10 panelists responding--five in favor, three undecided, and two against.

iv

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem Purpose of Study Significance of Study The Research Questions Definition of Terms Assumptions and Limitations	2 3 4 5 8
CHAPTER II REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
Introduction Changes Occurring in Graduate Education Professional Science Masters' Programs Changes in Employer Demands Growth of the Texas Industry The Delphi Method Web-based Delphi Consensus Summary of Review of Literature	9 9 24 29 37 41 44 45 47
CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY	49
Description of Sample	50

CHAPTEF Descrip Data Collection Procedures51 Round 2.....53 Round 3......55 Round 4......57

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Summary of Research Procedure	58
CHAPTER IV RESULTS	61
Demographics of Responding Sample Stakeholder Priorities for a Professional Science Masters Program Knowledge, Skills and Abilities Dimensions of the Internship Hands-on Experience vs. Writing a Thesis Focus of Program	63 67 88 97 00 01 08 10 12 16 18
CHAPTER V CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS1	23
Knowledge, Skills and Abilities.1Dimensions of the Internship.1Hands-on Experience vs. Writing a Thesis1Program Focus1Entry Level Positions Appropriate for New Graduates1Roles of the Industry Advisory Board1Minimum Hands-on Experience Required for New Graduates1Other Issues1Recommendations for Practice1Study Design1Program Development1Recommendations for Research1	29 33 35 36 37 38 39 39 41 41 42 44
REFERENCES1	46
APPENDIX A1	60
APPENDIX B1	73
APPENDIX C1	77

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX D	180
APPENDIX E	215
APPENDIX F	221
APPENDIX G	245
APPENDIX H	288
APPENDIX I	296
APPENDIX J	300
VITA	

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1	Demographics of Delphi panel64
Table 2	Suggested tracks
Table 3	Tracks recommended for a professional science master's program70
Table 4	Actual and expected counts of level of agreement of faculty and industry panelists for a preclinical/clinical development and business development track
Table 5	Skills identified for core curriculum for all students73
Table 6	One-way analysis of variance comparing high and low confidence level groups for skills that should be included in core curriculum77
Table 7	Skills identified as appropriate for specialized tracks78
Table 8	Actual and expected frequency counts for level of agreement between faculty and industry subgroups for six skills designated for tracks
Table 9	One-way analysis of variance to compare means for high and low confidence groups for skills that should be included in different tracks
Table 10	Summary of frequencies for thirteen laboratory skills eliminated from skills list because they lacked a majority
Table 11	Recommended length of internship
Table 12	Level of responsibility expected of an intern90
Table 13	Methods of evaluating an internship92
Table 14	Differences between subgroups for methods of evaluation
Table 15	Level of compensation for interns

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Page

Table 16	One-way analysis of variance comparing means for high and low confidence groups for full time equivalent level of compensation for interns	96
		90
Table 17	Other factors to consider in an internship program	97
Table 18	Hands-on experience required for all students, regardless of track	99
Table 19	One-way analysis of variance comparing means for high and low confidence level groups for number of semesters of hands-on experience that students should have by graduation	100
Table 20	Focus of program	101
Table 21	Position titles taken from the literature	103
Table 22	Positions suggested by panelists in addition to those from the literature	105
Table 23	Significant differences between industry and academic groups occurred for three positions appropriate for new graduates	107
Table 24	One-way analysis of variance comparing means for high and low confidence groups for entry level positions appropriate for new graduates	108
Table 25	Roles identified for the industry advisory board	109
Table 26	Minimum semesters of hands-on experience that should be required of all students	112
Table 27	Goals identified by Delphi panel	114
Table 28	Comments made in response to recommendations for teaching innovation	115
Table 29	Suggestions from panelists to improve the Delphi process	117

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

When I received a bachelor of science degree in biology in the mid 70's, my undergraduate advisor told me that I should get a teaching certificate if I was not planning to go to graduate school because there would be "nothing else I could do with only a bachelor's degree." I ignored his sage advice, determined to prove him wrong. After several years of less-than-satisfying jobs out of my field, I finally gave in and went back to school and earned a teaching certificate in secondary science. At that time, government or academic jobs seemed to be the most likely career paths for aspiring young biologists and they were hard to come by with only a bachelor's degree and little experience. I did work in a soils testing laboratory for a short time, but it was a temporary position and required only a high school education.

Career options for today's students are much brighter. The growth of the life science industries over the past twenty years has created a growing demand for scientists at all levels, community college through doctorate. Many opportunities are opening up in nontraditional fields, such as sales and business development, for persons with a scientific background. But these opportunities

This dissertation follows the style of the *Journal of Agricultural Education*.

also require knowledge and skills in business, communication, and other fields that are more common in a corporate science environment than an academic environment.

Traditionally, academic programs in the sciences have not emphasized other fields in their curricula. However, external and internal pressures are motivating colleges and universities to change their approach to education. In response to this, the Sloan Foundation began an initiative to support the development of professional science master's (PSM) degrees in 1997 (Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, 1999). There are now over 100 different professional science master's programs supported by universities or by the Sloan Foundation (Smith, Swanson, & Tobias, 2004). These changes in education and the growth of the life science industries combined to create the impetus for the development of an interdisciplinary professional science master's program at Texas A&M University in 1999.

Statement of the Problem

Significant changes are occurring in graduate science education, due in large part to the rapidly increasing number and variety of science-based industries and decreasing enrollments of domestic students in advanced science degrees. However, there is little actual research on graduate education that documents the impact of those changes, other than reports of increasing or decreasing enrollments and increasing or decreasing job markets in different

fields. Participants in a recent National Science Foundation workshop (Office of Legislative and Public Affairs, 2003) noted that there was a significant lack of research literature on graduate education and that it would be increasingly difficult to make decisions unless measures were taken to encourage that research and to develop a body of literature in graduate education. With emerging trends in education, such as interdisciplinary professional science master's programs, research in graduate education is needed now more than ever.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to identify industry and academic priorities in the development of a model appropriate for a professional science master's program combining biotechnology and business. Specific objectives were to identify the importance assigned by each group to various aspects of a professional science master's program combining biotechnology and business and to identify differences in priorities between subgroups. Additionally, this study sought to examine user preferences between Web-based and traditional methods of conducting a Delphi study.

Significance of Study

This study could help define the critical components of a model for a professional science master's program combining biotechnology and business.

Those components have not been previously defined through research and this information could be valuable in program development. This study could demonstrate the usability of the Delphi method for program development in higher education, particularly for those programs that are emerging between disciplines and that have no well-defined curricular standard.

The Research Questions

The study addressed the following questions:

- What outcomes or learning objectives (knowledge, skills or attitudes) should be expected of a graduate from a professional science master's program in biotechnology?
- 2. What factors would constitute the ideal internship?
- 3. Which is more important--the hands-on laboratory experience gained while doing research for a thesis or the completion of the thesis itself (design, application and documentation)?
- 4. To what extent should a professional science master's program be focused on local, regional or national workforce needs?
- 5. What entry-level positions would be appropriate for a recent graduate of a professional science master's program in biotechnology?
- 6. What roles are appropriate for an industry advisory committee for a professional science master's program in biotechnology?

- 7. What is the minimum number of hours of practical laboratory experience that a new graduate of a professional science master's program in biotechnology should have to be considered employable?
- 8. What other issues should be addressed that were not discussed in previous questions?

A secondary purpose of this study was to evaluate the participants' perceptions of the usefulness of the Delphi for program development. Panelists were asked three questions at the end of the study:

- 1. Why did you choose this format?
- 2. How useful do you think this Delphi process was in designing a new degree program?
- 3. What recommendations do you have for improving the process?

Definition of Terms

An **Associate of Applied Sciences** degree (A.A.S.) is typically a twoyear degree awarded to students in occupational or vocational programs. Students earning this degree generally seek employment following graduation, though some degrees can allow for transfer to a four-year college.

Biotechnology is defined by the Biotechnology Industry Organization as "...a collection of technologies that capitalize on the attributes of cells, such as their manufacturing capabilities, and put biological molecules, such as DNA and proteins, to work for us (Biotechnology Industry Organization, 2004, \P 6)." Their definition goes on to say that the term should be used in the plural, biotechnologies, to really understand it.

Consensus refers to unanimous agreement within a group regarding a decision made. "When a decision is made by consensus, all members understand the decision and are prepared to support it. That means that all members can rephrase the decision to show that they understand it, that all members have had a chance to tell the group how they feel about the decision, and that those members who continue to disagree or have doubts will nevertheless say publicly that they are willing to give the decision a try for a period of time" (Johnson & Johnson, 2002). Procedures such as "majority voting, tossing a coin, averaging and bargaining (p. 297)" must be avoided and minority opinions and conflict should be encouraged. However, as the review of literature will reveal, the definition and acceptable level of agreement varies between disciplines, being quite high (90-100%) in conflict management, but somewhat lower in other fields and varying widely within a field. For purposes of this study, items that did not receive "strongly disagree" from any member of the panel were considered to have reached consensus.

The **Delphi method** is a specific set of procedures developed by the RAND Corporation to elicit and process group opinion. It is particularly useful when face-to-face meetings are not feasible because the members of the group are geographically distant (Dalkey & Rourke, 1971). The Texas Healthcare and Bioscience Institute (Texas Healthcare and Bioscience Institute, 2001) uses the term, *life science industries,* to encompass the pharmaceutical, biotechnology, agricultural biotechnology, environmental and other sectors. These industries use the products of living organisms to develop products and processes to benefit mankind.

Many different technical terms are used in this document that may be unfamiliar to anyone not involved in the biotechnology industry. Human Factors testing, clinical testing, Points to Consider documents, 21CFRX00, Guidance documents, Good Laboratory Practice, Good Manufacturing Practice, Good Clinical Practice, Good Tissue Practice (U.S. Food and Drug Administration, 2004) and the International Conference on Harmonisation (International Conference on Harmonisation, 2004) are all related to the federal and international regulatory processes that govern the production of medical devices and pharmaceuticals. ISO 9000 is an international standard developed by the International Organization for Standardization to establish quality standards for production and manufacturing (International Organization for Standardization, 2004). More detail on the various laboratory skills listed can be found at the Biotech Life Sciences Resource Web site (University of Texas Institute for Cellular and Molecular Biology, 1999).

Assumptions and Limitations

It was assumed that participants of this study would be aware of the knowledge, skills and abilities necessary to be successful as an employee in an industry environment. As well, participants were assumed to have a relatively positive attitude toward master's degrees and professional science master's degrees. However, being that people tend to be more in tune with the needs of the present than the needs of the future, this study may be limited in its application to programs developed at a different time or in a different place. Because the Delphi is an assessment of expert opinion, rather than empirical data, that opinion will change with the makeup of the group, the time of the study or the subsequent changes in knowledge and attitudes of the panelists over time. Linstone (1975) lists eight basic pitfalls of Delphi studies which should be carefully considered when designing a study or interpreting results-discounting the future, the prediction urge, the simplification urge, illusory expertise, sloppy execution, optimism-pessimism bias, overselling, and deception. Several of these could come into play in this study due to the unpredictable nature of human beings or the lack of expertise of the designer.

CHAPTER II REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Significant changes are occurring in graduate science education, due in large part to the rapidly increasing number and variety of science-based industries and decreasing enrollments of domestic students in advanced science degrees. However, there is little actual research on graduate education, other than reports of increasing or decreasing enrollments or changing job prospects in different fields, to document the impact of those changes. A recent National Science Foundation workshop (Office of Legislative and Public Affairs, 2003) concluded that there was a significant lack of literature on graduate education, and that it would be increasingly difficult to make decisions unless measures were taken to encourage research and develop a body of literature in this area. With emerging educational trends such as interdisciplinary professional science master's programs, that research is needed now more than ever.

Changes Occurring in Graduate Education

In 1995, the Committee on Science, Engineering and Public Policy Report (COSEPUP) (National Academy of Sciences Committee on Science Engineering and Public Policy, 1995) widely disseminated the conclusions of a joint study by the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering and the Institute of Medicine. The overall emphasis of the study pointed out that "more employment options are available to graduate scientists and engineers who have multiple disciplines, minor degrees, personal communications skills and entrepreneurial initiative" (Riggs & Galas, 1998). The report also recommends that graduate students be provided with experiences that enhance career skills, such as the ability to communicate complex ideas to nonspecialists and the ability to work well in teams. Off-campus internships in industry and government were described as useful in developing those skills. These recommendations are supported by numerous other sources (Fiske, 1998; Jensen, 1997; Kreeger, 1995; McCollum, 1998; McCormick & Hodgson, 1993; Mertl, 1998; National Academy of Sciences & National Academy of Engineering, 1996). However, there is little integration between development of academic standards and skills standards, though supposedly they have the same goals--to prepare the students for their chosen career path (National Governors Alliance, 1998).

In response to the COSEPUP report, the Association of Graduate Schools (AGS) made three general recommendations (Association of Graduate Schools):

 Offer a broader range of academic options, in part due to the shift away from academic employment and toward industry positions. The AGS position was that some disciplines were becoming too specialized, but the integrity of the Ph.D. as a research degree should not be diluted.

- Provide better career information and guidance, including establishing a national database to collect information on time to degree, financial aid, placement and career paths that would be available to advisors and students.
- Devise a national human-resource policy for advanced scientists and engineers.

When compiling a list of successful programs and policies, AGS (Association of Graduate Schools, 1996) evaluated these programs based on

- Increased breadth designed to give graduates greater versatility.
- Reduced time to degree.
- Improved career advising and placement.
- Professional skills training.
- Improved program promotion and evaluation.
- Overall student experience.

However, the focus of the AGS documents appeared to be only on Ph.D. programs, with no mention of improving master's degree programs specifically, though master's students would benefit from most of the changes. No mention was made of encouraging disciplines to place more value on the master's degree.

Traditionally, higher education in the US has focused on young, residential students. Curriculum in the programs emphasized academic disciplines rather than the needs of workers or employers (Ferguson, 1995), but in the early 1990's, only 25% of persons enrolled in higher education fit that traditional mold. In 1991, 32% of 12,000 adults participating in a national survey were enrolled in classes of some kind, the majority career-related (Ferguson, 1995). In 1993, almost 15 million students were enrolled in postsecondary education, more than double 1967 enrollments. Two million degrees were awarded in that time period, with approximately one-fourth of those in science and engineering fields

Ferguson (1995) calls for a change in the current paradigm of education, with less emphasis on disciplines and more emphasis on developing new standards that better serve workforce development. Results of the Third International Mathematics and Science Study support this with the U.S. ranking consistently below average on all the tests and last on some, which explains why many new employees lack the most basic skills needed for success (Hoover, 1999).

Stronger alliances between business and higher education will be necessary if Ferguson's "new paradigm" is to be achieved. Partnerships are formed for a variety of reasons, but successful partnerships have certain key elements (Charp, 1998) --visionary leadership, thorough needs assessment, consensus building, inclusiveness across the population, effective public relations, clearly defined roles and responsibilities, effective strategic planning, shared decision making that benefits all stakeholders, sufficient resources and expertise, and long term commitment. When partnering with industry, particularly for program or curriculum development, industry advisors must be chosen carefully. Many managers do not have the necessary understanding of knowledge and skills needed by their employees unless those managers came up through the ranks of a company and actually supervised or worked in the positions in question (Stasz, Ramsey, Eden, Melamid, & Kaganoff, 1996).

With increasing public pressure for accountability, universities must shift their focus more toward teaching and undergraduate education to better prepare students for entry into the workforce (National Academy of Sciences & National Academy of Engineering, 1996). Funding agencies are starting to promote more interdisciplinary graduate education and research training with emphasis on professional development that goes beyond the technical skills needed to finish a thesis (Mertl, 1998). This is in response to employer perceptions that new graduates, even at the doctoral level, lack skills in communication and multidisciplinary teamwork (Mertl, 1998). Complicating this task is the fact that as many as 80% of incoming freshmen in community colleges and universities may need remedial education in at least one subject (Rae Dupree, 1997). The National Science Board (1998) found that over 20% of minority students planning a major in the biological sciences or engineering thought they would need remedial work in science.

Ausubel (1996) and others (Bowen, 1996; Committee on Education & Human Resources, 2003; Massy & Goldman, 2001; National Science Board, 2003) believe that we are producing too many Ph.D.s in a system that recruits

students primarily for its own benefit with little thought given to students' postgraduate careers. Ausubel goes on to say that universities are too focused on faculty research and not focused enough on teaching, with too many offering very similar degrees. The demand for graduate students too often is driven by the needs of the university research enterprise, where students do research and, in many cases, teach for much less money than would be required for new faculty. The number of Ph.D.s produced was directly related to the number of professors on the graduate faculty and the number of years many new graduates were spending in post-doctoral positions was expanding, particularly in the life sciences (Ausubel, 1996). One point Ausubel (1996) makes is that the value of the master's should be increased, particularly in the life sciences, rather than being viewed as a consolation prize for students who aren't successful in a Ph.D. program.

Going back in the literature for ten years or so, there were many references regarding the over- or under- production of scientists, namely Ph.D.s (Bowen, 1996; Committee on Education & Human Resources, 2003; Greenberg, 2003; Massy & Goldman, 2001; National Science Board, 1998, 2003). In all fairness, however, those sources calling for a reduction in Ph.D.s don't always clarify whether the perceived overproduction is based on the ranks of all Ph.D.s or only those who don't have tenure track jobs five to eight years after graduation. Most graduate programs are designed to prepare students to become faculty and carry on independent research, yet the reality is that only 12% will find positions as faculty (McCollum, 1998). The opinions and data on this seemed to vary widely and would be a worthy subject of a meta-study.

Greenberg (2003) reported that this country has never trained enough American-born scientists. We've always depended on science talent from other countries. According to him, NSF reports produced in 1997 stated that foreign scientists accounted for 44% of US Ph.D.s in engineering, 30% in mathematics, 29% in chemistry, and 25% in biology. More than half remain in the US either temporarily or permanently. The underlying problem is that American students don't choose science as a career. His conclusion was that there are better ways to make a living and scientists in this country are not properly rewarded for what they contribute. Scientists spend years in low-paying post-doctoral positions while other fields provide more lucrative rewards (Greenberg, 2003).

One interesting study regarding students with bachelor's degrees in biology was that they were the most likely of any major to enroll in graduate school and were the least likely to be employed full-time one year after graduating with their bachelor's degree (Barton & Lapointe, 1995). Of those biology majors who were employed full-time, 42% were in jobs that did not require a degree and only 27% were in a job related to their field. Could this be due to the mindset that only the Ph.D. has any real value? Or could it be that our undergraduate life science programs still subscribe to the traditional paradigm of preparing students for graduate and professional school rather than for entering the workforce?

Universities are increasingly faced with accusations of declining quality of undergraduate programs and the perception that they lack effective strategies for evaluating departments, institutions, systems and missions for the purpose of distributing ever-decreasing resources (Benjamin & Carroll, 1996). Universities are experiencing increased pressure to solve national and local problems. Undergraduate science, mathematics and engineering programs are expected to prepare science educators, professional scientists, and business leaders. They must teach not only science facts, but the process of scientific decision making, communication of complex concepts, and working in teams to solve complex problems (Advisory Committee to the National Science Foundation Directorate for Education and Human Resources, 1996). The National Science Foundation is calling for government, industry, education, and professional organizations to work together for the necessary improvements (Advisory Committee to the National Science Foundation Directorate for Education and Human Resources, 1996).

According to Graham and Nicholas (2001), universities traditionally evaluate programs on inputs rather than on outcomes, and have a poor track record of publicly reporting data about their performance. Organizations that rank universities, like the U.S. News and World Report (2004), base their rankings on inputs rather than outcomes, which reinforces the practice. Universities strive to provide the data that the ranking agencies will use, and the ranking agencies use those data because that is the standard process for evaluation in higher education (Graham & Nicholas, 2001). Some educators see this as a cycle that needs to change and, in 1999, piloted the National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE) (Kuh, 2003). They suggest that universities be evaluated on benchmarks that support student learning rather than institutional resources and reputation.

The objective of the NSSE study was to collect data annually on student participation in programs and activities developed based on best practices in undergraduate education that support desired outcomes. At the end of the fourth round of data collection in 2003, over 1,300 different colleges and universities had participated with results being widely distributed on campuses to encourage improvement in undergraduate education (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2004b). Four-hundred seventy-three colleges participated in the spring 2004 round of data collection (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2004a).

The Kellogg Commission (Kellogg Commission, 1999) provided an indepth profile of a truly engaged institution. The engaged institution should work harder to provide internships, practicum, and service-learning opportunities for all students (p. 29). Engagement would address current issues such as improving employability skills, the career ladder for entry-level workers, and the shortage of scientists and engineers (p. 32-34). One way to accomplish this would be through specialized programs to meet the needs of industry. In summary, the report stated that the engaged institution must respond to the

needs of the current and future students, enrich the curriculum with learning and experiential opportunities that better prepare students for the work world they will enter, and work on community problems (p. 24).

In a survey conducted by the American Society for Cell Biology (Belden, Russonello, & Stewart, 1998), 25% of the members said they would not pursue a Ph.D. in their field if given the chance to start over. Most of this 25% were trainees, Asian scientists, or had graduated from a second or third tier university. The members agreed that too many Ph.D.s were being trained and that more permanent technician and research scientist positions should be created in the university so faculty would not be dependent on graduate students. The members also recommended that more diverse curricula be offered to broaden career options because the profession had changed over the years, with increases in industry and nontraditional positions, lack of research positions and lack of funding.

A study conducted by the Biomedical Association of Stanford Students (BioMASS) found that 40% of Ph.D. students graduating from the School of Medicine and the Department of Biological Sciences in 1996 were planning academic careers and 16% industry research careers (Hays, 1997). Twenty-five percent wanted careers that did not involve research and 58% were considering alternative careers. Seventy percent of the students surveyed were interested in dual discipline programs that involved a non-science field and 70% said their interest shifted away from academia while they were in graduate school. Twenty percent would not pursue a Ph.D. if they had the choice again. BioMASS recommended that students have better career counseling, alternative career advice, more diverse course work, experience outside their major department, and better mentoring.

A national study of master's programs involving 781 people, associated with 47 different programs across the US, found certain common characteristics of high quality master's programs (Conrad, Haworth, & Millar, 1993).

- Faculty, administrators and students understood and agreed on goals and had strong ownership in the program.
- 2. Faculty, administrators and students formed a learning community that encouraged exploration, individuality and informal learning experiences.
- 3. Structured around core course work that is offered on a regular basis.
- 4. Opportunities for constant interaction between students and faculty
- 5. Experiential learning opportunities
- 6. Individualized attention for students
- Students produced tangible products that benefited them as well as their field
- 8. Informal learning experiences and activities
- Institutional support through facilities, equipment, and promotion and tenure policies.
- 10. Departmental support, both financial and through faculty commitment.
- 11. Strong faculty involvement

- 12. Faculty with work experience outside the university
- 13. Committed students with diverse backgrounds.
- 14. Strong, committed leadership

The National Academy of Sciences (1995 p. 20) recommended more flexibility with less focus on an academic career, better career guidance, shortening of time to degree, and more training grants that were not tied directly to faculty research. The Education Imperative (National Academy of Sciences, 1997), supports linking partners in post-secondary education to provide high quality education and training to people in various stages of their careers, rigorous assessment of educational goals within departments and programs, rewards balanced between teaching, research, service and professional activities, and graduate education that prepares students for an "..increasingly interdisciplinary, collaborative, and global job market" (National Academy of Sciences, 1997 p. 11).

The National Science Foundation hosted a series of workshops in the 90's that made similar recommendations: more opportunities for experiential and applied experiences, training for alternative careers, combined B.S./M.S. degrees for students interested in industry careers, and better job placement and follow up (National Science Foundation, 1996). Other sources voiced similar concerns and placed increased emphasis on the value of the master's degree to satisfy the workforce needs (Bowen, 1996). Bowen made the interesting statement that this was in part based on the National Academy of Sciences findings that only one third of scientists and engineers with Ph.D.s had achieved tenure-track positions five to eight years after graduation.

The "typical" graduate student has also changed (Syverson, 1996). More than half were women, married, working full time, and one-fourth had dependents. There were more students in arts and sciences programs and at research-intensive institutions pursuing their degree full time. The average age was 33 and three-fourths were employed-16% of master's students were employed on campus and 50% of doctoral students. A higher percentage of physical and life science students (70%) were employed at universities. From 1990 to 2000, engineering master's degrees increased by 7%, only 1% average annually, but life science master's degrees increased 29% or 3% average annually (Syverson, 2003) Master's degrees in engineering peaked in 1994 and had decreased by 11% by 2000. Women made up the majority of new master's degree recipients.

In studies conducted with citizens and business people across Texas specifically for graduates of Texas A&M University, some recommendations were that curricula be broader and more multidisciplinary, internal internships and co-op programs for students be created with at least two semesters of experience, increased interaction with industry for faculty, students and for curriculum development, teach "...values, ethics, corporate culture, teamwork, learning skills, and adaptation to change...(Zey, Luedke, & Murdock, 1999)", how to interview, interpersonal skills, how to handle themselves in professional social settings, and how to communicate honestly with prospective employers (Zey et al., 1999).

Global competition for the science and engineering (S&E) workforce is increasing, which means the US cannot rely on international professionals as it has in the past (Committee on Education & Human Resources, 2003). Recommendations to counter this were that the federal government should direct more resources to encourage undergraduate study in science and engineering fields, provide more support for graduate education to respond to economic needs of students and promote a wider range of educational options in response to national skill needs, invest more in innovative approaches to doctoral and master's education and lead a national effort to gather information on current status of S&E workers, national S&E skill needs, and strategies that attract high-ability students and professionals in S&E careers. Yet according to some sources, there is currently an oversupply of biomedical science Ph.D.s (Committee on Education & Human Resources, 2003).

Problems arising in graduate S&E education are linked to the declining interest of domestic students in critical areas (physical, math and computer sciences), large increases in S&E retirements in the near future, the projected rapid growth in S&E occupations in the next ten years, new demands as a result of increased national security and severe pressure on state and local budgets (Committee on Education & Human Resources, 2003). From 1993 to 1997, the number of researchers in the thirty member countries of the Organization for

Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) increased 23%, but in the US those numbers only increased 11.8% (Committee on Education & Human Resources, 2003). In 1975, the US ranked third in the ratio of natural science and engineering (NS&E) degrees to the 24-year-old population, but currently, 16 countries outrank the US. From 1989 to 1998, bachelor's degrees in NS&E fields increased by 16.6%, but if biological and agricultural sciences are removed, other fields dropped by 7.9%. Twenty-five to thirty percent of freshmen surveyed intended to major in S&E fields, but less than half actually completed degrees within five years (Committee on Education & Human Resources, 2003).

Student loan debt has doubled in the past eight years and as a result only 27% of undergraduates are traditional students (Committee on Education & Human Resources, 2003). Students unable to attend full-time have difficulty in S&E fields because of prerequisites required, limited course offerings at accessible times and places and the necessity of laboratory work. Recommendations for retaining students were improved quality of teaching, changing the nature of introductory classes, facilities to support new teaching methods, and more effective academic support (Committee on Education & Human Resources, 2003). The report also recommended that universities should improve career guidance, increase training grants, voluntarily reduce enrollments in oversupplied fields, and broaden student experiences. Finally, the authors recommended that more financial support be put into academic

research to develop more adequate models of domestic supply and demand for S&E skills (Committee on Education & Human Resources, 2003).

Future development of graduate education is hampered by the lack of a significant body of research (Office of Legislative and Public Affairs, 2003). Changes occurring in graduate education such as online learning, mobile student populations, for-profit colleges and professional master's degrees are projected to become more prevalent. Graduate students of the future will seek more targeted opportunities for learning instead of traditional degree programs. Corporations will emphasize just-in-time learning. Studies are needed to evaluate outcomes and mechanisms for institutionalizing change and the graduate community needs a better understanding of what works for new students (Office of Legislative and Public Affairs, 2003).

Professional Science Master's Programs

As a result of these many years, and pages, of recommendations for changes in graduate education, the Sloan Foundation began an initiative to support the development of professional science master's (PSM) degrees in 1997 (Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, 1999). There are now over 100 different professional science master's programs supported by universities or by the Sloan Foundation (Smith et al., 2004). To date, the focus of the Sloan Foundation has been on two-year programs that emphasize course work and require an internship. In practically all these programs, course work in a professional field is combined with science and a professional internship.

Model PSM programs take three forms: 1) deepening student knowledge beyond what can be learned in a baccalaureate program, while staying within a discipline; 2) fusing scientific fields beyond what can be achieved in an undergraduate program; or 3) integrating disciplines such as science or math with training in management, law or other professions (Sciencemasters.com, 1997). Programs typically have "more science than an MBA, more informatics and computation than an MBA or science master's..., more education in professional fields..., and closer interaction with employers" (Sciencemasters.com, 1997) through experiential education opportunities.

The programs may combine scientific fields, such as life sciences and information sciences, (bioinformatics) or provide in-depth knowledge in one domain. Many PSM programs are in cross-disciplinary or emerging fields. All have "professional" components--business basics, law, regulatory affairs, skills-building modules or courses in management, negotiation, or communication (Ausubel & Tobias, 2002). A key element is the industry advisory committee set up before launching a program. These advisory committees take an active part in the process, especially in the planning stages. Students are exposed to cutting-edge research through experiences such as laboratory rotations. Most programs emphasize basic employability competencies such as writing and teamwork.

Management of these programs requires an industry liaison, rigorous assessment and quality control, follow-up with graduates and contact with similar master's programs. PSM directors see value in their contacts with local and regional firms and exposure to real-world problems and state-of-the-art instrumentation. These new master's degree are being promoted by others as an alternative to the academic Ph.D. for those students who are planning careers in the life science industries (M. N. Jensen, 1999; Kumagia, 1999).

PSMs first began in the 1980s, but disciplinary associations in the life sciences did not take much notice until 1997, when the William M. Keck Foundation and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation independently began to launch PSMs. The guidelines recommended by these foundations were (a) analysis of local workforce needs preceding development of the program, (b) active involvement of industry advisors, and (c) programs of at least two-year duration, including a three to six month internship. Two years were recommended as the minimum program length because it was believed faculty didn't take one-year students seriously enough, the second year students mentor the first year, and two years in the department would generate a greater sense of community and loyalty to the institution (Ausubel & Tobias, 2002). PSMs typically target recent baccalaureate degree holders who want a short, full-time, professional level program or part-time professionals who will take only one or two courses at a time (Tobias, 1999). Because most of these programs are relatively new and vary considerably, systematic evaluation is difficult (Tobias, 1999).

Unlike the traditional science programs, PSMs typically do not offer assistantships, but instead expect students to pay their own way (Kumagia, 1999). However, unlike MBA or law programs, which have excellent reputations backed by 100-year track records, there are not droves of students willing to pay. Perhaps because they are new, PSMs are at a disadvantage and many must supplement their students with teaching assistantships or other support. These programs are small. Within two to three years after the program is started, they try to graduate at least ten students per degree program per year. The programs conduct distinctive orientations and provide cross-departmental activities for students, provide special advising and placement, and track graduates over the long term. Though currently there are no skill standards for these programs, national standards may arise as programs grow. To have a significant impact on the national economy, thousands must be graduated. Contrary to many who feared otherwise, these programs do not compete with doctoral programs, but rather the courses benefit all students in the department and the PSM students can provide a pool for teaching assistants (Ausubel & Tobias, 2002). Tracking graduates will be critical to determining the success of these programs (Kumagia, 1999).

PSMs usually conform to local tuition and rules of revenue return, but some follow professional school models of charging more (Ausubel & Tobias, 2002). Many use startup funds to hire professional staff to coordinate faculty, for targeted recruiting, student services, and as a liaison to business. Since most do
not offer financial assistance, some means of reducing costs to students is needed. More favorable distribution of state resources is also needed to encourage increased number and variety of programs. Ausubel and Tobias (2002) believe that state economic development agencies should support PSMs because of their value as workforce incubators.

Science and technology industries need more focused, industryresponsive and timelier education opportunities. Graduates should be knowledgeable in their scientific discipline, be able to work across cultures and disciplines, communicate across departments and with customers, and work well in team settings. Demand is increasing for people who have technical knowledge and who can plan and manage a project to completion (Kumagia, 1999). The traits most frequently mentioned were "leadership, project management, team building, communication skills, planning and organizing, interpersonal skills, adaptability, and multi-cultural competencies" (Simmons, 2003). They need the "science equivalent of an MBA" (Simmons, 2003) and the typical Ph.D. is too narrowly specialized to provide this. Ph.D.s, and often MBAs, end up in jobs far from their interests and qualifications. In contrast, 91% of PSM graduates surveyed at twelve universities landed positions in their chosen field after graduation (Simmons, 2003). They ranked their degree highly, 41% believing it was competitive with an MBA. Sixty-six percent said their salary was \$50,000 or higher and 12% exceeded \$70,000. This exceeds most traditional

master's graduates, particularly in the life sciences where the average was \$33,500 (Simmons, 2003).

From 1984 to 2000, the total number of Ph.D.s granted in the math, physical and life sciences went from 7,500 to 10,000, but master's degrees awarded in these fields stayed flat at about 14,000 (Ausubel & Tobias, 2002). In 2002, there were over 40 universities with PSMs and in the February, 2003, newsletter from the Sloan Foundation, there were 67 PSM programs-twelve single track bioinformatics programs and the rest multi-track (Sciencemasters.com, 2003). Of the current enrollees, 80% are full time, 33% are women, 8% underrepresented minorities, and 84% are US citizens, with programs in the biosciences being the most popular.

Changes in Employer Demands

Industry is becoming the primary employer of graduates with bachelor's degrees. In 1995, 72% of those earning bachelor's degree in1993-94 were working full-time (Tsapogas et al., 1999), but the author did not provide figures on how many of those were in jobs related to their field or if any of those counted as unemployed had chosen to continue their education. Two-thirds of those employed full-time were in US industries and the remaining one-third were employed in education, government, or nonprofit organizations. One-third of the science graduates worked in companies with fewer than 500 employees. Life science graduates were more likely to be working in their field if they were

employed by a small business. Biotechnology was one of several technical fields that showed higher than average growth of new companies in the early 1990s. This demonstrates increasing opportunities for life science graduates in private industry.

The National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy (National Academy of Sciences & National Academy of Engineering, 1996) reported that the numbers of science and engineering Ph.D. recipients working in fields other than academics has increased steadily for the past twenty years, while the number of academic positions available has remained steady, or in some cases, decreased. Changes in society (e.g. the end of the Cold War, globalization, and advances in technology) have had a significant impact on the job market for scientists and engineers. Small and medium size companies are increasing their R&D expenditures and creating more employment opportunities for recent graduates with multidisciplinary skills, particularly those who have strong minors or dual master's degrees. Scientists and engineers are increasingly being recruited into nontraditional fields such as finance and companies are expecting more than technical knowledge from the scientists they hire. As companies become more global, they look for science professionals with multi-lingual skills, management skills, flexibility and the self-motivation to be a life-long learner (National Academy of Sciences & National Academy of Engineering, 1996).

Soft skills (ethics, intrapersonal, stress management, etc.) (Caudron, 1999) and basic skills (communication, computer skills, problem solving, etc.) (Laab, 1993) are becoming as important as technical skills. Increased emphasis is being placed on employability competencies that are common to employees in all levels and fields such as skills in reading, math, higher order thinking, and teamwork (Cotton, 1993). Employees must continually update their knowledge to stay abreast of new developments in areas of science that change rapidly. Employers are recognizing that employee success is more dependent on personality characteristics and behavioral skills than technical skills (Cusack, 1994).

Cusack (1994) points out that people with an internal locus of control and the belief that success comes from effort rather than ability are more successful and that these traits are often learned in childhood rather than as adults. This could have implications for elementary and secondary education-reward for effort rather than meeting a set academic standard, development of problem solving skills, self-esteem, optimism and resilience.

In the Massachusetts medical therapeutics sector, larger companies which had entered clinical or commercial manufacturing of one or more products were expanding product and manufacturing bases, developing marketing and sales divisions and had plans to continue expansion over the next 10-15 years (Dahms & Bourque, 2001). In 2001, there were about 1,300 biotechnology companies in the US industry, 350 of them publicly traded, with a combined

market capitalization greater than \$450 billion and annual revenues of about \$28 billion (Dahms, 2001b). There were approximately 130 products in commercialization and more than 50 publicly traded companies that were profitable. The industry was largely made up of emerging companies with more than \$15 billion in research and development and more than 1,400 products in various stages of clinical development. These companies employed more than 180,000 and grew at a rate of 9% to17% annually (Dahms, 2001b). The workforce could grow to one million by 2015. Competitive advantage relied on corporate technology, patents, strategic position and how companies developed and managed their workforce.

In 2001, the US technical force was 19% Ph.D., 17% M.S., 50% B.S., and 14% A.A.S. (Dahms, 2001b). Almost 10% of people in the US biotechnology workforce (~17,000) had H-1B visa status (Dahms, 2001b). Skilled labor was the second or third item on a list of a dozen or so significant hurdles that companies had to clear to move into commercialization (Dahms, 2001a).

As companies grow from an R&D base to production, they must develop their workforce for the shift. Employees must possess knowledge in business development, management, regulatory compliance, quality assurance, Good Manufacturing Practice, technology management, project management, data management, product creation, and drug development and approval. They also need soft skills such as leadership, teamwork, and management (Dahms, 2001a). The National Science Board created three key science and technology policy goals. One of those was to address the current and future needs for a well-trained workforce, from basic science literacy to advanced degrees in science and engineering (National Science Board, 1996). They foresaw an increasing demand for a technically skilled workforce.

In 1995, 55% of academic R&D expenditures were in the life sciences (National Science Board, 1998). Academic patenting, especially in biomedical fields, increased from 250 in the early 70s to 1,800 in 1995 (National Science Board, 1998). Pharmaceutical companies R&D expenditures tripled between 1985 and 1995 with the most significant increase in biotechnology research. More than one-third of drug companies R&D projects were biotechnology related.

Because of this rapid increase, graduate education is being closely examined for effectiveness in the career preparation of students. The demand for an educated workforce in science and engineering is expected to increase by 1.36 million jobs between 1996 and 2006 with an increase of 41,000 jobs just in the life sciences (National Science Board, 1998).

Baccalaureate and master's level scientists provided much of the workforce in R&D laboratories of pharmaceutical firms, biotechnology companies, and chemical suppliers (Gwynne, 2001). Forty to 50% of jobs in a company may be non-research, but require a B.S. or M.S. in science. Other opportunities for careers in clinical trials, regulatory affairs, sales, marketing,

technical assistance and other fields were available for those who didn't want to stay at the research bench. Demand is expected to increase as current technologies based on genome sequencing continue to mature (Gwynne, 2001). In 1995, 72% of scientists and engineers with bachelor's degrees and 59% with master's degrees were employed in a private for-profit company (National Science Board, 1998). In 1999, 62% of S&E master's degrees were employed in for-profit companies (Committee on Education & Human Resources, 2003).

Master's level graduates were in demand for positions in three distinct areas: business, operations, and clinical (Jensen, 1996). Working in an industry environment required people skills, ability to work in multidisciplinary teams, focus on goals, timelines and results. This fosters an environment where the independence typical in academia is not appreciated (Jensen, 1997).

All too often in the life sciences, the master's degree is just a stepping stone to the doctorate, unlike engineering programs where the master's can be a terminal professional degree that leads to a career in industry. In technical industries, master's level professionals oversee the majority of development, marketing and operations work and their numbers can promote or limit corporate growth (Riggs & Galas, 1998). In 1995, engineering schools granted 28,000 master's degrees, an increase of 20% from 1990, while life science schools granted only 5,400 master's of science degrees, an increase of only 11% from 1990.

Master's level scientists are needed because most undergraduates lacked the necessary training in science or management to be team leaders and Ph.D. level scientists are not typically trained to take discoveries from laboratory to marketplace. Riggs and Galas (1998) stated specifically that the life science industries needed a master's degree that combined "...an understanding not only of fundamental biology, but also of chemistry, engineering, computing methods, ethics and business "(p.41). They go on to say that communication and teamwork skills across multiple departments were more important than research skills and specialization.

Surveys conducted by the North Carolina Biotechnology Center in 1992 determined that 55% of B.S./M.S. level technicians were hired from within the industry, but only 28% were hired straight from college (Kennedy, 1993a). Reasons given for this were that employers placed a high premium on experience working in an industry environment, new graduates lacked basic laboratory skills and only large corporations had full-time staff devoted to inhouse training. The survey also found that students' chances to find jobs right out of college could be enhanced by increased opportunities for practical laboratory experience in the undergraduate curriculum, cooperative education experiences, summer jobs or internships in industrial laboratories, undergraduate research projects or jobs in academic laboratories, and exposure to the Good Laboratory Practice (GLP) or Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP) standards in college laboratories. Startup companies were more heavily invested

in R&D and their workforce was primarily above the level of B.S. (Kennedy, 1993a).

Generally, according to the NCBC study (1993), the most desirable preparation for biotechnicians included training in analytical instrumentation (HPLC, GC, all kinds of spectroscopy), biochemistry, microbiology, and computer literacy. (A word of caution here, however, as this was ten years ago and the industry has evolved rapidly since that time.) Workers at all levels needed strong basic abilities in communication, math, and problem solving. Once again, employers also cited abilities such as teamwork, creativity, critical thinking and initiative.

In a related study (Kennedy, 1993b), the most common deficiencies cited for new graduates at all education levels (high school, A.A.S., B.S., M.S., Ph.D.) were poor written and oral communication skills. While A.A.S. and B.S. level graduates were more commonly perceived as lacking problem solving and practical laboratory skills, interpersonal and teamwork skills were more of a problem for people with graduate degrees and older AAS students.

In many fields, there is more demand for B.S. and M.S. level than Ph.D. level employees (McCormick & Hodgson, 1993). Steve Aeby (as cited in McCormick & Hodgson, 1993) expressed the need for people experience in moving products through production and clinical trials. He emphasized the need for experience with GLP (Good Laboratory Practice), communication skills,

flexibility, organization skills, teamwork, junior management skills and self motivation.

Growth of the Texas Industry

Internationally, the current biotechnology marketplace includes approximately 2,500 firms, most of them in the US. There were more than 1,500 companies in the US with 190,000+ employees in 2001 (Griffith & Martinez, 2003), with most of them centered in industrialized areas due to a need for proximity to top research universities and a highly-educated workforce. Between 1992 and 2001, biotechnology industry revenues totaled \$28.5 billion, an increase of more than 350%.

There are four major regional concentrations for the biotechnology industry in Texas: Austin, Dallas-Fort Worth, Houston, and San Antonio (Griffith & Martinez, 2003; Texas Healthcare and Bioscience Institute, 1998). From 1990-1997, employment in this sector grew 3% annually, compared with 1.7% nationally for that sector and 2.9% annually overall in the state. More than 50,000 people were employed statewide in 2001 (Griffith & Martinez, 2003), with the largest segment (52%) being laboratory and research services. Twenty-four percent of jobs were in science and engineering (Texas Healthcare and Bioscience Institute, 2001).

Intellectual property in Texas generated \$12.4 million in income for Texas health related institutions in 1997, up from \$4.2 million in 1993. Small Business

Innovation Research awards (SBIR) to Texas companies working in the life sciences were \$41.5 million in 2001 (Griffith & Martinez, 2003). Federally funded R&D expenditures in Texas institutions nearly tripled from 1986 to 1998, equivalent to a 9.0% average annual increase (Texas Healthcare and Bioscience Institute, 1998). NIH expenditures in Texas grew 58% from 1990 to 1996, reaching \$456 million, but were significantly lower than California, Massachusetts, and New York. Venture capital investments in Texas companies reached \$403.5 million between 1995 and 2002, but this is an inconsistent source of funding (Griffith & Martinez, 2003). The strongest shaper of the business environment is government support, a highly trained workforce and favorable business climate (Griffith & Martinez, 2003).

Eighty-four percent of firms surveyed in 1997 noted that Ph.D. and master's degrees in life sciences were important to continued growth (Texas Healthcare and Bioscience Institute, 1998). Fifty-seven percent of companies surveyed noted that workforce skills and specific training resources were extremely important to continued growth. Seventy percent of respondents noted that employees with engineering and other technology related degrees were important to growth. About one-fourth of employees in the cluster were professionals, such as engineers, clinical technologists and scientists.

Patents related to healthcare technology in Texas increased from 6.6% to 8.1% in 1997 (Texas Healthcare and Bioscience Institute, 1998). Patent activity in pharmaceuticals, biotechnology, medical equipment, and medical electronics

has increased more than 92% since 1990. Biotechnology patents increased from 7% to 20% of total healthcare technology patents between 1990 and 1997 while pharmaceutical patents increased from 24% to 29%. Between 1993 and 1997, income generated from royalties, licensing, or other transactions related to intellectual property increased 38% at Texas health-related institutions, from just \$4.2 million to \$12.4 million. From 1997 to 2001, approximately 1,820 biomedical patents originated from Texas (Griffith & Martinez, 2003).

The Texas A&M Center for Business and Economic Analysis estimated that the healthcare technology industry in Texas encompassed 500 companies with \$6.5 billion in annual sales and more than 38,000 private sector jobs with an average salary of \$40,000 in 1997 (Texas Healthcare and Bioscience Institute, 1998). Average company R&D expenditures were \$3.1 million a year and there were at least 396 new products in development at that time.

In the area of academic research, which feeds this growing industry, Texas possesses a wealth of resources. Texas public and private higher education research institutions spent \$1.8 billion on life sciences research in 2001 (Griffith & Martinez, 2003). Of that, \$682.6 million went to medicallyrelated research. Life science degrees awarded in Texas increased 56% between 1989 and 1995 (Texas Healthcare and Bioscience Institute, 1998). Texas Health Science Centers awarded 218 doctoral degrees in life sciences and 1,300 professional degrees in 2001 (Griffith & Martinez, 2003).

The Texas Science and Technology Report (Texas Science and Technology Council, 1998) stated that workforce issues were the largest barrier to continuing the economic growth of Texas' technology-based economy. Recommendations from that report were to significantly expand the high school Advanced Placement program to increase the number of high school graduates with high level math and science skills and adoption of a high technology curriculum in community colleges across the state to help train and re-train students and workers for available jobs.

The Council on Science and Biotechnology Development was created in 2001 when the 77th legislature appropriated \$800 million for science, engineering, research and commercialization activities (Griffith & Martinez, 2003). The purpose of the Council was to create a seamless system of innovation from the laboratory to the marketplace in rapidly developing areas of biotechnology, such as biopharmaceutical development, bioinformatics, genomics and nanotechnology (Perry, 2001). The mission of the council was to work to create a partnership between institutions of higher learning, industry and government to promote biotechnology as an economic development tool. As an example of the benefits of such a cooperative effort, Governor Rick Perry (2001) noted that more than 400 biotech companies have been created in the San Diego area in the past 10 years, resulting in billions of dollars poured into the local economy. The Council was charged with identifying legal barriers to technology transfer, recruiting existing companies and facilities to Texas, and creating incentives to ensure that faculty, departments and universities were rewarded for commercializing technology. A subcommittee of that Council was established specifically to address workforce issues, which were seen as a barrier to continued growth of the industry (Perry, 2001).

The Delphi Method

The Delphi method was chosen for this study because it is recognized for its effectiveness in reaching consensus on curricular content and for developing curriculum in emerging fields (Finch & Crunkilton, 1999). According to Finch, the strength of the Delphi method lies in "allowing stakeholders and experts to speculate individually and reach consensus collectively on necessary content when there are few trained workers in a field (p.158-159)." It is used in education for cost effectiveness, curriculum and campus planning, establishing institutional and general goals and objectives, and reaching consensus on evaluation elements (Judd, 1972). When determining priorities for educational planning, factors such as availability of resources and people affected must also be taken into consideration (Caffarella, 1994), which can be accomplished with a Delphi as well.

Three distinct characteristics of the Delphi method are anonymity, controlled feedback and statistical group response (Dalkey, 1967; Turoff & Hiltz, 1995). In a typical Delphi, an initial questionnaire requests a list of content from panelists, which is ranked in terms of importance in successive rounds, allowing members of the panel to give opinions on each round. When more focus is needed on a specific issue, a modified version of the Delphi, which begins with a set of examples instead of general questions, is used (Scheele, 1975). The Delphi method can be used when no other data is available to determine curriculum content.

Scheibe et al. (2002) compared methods of ranking, rating scales, and pair-comparisons to determine which was most likely to provide interval data. Likert-like rating scales and rankings were the most likely to be interval. Rating scales were preferred by participants. However, he cautions that results may not be conclusive due to the difficulty of comparing successive rounds in a Delphi.

Use of pen-names allows respondents to be identified with their contributions, while maintaining their anonymity for purposes of voting or providing subjective information (Turoff & Hiltz, 1995). Two other important aspects of a Delphi are that respondents should know that they do not have to respond to every question, taking a "no judgment" view, and they should be asked to rate their level of confidence in their answer (Dalkey, 1967). Overall, group judgments were found to be 45% more accurate than individual judgments in studies done with factual data and similar studies with value judgments support that rule (Dalkey & Rourke, 1971).

The Delphi method is commonly applied to groups of 30 to 100 people that cannot meet easily face to face, allowing members of the panel to participate asynchronously. Delphi works better than structured face-to-face

meetings because answers are more accurate (Dalkey, 1967). Numerous studies by psychologists have demonstrated serious difficulties in face-to-face interactions due to the influence of dominant individuals, communications centered on individual and group interests rather than problem solving, and group pressure for conformity (Dalkey, 1969). This method provides the individual with the greatest freedom of individuality or freedom of expression (Turoff, 1971).

The advantage of having large groups is that individuals with different perspectives or differing abilities can contribute to those parts of a complex problem for which they have appropriate knowledge and problem solving skills (Turoff & Hiltz, 1995). According to the authors, this aspect of the Delphi is one of its most important--allowing an individual to choose what part of the problem to deal with at any time in the group problem solving process. This is easier to accomplish with a computer system than paper and pencil, which holds much promise for computer-based Delphi (Turoff & Hiltz, 1995).

Panelists should have a firm idea of a group's identity, but anonymity reinforces the panelists' self concept as impartial observers. When the panel is drawn from one field or discipline, interaction can quickly move to theoretical discussion rather than action. Scheele (1975) also recommends that panels be composed of stakeholders (those who are or will be directly involved), experts (those who have applicable specialty or relevant experience) and facilitators (those who have skills in clarifying, organizing, synthesizing, stimulating and when appropriate can supply alternative viewpoints) for the best combination of expertise. Participants should be chosen by starting with a small group and asking for names of others who would be good panelists in each role. Minority, as well as majority viewpoints, should be considered. Prestigious sponsors, publicity value, and attractive and stimulating peers can provide incentives for participation (Scheele, 1975). Suggesting that key participants collect and review feedback from their staff or students is another opportunity for publicity or recognition. Creating expectation and awareness among people important to the panelists can also serve as an incentive.

Web-based Delphi

One of the most significant potentials for automation of Delphi is the incorporation of real time analysis aids (Turoff & Hiltz, 1995). The moderator can tailor the group process to create activities at any point in the discussion. The addition of graphics, animation, video clips and audio offers possibilities in survey design that cannot be accomplished with a paper and pencil questionnaire (Dillman, 2000). However, this increased technical ability also introduces another source of survey error if the level of technology used is too sophisticated for the respondent to receive and respond to. Surveys must be designed with the lowest level of technology in mind and tested using different browsers, operating systems, and computers.

Consensus

The Delphi is not necessarily a method to produce quick consensus, but is intended to be a means of encouraging critical discussion (Turoff & Hiltz, 1995). It can uncover hidden issues just as easily as it can lead to agreement (Turoff, 1971), and should be considered a means of exploring differences rather than a just a tool for reaching consensus (Linstone & Turoff, 1975).

The stability of group opinion is sometimes measured instead of consensus because it allows for more information to be collected and can show consensus within subgroups rather than consensus of the group as a whole (Scheibe, Skutsch, & Schofer, 2002). Being that one of the original objectives of the Delphi method was to identify differences as well as agreement, the use of opinion stability, rather than consensus, is considered a better measure of success by some.

A problem that emerges with Delphi studies is the lack of agreement on the definition of "consensus". Fink et al. (1984) stated that consensus definitions can vary, but that justifiable levels should be agreed upon before the study is started. They mention that items on which there is two-thirds agreement after fifteen minutes of discussion should be considered consensus items. However, in literature related to conflict management, a minimum of 90% is recommended and 100% preferred (Susskind, 1999). Other sources indicate that even among professional facilitators, there is not common agreement on consensus (Freeman, 2002), so the definition and use of consensus seems to vary with different fields. Johnson and Johnson (2002) list seven methods of group decision making, describing Delphi as an example of decision by averaging individual opinions, while the consensus method is described separately. However, the authors' description of Delphi indicates they are not well-versed in the Delphi method or the research supporting it. One comment made was that the "opinions of the least knowledgeable members may annul the opinions of the most knowledgeable members (p. 294-295)", which was addressed in some of Dalkey's later studies where he recommended that data be analyzed by subgroups, including having panelists rank their level of confidence in their answer (Dalkey, Brown, & Cochran, 1969).

There also seems to be some distinction between methods for reaching consensus and the consensus method, the Delphi being frequently described in the literature as a method for reaching consensus while the consensus method is always described as a face-to-face process involving considerable give and take and unanimous or near unanimous acceptance of a decision (Butcher, 2002; Freeman, 2002; Susskind, 1999). Powell (2003) reviewed numerous studies and concluded that the failure to address assumptions concerning consensus was a common problem in Delphi studies, with levels ranging from 55% to 100% and in many cases, not mentioned at all.

Sandow (1972) proposed a model for a focus Delphi that emphasized the differences that occur between groups rather than consensus. He did not seem to be familiar with the early history and intent of a Delphi or chose to ignore it.

He did make several interesting points that for educational planning, all stakeholders should be represented rather than choosing "experts". Differences in priorities of each group should be examined, as well as their perceptions of who has the power to bring about change and their reaction to changes. This allows policy makers to plan for resistance that might be encountered and to know the priorities of the different groups that will be affected. He recommended providing the interquartile range (IQR) of each group in each round and the median of all groups. Minority reports should always be included for any Delphi (Scheele, 1975).

Summary of Review of Literature

Changes in graduate science education have been advocated by government and industry sources for many years. In response to this, professional science master's programs have been developed that emphasize (a) more science than an MBA, (b) more informatics and computation than an MBA or traditional science master's, (c) more education in professional fields, and (d) closer interaction with employers through experiential education opportunities. These recommended changes, coupled with the growth of the biotechnology industry, have led to the development of a model for a master's program combining scientific and business knowledge.

The Delphi technique is recommended for program development in emerging fields. It allows the systematic gathering and analysis of expert opinion

for a field in which there is no widely accepted curriculum. Use of the Webbased Delphi allows panelists to easily access the survey from any networked computer and simplifies compiling data or providing supplemental materials. The Delphi can be used to develop consensus within a group or to identify issues where there is broad disagreement. A definition of 'consensus' should be determined before the study begins.

CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to identify stakeholders' priorities in the development of a professional science master's degree in biotechnology. The specific objectives of this study were to identify stakeholders priorities for various aspects of a professional science master's in biotechnology; to identify differences in priorities between subgroups; and to examine user preferences between Web-based and traditional methods of conducting a Delphi study.

A modified Delphi study was designed based on methods recommended by Dalkey and Scheele (Dalkey, 1967, 1969; Scheele, 1975). The Delphi method is recommended for program and curriculum development, particularly in emerging fields where there is no recognized standard for curriculum (Finch & Crunkilton, 1999; Judd, 1972)

The Round 1 instrument consisted of eight open-ended questions (Appendix A). The first question was modified with a list of twelve skills. Panelists were allowed to add or remove skills on the list (Scheele, 1975). Additional issues emerged in Round 1 and were clarified via email exchange with the panelists before continuing to Round 2. Responses were organized into themes in Round 2 and ranked on a continuum. Panelists indicated where their answers fell on the continuum. Round 2.1 was used to clarify emergent issues relating to tracks and goals before continuing to Round 3, where panelists were given the chance to indicate their level of agreement on each item. In Round 4, medians and IQRs from Round 3 were provided for each item and panelists were allowed to reconsider their answer and make additional comments. In Round 5, the last two questions were completed and panelists were asked to evaluate the Delphi process with three open-ended questions.

Description of Sample

The methods used during each round of the Delphi study are reported in chronological order below. Two groups of academic and industry professionals were asked to nominate as many as three experts each to serve on the Delphi panel (Scheele, 1975). The first group was affiliated with an existing professional science master's program, either as an academic or industry advisor. Administrators of other professional science master's programs were also contacted and asked to participate and provide three nominations. We received 33 referrals and contacted them via email (Appendix B) to explain the rationale and design of the study. Of the initial 33, 24 agreed to participate. Purely by chance, 12 of these were from universities and 12 were working in the life science industries.

The list of participants, with information on their titles and affiliations, was submitted to a third party for validation. This person was director of a national biotechnology training project with many years experience working with industry and higher education to prepare students for biotechnology careers.

Description of Survey Instrument

This study used Web-based forms to collect the data. The initial instrument consisted of a password protected sign in page (Appendix A-1), an informed consent form (Appendix A-2), a brief demographic form (Appendix A-3), and a welcome page listing the eight open-ended questions with links to individual pages for each question (Appendix A-4). The programming language used for the interactive web site was Active Server Pages (ASP). All panelists were offered the option of printing out the entire survey and returning it by mail in the first round. No panelist chose to use this alternate method.

Instruments developed for Delphi research are emergent, meaning that the questions for each round are developed from the results of the previous round (Linstone & Turoff, 1975). Dillman's principles of Web survey layout and question design were used and respondents were provided the option of using a Web-based form or printing and returning the survey (Dillman, 2000).

Data Collection Procedures

Preparation

Panelists were provided a pen name at the beginning of the survey so that their answers could be identified while they remained anonymous to each other (Turoff & Hiltz, 1995). All responses were treated as confidential.

Panelists were told that they could discuss the questions with others in order to improve their responses. They were asked to confer with employees,

associates or their students, if desired, to form answers for the questions (Scheele, 1975). Panelists were asked to provide their level of confidence in answering each question in the first round (Dalkey et al., 1969). Research has shown that the Delphi process can be improved by using self-ratings of confidence to form subgroups of very confident, confident and unconfident responses. Unexpected information can emerge when results are examined by subgroups such as gender, field of expertise, or other common factors (Dalkey, 1969).

Round 1

Round 1 consisted of eight questions. The first question was modified by providing 12 examples of skills that graduates of the program would be expected to have and asking panelists to delete from or add to the list. The remaining seven questions were open ended and addressed internships, the importance of hands-on experience versus writing the thesis, regional or national focus, entry level positions appropriate for graduates, different roles for the industry advisory board, and minimum hours of laboratory experience that should be expected (Appendix A-4). These questions were chosen based on my years of experience with a professional master's program and the inconsistencies or lack of information in these particular areas, particularly as it applied to an interdisciplinary graduate program.

In Round 1, four panelists expressed the opinion that the program should offer different tracks. An email was sent to all panelists (Appendix C) at the end of Round 1 asking them if two or more tracks should be offered. Those responses were incorporated in the development of Round Two.

Round 2

Results of the initial round and the clarifying email were summarized and returned to the panelists in Round Two (Dalkey, 1967, 1969) (Appendix D). A color coding method was used to identify common themes (Dooley, 1995). In Question 1, panelists were asked to list tracks they thought would be appropriate and indicate whether knowledge, skills and abilities identified in Round 1 should be part of the common core curriculum or included in a track. For Questions 2, 3, 4 and 7, themes emerged and responses were grouped according to theme. These thematic responses were organized into different levels within each theme to form a continuum. Panelists were asked to consider the information provided and determine where their answer fell within this continuum.

In Question 5, responses regarding entry-level positions for graduates of the program revealed that panelists were apparently using different titles for the same position. In response to this, a published list of job titles (Dahms & Bourke, 2001) was provided and panelists were asked to provide additional titles if they were not included on the list. For Question 6, panelists were asked to indicate their level of agreement for the roles identified for the industry advisory board using a five-point Likert scale (Dunn-Rankin, 1983). In Question 8, panelists were given a list of 10 issues from Round 1 and asked to choose those they thought should be considered in this study.

A second issue relating to program goals emerged in Round 2 that required further clarification before continuing on to the third round. This required an additional, brief literature review on use of the Delphi to clarify goals. According to Rutherford (1973), a Goals Delphi should start by asking panelists to suggest objectives, then sorting those objectives into goals in later rounds. Objectives were easier for panelists to identify than more nebulous goals. Goals are usually formed by committees, which typically suppresses conflict and tends only to seek agreement on general issues rather than ironing out specifics (Rutherford, 1973). Good program objectives can be learning objectives or operational objectives and they should be rational, concrete, practical, achievable, and ideally, measurable. Unlike learning or operational objectives, program objectives may or may not be measurable (Caffarella, 1994).

In order to further clarify the issues that emerged relating to separate program tracks and program goals, a brief clarifying round, 2.1, was initiated. Round 2.1 consisted of two questions relating to tracks and program goals. Panelists were given one week to complete it. They were given an open-ended question and asked to list up to five objectives for the program. Each objective was printed on a card and cards were then sorted into themes to identify goals.

Panelists were given a list of the tracks identified in Round 2 and chose those they considered appropriate for the program. Tracks receiving a simple majority of responses were retained for Round 3. Results from this clarifying round, Round 2.1, were combined with results from Round 2 to develop questions for Round 3.

Round 3

In this round, the two emerging issues were combined and added to Question 1 with the data collected on knowledge, skills, and abilities (Appendix E). The question of hands-on experience, originally Question 3, was also added to Question 1 because we believed that it could be affected by the issue of different program tracks. Using a five-point Likert scale, panelists were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each goal on the list, each suggested track, and whether all students, regardless of track, should have hands-on laboratory experience. If they agreed that all students should have hands-on experience, they were asked to indicate how many semesters should be required (Question 3 in Round 1). They were also asked to indicate if hands-on experience should be required for each of the different tracks (Question 7 in Round 1). A text box was provided for additional comments.

Skills were presented in two tables, one listing skills identified as those that should be included in the core curriculum for all students and one listing those skills that were appropriate for specialized tracks, with frequencies from Round 2 provided. Only those skills that had been chosen by 50% or more of respondents were retained from Round 2. Panelists indicated their level of agreement that each was appropriate for core or track.

For Question 2, different levels on a continuum for the four different themes that emerged for the internship were placed in separate tables and ranked in order by the frequency with which they were chosen by panelists, highest to lowest. Panelists were then asked to rank their choices for each within each theme, starting with '1' as the most desirable choice.

Question 3 addressed national, regional or local focus for the program. Five themes emerged and were listed in order by frequency. Panelists were then asked to rank their choices for each, with "1" as the most desirable choice and "5" the least desirable.

Question 4A listed those entry-level positions that were chosen as most appropriate for recent graduates by 50% or more of respondents. Frequencies for each position were provided and panelists were asked to indicate their level of agreement that the position was appropriate for a new graduate on a fivepoint Likert scale. Question 4B listed additional titles identified in the previous round and panelists responded "yes", "no", or indicated that it was "fundamentally the same" as a title listed in Part A.

For Question 5, medians and IQRs from Round 2 were provided and panelists had the opportunity to consider their previous response, make any changes they chose, and provide additional comments. For Question 6, only one issue was carried forward from the previous round. Panelists were asked to discuss possible innovations in curriculum and teaching for professional programs.

Round 4

In this round, medians, interquartile ranges (IQR), comments and each panelist's response from the previous round were provided as feedback (Dalkey, 1967, 1969) (Appendix F). Panelists were allowed the opportunity to reconsider their answer and make additional comments.

Round 5

Hands-on experience for all students and suggested entry-level positions were the only questions requiring further discussion in Round 5 (Appendix G). Medians, IQRs, comments and responses from the previous round were provided and panelists were allowed the chance to reconsider their answer.

The panelists were asked open-ended questions regarding their choice of the paper or Web-based version of the Delphi and allowed to respond by email or traditional mail. Three questions were asked:

- 1. Why did you choose this format (paper version or Web-based)?
- 2. How useful do you think this Delphi process was in designing a new degree program?
- 3. What recommendations do you have for improving the process?

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics for each round were computed using SPSS 11.0. Subgroups were identified and analyzed based on affiliation (industry or academic) and level of confidence in their answer. Those persons indicating a confidence level of 4 or 5 on each question were considered "high" and treated as a subgroup. Consensus was considered to be achieved if no one chose "disagree strongly" on the Likert scale. The SPSS features Frequencies and Descriptives were used to calculate frequencies, medians, IQR and variability of the variables, including bar graphs. Boxplots were generated to visualize all results.

The Crosstabs feature was used to calculate Pearson's Chi square and Fisher's Exact for comparison of industry versus academic preferences. One-Way Analysis of Variance was performed to compare means between panelists having a high level of confidence in their answers and the group as a whole, with an alpha level of p<.10. We believed this was appropriate given that this was an exploratory study with a small sample size.

Summary of Research Procedure

This study identified stakeholders' priorities in the development of curriculum and a program of study appropriate for a professional science master's degree in biotechnology. It identified differences in priorities between subgroups; and examined user preferences between Web-based and traditional methods of conducting a Delphi study. Panelists were chosen using a snowball technique. Twenty-four participated in the first round, but numbers varied in subsequent rounds.

A modified Delphi study began with one modified question and seven open-ended questions. The modified question had a list of 12 skills gleaned from the numerous sources. Panelists were allowed to add or remove skills on the list.

Issues emerged in Round 1 concerning different tracks and were clarified via email exchange with the panelists before continuing to Round 2. Responses were organized into themes in Round 2 and ranked on a continuum. Panelists indicated where their answers fell on the continuum. Round 2.1, lasting one week, was used to clarify both issues before continuing to Round 3. Panelists were given the chance to indicate level of agreement on each item in Round 3, using a five-point Likert scale. In Round 4, medians and IQRs from the previous round were provided for each item and panelists were allowed to reconsider their answer and make additional comments. In Round 5, the last two questions were completed and panelists were asked to evaluate the Delphi process with three open-ended questions.

For this study, consensus was defined as no item receiving 'disagree strongly' from any panelist. SSPS 11.0 was used for data analysis. Frequencies, percentiles, medians, and IQRs were used for initial data analysis. Pearson's

Chi Square, Fisher's Exact and One-Way Analysis of Variance were used to analyze differences between groups.

CHAPTER IV RESULTS

The primary purpose of this research was to develop a model for a professional science master's program combining biotechnology and business. The objectives were to (a) identify stakeholder preferences for various dimensions of a professional science master's combining biotechnology and business and (b) to identify differences in priorities between subgroups. A secondary purpose was to examine user preferences between Web-based and traditional methods of conducting a Delphi study and their impressions of its usefulness for program development.

Prior to the first round, demographic data was collected on panelists regarding their gender, age, years experience in their current field, position title and education levels. Round 1 started with eight open-ended questions designed to investigate (a) learning objectives, (b) internships, (c) thesis vs. nonthesis, (d) program focus (e) possible entry level positions, (f) roles for the industry advisory board, (g) recommended hours of hands-on experience and (h) other issues. The final round ended with three questions to assess the panelists' perception of the usefulness of the Delphi for program development in higher education.

Further analysis was done to determine if there were significant differences in priorities of academic and industry panelists. An a priori probability level of 0.10 was chosen because of the small sample size and the exploratory nature of the study. Significant differences occurred between groups for two tracks, six skills designated for tracks, the method of evaluation, and three entry level positions.

Results were analyzed to determine if there were significant differences based on panelists' level of confidence in their responses using a one way ANOVA. Again, an a priori probability level of 0.10 was chosen because of the small sample size and the exploratory nature of the study. Significant differences occurred for (a) the number of semesters of hands-on experience recommended, (b) one skill recommended for core curriculum, (c) eight skills recommended for tracks, (e) compensation level, and (d) positions appropriate for new graduates.

Each of the questions will be addressed in the order listed, following each question through the entire Delphi process. Only those items which were found to be significantly different for the analysis between industry and academic subgroups and/or high and low confidence levels are provided in tables.

At the beginning of Rounds 3, 4 and 5, panelists were provided with a definition of consensus. For the purposes of this study, any item not receiving a rating of "disagree strongly" would be considered a consensus item.

Demographics of Responding Sample

Using a snowball technique (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), thirty-three referrals were gathered and from this list, twenty-four agreed to participate (Linstone & Turoff, 1975) (Table 1). The original panel consisted of 12 faculty, some in administrative positions associated with professional master's programs, and 12 members in management positions in the life science industries. The panelists ranged in age from 28 to 66 years. They averaged 20 years experience in their field, ranging from a low of 4 years to a high of 38 years. There were 9 females and 15 males that agreed initially to participate in the study.

Participation varied on each round. Twenty-four panelists started Round 1, but one withdrew midway through the first round and did not participate in subsequent rounds. Seventeen panelists participated in Round 2, 15 in 2.1, 14 in Round 3, 11 in Round 4 and 13 panelists in Round 5. Reasons for nonparticipation varied during the 10 months of the study due to schedules being conflicted by end of semester workloads, between semester breaks, summer vacations, travel out of the country, and many other reasons.

When looking at the highest degree achieved by panel members, there were 11 with Ph.D.s in science, 2 with Ph.D.s in business, 1 with a Ph.D. in higher education, 3 with Master of Science degree, 3 with MBAs, and 3 with a B.A. or B.S. degree. All three MBAs had undergraduate degrees in science. Science disciplines represented were biochemistry, genetics, physics, mathematics, molecular and cellular biology, ecology, wildlife biology, plant
biology, plant physiology, plant pathology, chemistry, and biology. They resided in California, Texas, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York, District of Columbia, Arizona, New Jersey, and Minnesota.

Table 1

Title	Education	Years Exp	Gender	Rounds Completed	Industry- Academic
Sales Manager	B.S. Chemistry Penn State Univ, M.S. Chemistry UCLA, Certificate in Human Resources Loyola Marymount	4	F	1,2,2.1,4,5	I
Director, Assoc. Professor	B.S. Biochemistry TAMU, M.S. Molecular Cell Biology UT-Dallas, Ph.D. Molecular Cell Biology UT-Dallas	7	F	1	A
Research Professor	B.S. Biology, M.A. Biology, M.S. MIS, Ph.D. Plant Pathology	10	F	All	A
Principal Consultant/ President	B.S. Wildlife Biology, Texas A&M University	13	F	1,2,5	I
Director	B.S. Biology (magna cum laude), M.S. Biology, Ph.D. from the Ecology Program	15	F	All	I
President	B.S. Biology, Texas Wesleyan University, M.S. Biology (Human Genetics), University of North Texas	18	F	1,2,2.1,3,5	I

Demographics of Delphi panel.

Title	Education	Years Exp	Gender	Rounds Completed	Industry- Academic
Plant Biotechnologi st	B.A. Sociology, University of Oklahoma, M.S. Botany, Oklahoma State University, Ph.D. Plant Biology, Washington University in St. Louis	20	F	1,2,2.1,3,4	Ι
Author Consultant	B.A. history and literature, M.A. history, Eight honorary doctorates	25	F	1,2.1	A
Professor of Education	B.A. English, M.A. Media Ecology, Ph.D. Higher Education	33	F	1,2,2.1,3	A
District Manager / Managing Director	B.S. Chemistry	7	М	1,2,2.1,3,5	I
Director, Corporate Liaison	B.A. Chemistry, Albion College, Ph.D. Physical Chemistry, Kansas University	8	М	All	A
Senior Scholar in Residence	B.A. Chemistry, M.S. Physical Chemistry, Ph.D. Physical Chemistry	12	М	All	A
President & CEO	B.A. Physics, MBA	12	М	1	I
Associate Professor	B.S. Biology, Ph.D. Biology	22	М	1,2,3,4	A
President	B.S., M.S., MBA	23	М	1,2,2.1,5	I

Title	Education	Years Exp	Gender	Rounds Completed	Industry- Academic
Biotechnology Consultant Principal	B.S., Biology; M.Sc., Biology, Molecular Genetics; Executive MBA (currently enrolled)	23	М	1	Ι
Director, Quality Systems	B.S. Microbial Genetics - U. Mass- Amherst	25	М	1,2,2.1,3,4	I
СТО	B.A. Chemistry, Ph.D. Biochemistry	25	М	1,2,3,4,5	I
CEO	B.S. Zoology, M.S. Biochemistry	26	М	All	I
Executive Director	Ph.D.	31	М	1	A
Director Professor of	B.A. Mathematics Millersville University Ph.D. Management B.S. in economics.	32	Μ	All	A
Management	Kent State University, MBA Kent State University, Ph.D. in management, University of Washington	34	М	1	A
Research Director	B.S. Forestry Iowa State University, M.S. Soil Science University of Wisconsin, Ph.D. Plant Physiology University of Wisconsin	37	М	1,2,2.1,3,5	A
Professor of Mathematics	B.Sc. Ohio State University (Mathematics), M.Sc. Ohio State University (Mathematics), Ph.D. University of Michigan (Mathematics)	38	Μ	1	A

Stakeholder Priorities for a Professional Science Master's Program

Knowledge, Skills and Abilities

Panelists were asked to list the knowledge, skills or abilities expected of graduates of a professional science master's program combining biotechnology and business. They were given an initial list of twelve skills gleaned from the literature and an industry advisory board for a biotechnology program (Chang, 1999; Howard, 1999; McGrath, 1999; Moyer, 1999, personal communication; National Academy of Sciences, 1995) and asked to add to or delete from that list.

An issue emerged in Round 1 that significantly influenced the design of the questions in subsequent rounds. In comments, five panelists suggested that the program should have tracks. A follow up email to all panelists resulted in responses from eighteen. Fifteen agreed that the program should have at least two tracks emphasizing alternative curricular areas. In Round 2, panelists were asked to suggest tracks that would be appropriate. Eighteen panelists responded in Round 2, identifying twenty-three different tracks (Table 2).

Suggested tracks.

Suggested Track	Frequency
Manufacturing	7
Science	6
Preclinical and Clinical Development	6
Business Development	4
Regulatory	4
Drug Discovery	4
Management	4
Marketing	3
Product development	3
Lab Management	3
General Business	2
Quality Assurance	2
Operational Management	1
Intellectual Property	1
Entrepreneurship	1
Pharmacological Economics	1
Bioinformatics	1
Forensics	1
Technology transfer	1

Suggested Track	Frequency
Human factors	1
Project management	1
Financial analysis	1
Discovery technologies	1

Round 2.1, lasting one week, was designed to further address the tracks issue in order to develop questions for Round 3. In Round 2.1, panelists were asked to evaluate each suggested track and indicate if it should be maintained as a track, combined with another track or was not appropriate for the program. Four tracks received a simple majority from the 15 respondents (Table 3).

Four respondents indicated that the science track was too general and should be more specialized, so in subsequent rounds "science" was divided into molecular biology, biochemistry and cellular biology. We chose these disciplines because, realistically, science at the university is categorized by discipline and department and these are most relevant to biotechnology. In Round 3, two panelists commented that this was too discipline specific and that classes from each of the disciplines should be combined to form a track more appropriate for industry. Medians, IQR and an indication of consensus are in Table 3.

Track	Freq	Median R3	IQR R3	Median R4	IQR R4
Preclinical/Clinical Development	10	1.00	1.00- 2.00	1.00	1.00- 2.00
Manufacturing	9	1.50	1.00- 2.25	1.00	1.00- 2.00
Business Development	8	1.50	1.00- 3.00	1.00	1.00- 2.00
Molecular biology*	8	1.00	1.00- 2.25	2.00	1.00- 2.00
Biochemistry*	(Science)	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 3.00
Cell biology*	roo strongly on	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	2.00- 3.00

Tracks recommended for a professional science master's program.

Note: Scale used was 1=Agree strongly and 5=Disagree strongly. Consensus was not reached on items marked with *.

When results of the academic and industry subgroups were compared, tabulated values were significantly different from expected values for the Preclinical/Clinical track and the Business Development track (Table 4). More industry panelists chose "agree strongly" than "agree" that Preclinical/Clinical Development and Business Development should be tracks. More academic panelists chose "agree" than "agree strongly".

Table 4

Actual and expected counts of level of agreement of faculty and industry

Preclinical/Clinical Research Track		Level	of Agreer	nent	df	X ²	р
		1	2				
Academic	O E	1 2.5	3* 1.5		1	4.055	.088 ^b
Industry	O E	6* 4.5	1 2.5				
Business Development							
Academic	O E	0 2.2	2* 1.1	2* .7	2	8.119	.017 ^a
Industry	O E	6* 3.8	1 1.9	0 1.3			_

panelists for a preclinical/clinical development and business development track.

Note: The scale used was 1=agree strongly and 5=disagree strongly. a = Pearson Chi Square and b = Fisher's Exact. E=expected frequencies. O=observed frequencies. *p<0.10.

In Round 1, 116 different skills were identified (Appendix H). In Round 2, panelists were asked to evaluate each skill and indicate if it should be part of core curriculum for all students or a specialized track. If a competency was not

appropriate for core or track or was outside a person's area of expertise, they were asked to leave it blank. Skills were categorized based on a simple majority of 50% or higher. If they received less than 50%, they were not carried to the next round. Forty skills were categorized as core curriculum, 52 as appropriate for tracks and 23 were dropped because they did not have a simple majority. "Basic finance" was an exact tie between track and core, so was not carried forward since it did not have a clear majority.

In Round 3, panelists were asked to indicate their level of agreement on a five-point Likert scale for the different tracks, skills designated for core curriculum and skills designated for tracks. In Round 4, panelists were given their response from Round 3, the median and IQR and asked to indicate their choice a second time, using the same five-point scale. If their response in Round 4 was outside the IQR, they were asked to give an explanation. Any item which did not receive a "Strongly disagree (5)" was considered to have reached consensus.

In Table 5, core skills are listed with frequencies, final medians and IQR and an indication of consensus. They are ordered first by frequency, then by final median. Critical thinking, problem solving and a variety of skills related to competency in communication received a ranking of 1 (agree strongly).

72

Skill	Freq	Median R3	IQR R3	Median R4	IQR R4
Critical thinking skills	17	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Present findings with PowerPoint type presentation	17	1.00	1.00- 2.00	1.00	1.00- 2.00
Time management	17	2.00	1.00- 2.25	2.00	1.50- 2.00
Writing on, speaking about and presenting technical material to a variety of audiences with varying levels of knowledge in the field	16	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Problem solving skills	16	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Interpersonal skills-ability to work with diverse cross-section of people	16	1.00	1.00- 2.00	1.00	1.00- 2.00
Ethics of research and business	16	1.00	1.00- 2.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00
Teamwork in scientific investigation	14	2.00	1.00- 2.25	1.00	1.00- 2.00
Working on teams with professionals who are not trained in biology or biotechnology	14	2.00	1.00- 3.00	1.50	1.00- 2.25
Scientific and technical writing	13	1.00	1.00- 2.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00

Skills identified for core curriculum for all students.

Skill	Freq	Median R3	IQR R3	Median R4	IQR R4
Writing brief trip reports	13	1.50	1.00- 2.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00
Resume writing	13*	2.00	1.75- 3.00	2.00	2.00- 3.00
How biotechnology is used in different fields-agriculture, environmental, human health, etc.	13	2.00	1.75- 3.00	2.00	2.00- 3.00
Intellectual property issues	13	2.00	1.00- 2.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00
Understanding drug discovery & development	13	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 3.00
Survey of biotechnology industry	13*	3.00	2.00-	3.00	2.00-
Understanding other people's research	12	2.00	2.00- 3.00	2.00	2.00- 3.00
Understand value and role of corporate culture	12	2.00	2.00- 3.00	2.00	2.00- 3.00
Laboratory safety	12	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.50	1.75- 3.00
Work both as an individual and as a productive member of a research team	12	2.50	1.00- 3.00	3.00	1.00- 3.00
Interviewing skills	12*	2.00	1.00- 3.50	3.00	2.00- 4.00
Keeping laboratory notebooks	12	2.50	2.00- 3.00	3.00	2.00- 3.00

Skill	Freq	Median R3	IQR R3	Median R4	IQR R4
Literature review skills	11	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 2.25
Eagerness to adapt to new directions	11*	2.00	1.75- 3.00	2.00	2.00- 3.00
Awareness of history, current state and direction of the field	11	2.00	1.75- 3.00	2.00	2.00- 3.00
Chemical safety	11	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 3.00
Radiation safety	11	2.00	1.00- 3.00	3.00	2.00- 3.00
Preparing an abstract for a meeting	10*	1.50	1.00- 2.00	1.00	1.00- 2.00
Interpretation of scientific literature	10	1.50	1.00- 2.25	2.00	1.00- 3.00
Reading a balance statement	10	2.00	1.50- 3.00	2.00	2.00- 3.00
Knowledge of gene expression	10	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 3.00
Federal regulatory process	10	2.00	1.00- 2.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00

Skill	Freq	Median R3	IQR R3	Median R4	IQR R4
Proposal writing	10	2.50	1.00- 3.00	3.00	2.00- 3.00
Trouble shooting	9	2.00	1.75- 3.00	2.00	2.00- 3.00
How to read a profit and loss statement	9	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 3.00
Good Laboratory Practice (GLP)	9	2.00	1.00- 2.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00
Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP)	9	2.00	1.75- 2.25	2.00	1.00- 2.00
Basic Information Technology (IT) and MIS needs for biotech companies	9*	2.00	2.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 3.00
Knowledge of clinical trials process	9	2.00	1.50- 2.50	2.00	2.00
Present a business plan for a biotechnology company	9	3.00	1.75- 3.00	3.00	2.00- 3.00

Note: The scale used was 1=agree strongly and 5=disagree strongly. Consensus was not

reached on items marked with *.

Only one skill was significantly different when compared by confidence level. Respondents who indicated a high level of confidence in their response for including knowledge of gene expression in core curriculum were significantly different from respondents indicating a low level of confidence (Table 6). The group of respondents with a high confidence level had a mean score of 2.43. The group with a low confidence level had a mean of 1.33.

Table 6

One-way analysis of variance comparing high and low confidence level groups for skills that should be included in core curriculum.

Item	Confidence Level	Mean	df	F	р
Knowledge of gene expression	Low High	1.33 2.43	1	2.519	.064*

Note: The scale used was 1=agree strongly and 5=disagree strongly.

*p<0.10

There were no significant differences observed between industry and academic groups in skills designated for core curriculum. 'Agree strongly' was unanimously chosen by all panelists for 'Critical Thinking' and as a result, there were no Chi Square values.

Panelists were asked to indicate which skills were appropriate for specialized track, rather than core curriculum. However, they were not asked to sort those skills out into particular tracks because that would have complicated this study far beyond what was originally intended. In Table 7, skills identified as appropriate for tracks are listed with frequencies, final median and IQR and an indication of consensus. They are ordered first by frequency, then by final median.

Table 7

Skill	Freq	Median R3	IQR R3	Median R4	IQR R4
Product development	15	2.00	1.25- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 3.00
Sales skills	15	2.00	1.00- 3.00	3.00	1.00- 3.00
Clinical testing	13	2.00	1.00- 2.50	2.00	1.75- 2.00
Developing partnerships	13	2.00	1.00- 3.50	2.00	1.00- 3.00
Marketing	13*	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 2.25
Medical writing	13	2.00	1.00- 2.50	2.00	1.00- 2.00

Skills identified as appropriate for specialized tracks.

Skill	Freq	Median R3	IQR R3	Median R4	IQR R4
Preclinical testing	13	2.00	1.00- 2.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00
Human Factors testing	13	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.50	1.00- 3.00
Acquiring funding for biotech companies	13	2.00	1.25- 3.00	3.00	1.00- 3.00
Conducting market research	13*	3.00	1.00- 4.00	3.00	2.00- 4.00
Good Clinical Practice (GCP)	12	2.00	1.00- 3.00	1.00	1.00- 2.00
Contract law	12	1.00	1.00- 2.50	1.50	1.00- 2.75
Good Tissue Practice (GTP)	12	2.00	1.00- 2.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00
Poly(A) RNA isolation	12	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	2.00- 3.00
Transfection	12	2.00	1.00- 3.75	2.00	2.00- 3.00

Skill	Freq	Median R3	IQR R3	Median R4	IQR R4
Know about medical devices under development	12	2.50	2.00- 3.00	2.50	2.00- 3.00
Facility design and engineering (*Basic understanding of HVAC, water systems, facility layout and design)	12	2.00	1.00- 4.00	3.00	1.25- 4.00
Know about current drugs under development	12	3.00	2.00- 3.00	3.00	1.75- 3.00
In vitro translation	11	2.00	1.00- 2.75	2.00	2.00
In-vitro transcription	11	2.00	1.25- 2.75	2.00	1.00- 2.00
ISO 9000	11	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 3.00
Microeconomics of a firm	11*	2.00	1.00- 4.00	2.00	1.00- 4.00
Quality Assurance	11	2.00	1.50- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 3.00
Site directed mutagenesis techniques	11	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 3.00

Skill	Freq	Median R3	IQR R3	Median R4	IQR R4
Points to Consider documents	11	3.00	1.25- 3.00	3.00	1.00- 3.00
Tissue and organ replacement	11	2.50	1.00- 4.00	3.00	3.00- 4.00
Understanding venture capital process	11*	2.00	1.00- 3.00	3.00	2.00- 3.00
21CFRx00	10	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 2.50
Basic accounting principles	10	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 2.50
Biostatistics	10	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 3.00
Biotechnology market knowledge	10	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	2.00- 3.00
Cell therapies	10	2.00	1.00- 3.75	2.00	2.00- 3.00
Experimental design	10	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00
How to write a business plan	10*	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 3.00

Skill	Freq	Median R3	IQR R3	Median R4	IQR R4
In situ hybridization	10	2.00	1.25- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 3.00
Microbial screening	10	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	2.00- 3.00
Non-isotopic labeling techniques	10	2.50	1.25- 3.00	2.00	2.00- 3.00
Project management	10*	2.00	1.50- 3.50	2.00	2.00- 2.75
Proteomics	10	2.00	1.25- 2.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00
RNA amplification	10	2.00	1.00- 2.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00
RNA isolation	10	1.50	1.00- 2.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00
Use of bacteria	10*	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.50	1.00- 3.00
National and International Scope of Interest	10	2.50	2.00- 3.75	3.00	2.00- 4.00
Transformation	10*	2.00	1.00- 3.75	3.00	1.75- 3.00
Bioinformatics	9	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 3.00
cDNA library construction	9	2.00	1.00- 2.00	2.00	2.00
PCR-Real time	9	2.00	1.00- 2.75	2.00	1.00- 2.00

Skill	Freq	Median R3	IQR R3	Median R4	IQR R4
Reverse transcription	9	2.00	1.00- 2.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00
Risk management	9	2.00	1.00- 3.50	2.00	1.75- 2.25
SDS-PAGE	9*	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 3.00
Viral and non-viral gene therapy	9	2.00	1.00- 2.75	2.00	1.00- 2.00
Guidance documents	9	2.50	1.00- 3.00	2.50	1.00- 3.00

Note: Consensus was not reached on items marked with *.

Tabulated values were significantly different from expected values for six skills designated as appropriate for curriculum for tracks. Only those items that were significantly different are included in Table 8. In general, industry panelists agreed more strongly that these skills should be in tracks. In particular, industry panelists chose 'agree strongly' or 'agree' for 'Conducting market research', but academic panelists chose 'disagree' or 'disagree strongly'.

Actual and expected frequency counts for level of agreement between faculty and industry subgroups for six skills designated for tracks.

		Level of Agreement						Value	р
Experimental Design		1	2	3	4	5			
Academic	0	0	4*	1*	-	-			
	Е	1.8	2.7	.5	-	-	2	5.622	.060 ^a
Industry	0	4*	2	0	-	-			
	Е	2.2	3.3	.5	-	-			
How to write	а								
business pla	n								
Academic	ō	0	3*	1	-	1			
	F	2	1.5	1.0	-	.5	3	8.000	.046 ^a
Industry	0	4*	0	1	-	0			
	Е	2.0	1.5	1.0	-	.5			
Conducting									
Market Resea	arch								
Academic	0	0	0	1	3*	1*			
	E	.9	1.4	.9	1.4	.5	4	8.983	.062 ^a
Industry	0	2*	3*	1	0	0			
	Е	1.1	1.6	1.1	1.6	.5			
In situ									
Academic		1	0	4*	_	_			
	Ĕ	1.8	.9	2.3	_	-			
la du atoria	~	•*	^ *		-	-	2	4.748	.093 ^a
industry	E	3° 2.2	2° 1.1	ا 2,7	-	-			
	_				-	-			

			Level	of Aare	ement	t	df	Value	D
SDS-PAGE		1	2	3	4	5			P
Academic	0	0	3*	2*	-	0			
	Е	1.8	1.4	1.4	-	.5	3	8.311	.040 ^a
Industry	0	4*	0	1	-	1*			
,	Е	2.2	1.6	1.6	-	.5			
Quality Assurance									
Academic	0	0	3*	2*	-	-			
	Е	1.8	1.4	1.8	-	-	2	6.967	.031 ^a
Industry	0	4*	0	2	-	-			
,	Е	2.2	1.6	2.2	-	-			

Note: Scale used was 1=agree strongly and 5=disagree strongly. a= Pearson Chi Square and b= Fisher's Exact. E=expected frequencies. O=observed frequencies. *p<0.10

The level of agreement of respondents with a high level of confidence in their response for skills that should be included in curriculum for different tracks was significantly different from that of respondents indicating a low level of confidence for eight skills (Table 9).

One-way analysis of variance to compare means for high and low confidence groups for skills that should be included in different tracks.

Item	Confidence Level	Mean	df	F	p
Product development	Low High	2.67 1.71	1	3.721	.090
Basic accounting principles	Low High	1.00 2.14	1	4.978	.061
Microeconomics of a firm	Low High	1.33 3.13	1	4.056	.075
SDS-PAGE	Low High	3.67 1.63	1	12.512	.006
Transformation	Low High	3.67 2.14	1	5.185	.052
Use of bacteria	Low High	4.00 1.88	1	6.513	.034
ISO 9000	Low High	3.00 1.75	1	5.579	.042
Quality assurance	Low High	3.00 1.63	1	9.581	.013

Note: The scale used was 1=agree strongly and 5=disagree strongly.

p<0.10

Skills that did not receive a majority for core or track in Round 3 were analyzed to determine if there were any significant differences between industry and academic panelists in how those skills were designated. There were significant differences in 13 laboratory skills-agarose gel electrophoresis, automated sequencing, Northern blot, Southern blot, Western blot, cloning genes, DNA isolation, DNA sequencing, microarrays, making reagents, polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis, polymerase chain reaction (PCR), and tissue culture. Panelists were asked to choose 'blank' if they thought the skill was outside their expertise or if it should be eliminated from the program. Summarized frequencies for blank, track and core are in Table 10.

Table 10

Summary of frequencies for thirteen laboratory skills eliminated from skills list because they lacked a majority.

		Academic		Industry			
	Blank	Track	Core	Blank	Track	Core	
Combined frequencies for thirteen laboratory skills	66	27	11	11	61	58	

Dimensions of the Internship

In the first round, panelists were asked to describe the ideal internship. Four themes emerged-length of internship, level of responsibility, level of compensation and the method for evaluating the internship.

Length of internship. The length of time identified initially varied from one month to one year. For Round Two, responses were categorized as 0-3 months, 4-6 months and over 6 months. Responses representative of each group were provided. Panelists were asked to consider each group of responses and indicate which best reflected their choice.

In Round 3, frequencies for each category were provided and panelists were asked to rank them, with 1 being the most desirable choice and 3 the least desirable. Results from that round indicated that 0-3 months, or one semester, was ranked first with a median of 1.0.

In Round 4, panelists were given medians, IQRs and their response from the previous round. Panelists were asked to consider results and confirm or change their response. If their response was outside the IQR and they chose not to change it, they were asked to explain their choice. The rankings changed after this round and 4-6 months (two semesters) emerged as most desirable with a median of 1.50 (Table 11).

Length of Internship	Freq Round 2	Median R3	IQR R3	Median R4	IQR R4
4-6 months (2 semesters)	5	2.00	1.00- 2.00	1.50	1.00- 2.00
0-3 months (1 semester)	6	1.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 3.00
7-12 months (1 summer + 1 semester up to1 year)	6	2.00	2.00- 3.00	3.00	1.25- 3.00

Recommended length of internship.

Note: The scale used was 1=most desirable and 3=least desirable.

Level of responsibility. The level of responsibility identified initially varied from apprentice level to just below that of an entry level employee. For Round 2, responses were categorized as low level (apprentice), moderate level and high level (just below entry level). Responses representative of the responses for each category were provided. Panelists were asked to consider each group of responses and indicate which best reflected their choice.

In Round 3, frequencies for each category were provided and panelists were asked to rank them, with '1' being the most desirable choice and '3' the least desirable. Results from that round indicated that a high level of responsibility was ranked first with a median of 1.0.

In Round 4, panelists were given medians, IQRs and their response from the previous round. Panelists were asked to consider results and confirm or change their response. If their response was outside the IQR and they chose not to change it, they were asked to explain their choice. The rankings did not change after this round (Table 12).

Table 12

Level of responsibility	Freq Round 2	Median R3	IQR R3	Median R4	IQR R4
High level of responsibility (about a half step below the position that the student would be hired for)	12	1.00	1.00- 2.00	1.00	1.00- 2.00
Start low (apprentice level) and move to higher level commensurate with intern's personality and abilities and company's policies	4	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 3.00
Moderate level	1	3.00	2.00-	2.50	2.00-
			3.00		3.00

Level of responsibility expected of an intern.

Note: The scale used was 1=most desirable and 3=least desirable.

Evaluation of internship. The methods for evaluating an internship identified in Round 1 varied from verbal evaluation from the internship supervisor to a project comparable to a thesis. For Round 2, responses were categorized as qualitative, quantitative or a combination of the two. Responses representative of the responses for each category were provided. Frequencies

were provided for each category. Panelists were asked to consider each group of responses and indicate which best reflected their choice.

Quantitative evaluation was defined as culminating in a written product such as a written report or an evaluation form where students were assigned a numerical score. Qualitative was defined as performance reviews, verbal evaluation or a letter from the supervisor. Panelists were asked to consider each group of responses and indicate which best reflected their choice.

In Round 3, frequencies for each category were provided and panelists were asked to rank them, with '1' being the most desirable choice and '3' the least desirable. Results from that round indicated that a combination of qualitative and quantitative was ranked first with a median of 1.0.

In Round 4, panelists were given medians, IQRs and their response from the previous round. Panelists were asked to consider results and confirm or change their response. If their response was outside the IQR and they chose not to change it, they were asked to explain their choice. The rankings did not change after this round. A combination of qualitative and quantitative evaluation was the most desired choice (Table 13).

91

Evaluation method	Freq Round 2	Median R3	IQR R3	Median R4	IQR R4
Combination of qualitative and quantitative	7	1.00	1.00- 2.00	1.00	1.00
Qualitative only	6	2.00	2.00- 3.00	2.00	2.00- 3.00
Quantitative only	4	3.00	2.00- 3.00	3.00	2.00- 3.00

Methods of evaluating an internship.

Note: The scale used was 1=most desirable and 3=least desirable.

When differences in academic and industry subgroups were analyzed, tabulated values were significantly different from expected values for 'Qualitative Evaluation' and 'Quantitative Evaluation'. Neither was ranked as 'most desirable' by any panelist. 'Agree strongly' was unanimously chosen by all panelists for 'Combination of Qualitative and Quantitative Evaluation' and as a result, there were no Chi Square statistics. All three are included in Table 14 for comparison.

_

		L	evel o	of Agre	eme	nt	df	Value	р
Qual & Quan Evaluation Combined		1	2	3	4	5			
Academic	O E	4 4	-	-	- -	-	-	-	No statistics
Industry	O E	7 7	-	-	-	-			
Qualitative Evaluation On	ly								
Academic	O E	-	1 2.9	4* 2.1	- -	-		5 4 9 9	o (sh
Industry	O E	-	6* 4.1	1 2.9	-	-	1	5.182	.045°
Quantitative Evaluation On	v								
Academic	O E	- -	4* 2.1	1 2.9	- -	- -	1	5 182	045 ^b
Industry	O E	- -	1 2.9	6* 4.1	- -	- -	I	0.102	.0+0

Differences between subgroups for methods of evaluation.

Note: The scale used was 1=most desirable and 3=least desirable. a=Chi Square and b=Fisher's

 $\label{eq:exact} \mbox{Exact. E=expected frequencies. O=observed frequencies.}$

*p<0.10

Level of compensation. The level of compensation identified in Round 1 varied from zero to just below that of an entry-level full-time person in that position. For Round 2, responses were categorized initially as \$0-\$10/hour, \$10-\$15/hour and near non-student full time equivalent (FTE). Responses

representative of each category were provided. Frequencies for the number of responses in each category were provided and panelists were asked to provide a number for a monthly salary.

As we examined the responses from Round 2, it became apparent that some of the differences in the salary numbers provided could be due to the varying locations of the panelists. In light of this, we revised the question to account for location, cost of living and other factors by creating categories for one-fourth of FTE, one-half of FTE, three-fourths of FTE and full FTE pay levels (Table 15). Panelists were asked to consider each group of responses and indicate which best reflected their choice.

In Round 3, panelists were asked to rank each category, with '1' being the most desirable choice and '5' the least desirable. Results from that round indicated that compensation should be 1/2 or 3/4 of an entry level FTE, with each having a median of 2.0 and IQR of 1.00-3.00.

In Round 4, panelists were given medians, IQRs and their response from the previous round. Panelists were asked to consider results and confirm or change their response. If their response was outside the IQR and they chose not to change it, they were asked to explain their choice. The medians did not change after this round (Table 15) though the IQRs did change slightly. Responses are arranged in order by median.

94

Level of Compensation	Median R3	IQR R3	Median R4	IQR R4
Pay should be equal to 1/2 entry level FTE	2.00	1.00-3.00	2.00	1.00-3.00
Pay should be equal to ³ / ₄ entry level FTE	2.00	1.00-3.00	2.00	1.00-2.75
Pay should be equal to 1/4 entry level FTE	3.00	2.75-4.00	3.00	3.00-4.00
Pay should be equal to an entry level FTE	4.00	1.00-5.00	4.00	2.25-4.75
0-Internships should not be paid	5.00	4.00-5.00	5.00	5.00

Level of compensation for interns.

Note: The scale used was 1=most desirable and 5=least desirable.

The level of agreement was significantly different for respondents indicating a high level of confidence in their response for a level of compensation equivalent to a full time employee for interns and that of respondents indicating a low level of confidence (Table 16). However, with only one respondent indicating a low level of confidence, this may not be an accurate comparison.

One-way analysis of variance comparing means for high and low confidence groups for full time equivalent level of compensation for interns.

ltem	Confidence Level	Mean	df	F	p
ETE (Full time	Low	1.00			
equivalent pay)	High	3.73	1	4.213	.067

Note: Scale used was 1=agree strongly and 5=disagree strongly.

Other factors were mentioned in Round 1 that were not related to these four themes, but that could be important to consider in an internship program. In Round 2, panelists were asked to rank each issue as (1) not important, (2) important but not necessary or (3) important and necessary. In Round 3, panelists were provided their choice and the IQR from the previous round and asked to confirm or change their choice. Medians did not change between rounds and there was only slight variation in IQRs (Table 17).

Other factors to consid	er in an ir	nternship progra	am.
-------------------------	-------------	------------------	-----

Other Factors to Consider	Median R2	IQR R2	Median R3	IQR R3
Working with a company that is familiar with the science master's' curriculum and goals.	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Good supervision provided by the company.	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Both individual and team experiences should be provide during the internship.	2.00	2.00-3.00	2.00	2.00-2.75
The student and the school should evaluate the position each time to be sure it should be continued within the program.	3.00	2.50-3.00	3.00	2.00-3.00

Note: The scale used was 1=not important, 2= important but not necessary and 3=important and necessary.

Hands-on Experience vs. Writing a Thesis

Two themes emerged for this question from the responses in Round 1-

emphasis on psychomotor skill development and emphasis on cognitive

development, rather than any emphasis on thesis vs. non-thesis. Eighteen out of

24 responses emphasized the need for a learning experience that culminated in

some type of written product. Six of those 18 said specifically that the traditional

academic thesis was not particularly useful, but that some kind of product such as a research report, case study, or technical document with an industry focus should be required.

In Round 2, responses were grouped as emphasizing psychomotor skills, thesis option or cognitive abilities. Respondents were given frequencies and representative examples of comments from Round 1 for each group and asked to restate their position.

When Round 2 results were analyzed from the viewpoint of experiential education, it was found that all respondents agreed there should be an experiential component with a written product that emphasized critical thinking, organizing information, presenting information, etc. The only point of disagreement seemed to be whether or not all students in the master's program should be required to have hands-on laboratory experience as a component of their graduate program. Given that information, we changed the question in Round 3 to ask if all students in the program, regardless of track, should be required to have hands-on wet laboratory experience, which could be acquired either as an undergraduate before entering the program or during their graduate program. We also asked how many semesters should be required for every student, which could be acquired in their graduate program or as an undergraduate.

In Round 4, panelists were given the median, IQR, their response from the previous round and comments from all panelists. They were then asked to

98

consider their response and make any changes they thought necessary. If their response was outside the IQR, they were asked to provide an explanation to better understand their position. Since no panelists chose "disagree strongly", this question reached consensus. There was little change between Rounds 3 and 4 (Table 18).

Table 18

Question	Median R3	IQR R3	Median R4	IQR R4
Hands-on experience for all	1.50	1.00-2.00	1.00	1.00-2.00
Number of semesters	1.00	1.00-2.00	1.00	1.00-2.00

Hands-on experience required for all students, regardless of track.

Note: The scale used for 'hands on experience for all' was 1=agree strongly and 5=disagree strongly.

When results were analyzed for differences between academic and industry subgroups and level of confidence, only level of confidence was significant. The mean number of semesters recommended for hands-on experience by respondents indicating a high level of confidence in their response was significantly higher than that of respondents indicating a low level of confidence (Table 19).
Table 19

One-way analysis of variance comparing means for high and low confidence level groups for number of semesters of hands-on experience that students should have by graduation.

Item	Confidence Level	Mean	df	F	р
Number of semesters hands-on experience	Low High	1.13 1.75	1	1.042	.030

Focus of Program

Five themes emerged in Round 1-national focus, national overview with tracks to meet student goals, national overview with regional specializations, regional focus and local focus. In Round 2, panelists were given frequencies and representative examples of comments from Round 1 for each theme and asked to choose the group of responses that best stated their position.

In Round 3, the themes were ranked in order from most to least frequent and frequencies were provided. Panelists were asked to rank each program focus, with '1' being the most desirable and '5' being the least desirable.

In Round 4, panelists were given the median, IQR, their response from the previous round and comments and asked to consider their response and make any changes they thought necessary. If their response was outside the IQR, they were asked to provide an explanation to better understand their position. Unfortunately, they were given the wrong scale, so even though there was little change between rounds, the results are not definitive. The scale for Round 4 should have been a ranking of '1' being "most desirable" and '5' being "least desirable". Mistakenly, panelists were given the scale of '1' being "agree strongly" and '5' being "disagree strongly" (Table 20).

Table 20

Program Focus	Freq R2	Media n R3	IQR R3	Media n R4	IQR R4
National overview with tracks to meet student goals	4	1.5	1.00- 2.00	1.5	1.00- 2.00
National focus	4	2.5	2.00- 3.00	2	2.00- 3.00
National overview with regional specializations	3	3	1.00- 3.00	2	1.00- 3.00
Regional emphasis	2	4	4	4	4
Local emphasis	2	5	5	5	5

Focus of program.

Entry Level Positions Appropriate for New Graduates

The results of Round 1 indicated that we needed to simplify the question. Panelists were apparently using different titles for very similar positions. We selected an article that listed job titles and degree levels based on research with the biotechnology industry in California (A. S. B. Dahms, J., 2001). We chose 27 titles for master's and bachelor's level with 0-3 years experience and provided those in a table for Round 2. We provided a PDF copy of the article online for panelists to read if they desired. Panelists were asked to choose those titles they agreed with and add any that they felt were not represented by the list. Sixteen titles received a simple majority and 14 additional titles were suggested.

In Round 3, frequencies were provided for each of the original 16 titles and panelists were asked to indicate their level of agreement on a five-point Likert scale. The additional titles were provided in a separate list. Panelists were asked to indicate whether the suggested title was an appropriate entry level position with a simple choice of 'yes' or 'no' and were also given the option to indicate if they thought it was fundamentally the same as a title in the first list.

In Round 4, the original titles were provided ranked in order by median. Panelists were given median, IQR, and their choice from the previous round. They were asked to make any changes they thought necessary based on feedback using the same five-point Likert scale. If their response fell outside the IQR, they were asked to provide an explanation. Results were ranked first by frequency, then by median in the last round (Table 21).

Table 21

Position titles taken from the literature.

Position Title	Freq B2	Median B3	IQR B3	Median R4	IQR B4
Marketing research analyst	16	2.0	1.00- 3.00	1.50	1.00-2.00
Business development research analyst	14	2.00	1.00	1.50	1.00- 2.75
Research associate	13	1.00	1.00-	1.00	1.00
Manufacturing associate	12	1.00	2.00 1.00- 2.00	1.00	1.00- 1.75
QC analyst	12	2.00	1.00- 3.00	1.50	1.00- 2.00
QC microbiological	12	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00
Process development associate	11	1.00	1.00- 2.00	1.00	1.00- 1.75
Clinical data associate	11	1.00	1.00- 2.25	1.50	1.00- 3.00
Technical service rep	11	2.00	1.00- 2.25	1.50	1.00- 2.00
Junior position in licensing/tech transfer	11	2.00	1.00- 3.00	1.50	1.00- 2.00
QA documentation specialist	11	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00
QA documentation coordinator	11	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 3.00
Aseptic fill associate	10	2.00	1.00- 3.00	1.50	1.00- 2.00

Table 21 continued.

Position Title	Freq R2	Median R3	IQR R3	Median R4	IQR R4
QS technical writer	9	2.00	1.00- 3.00	1.00	1.00- 2.00
Documentation assistant	9	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 2.75
Product management associate	9	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.00- 3.00

Note: QA is 'quality assurance'. QC is 'quality control'.

In Round 4, panelists were given frequencies of 'yes' and 'no' for the additional titles suggested. The additional titles were ranked in order by the difference between yes and no (N_{yes} - N_{no}) and equivalent titles that were suggested were provided. Panelists were asked to indicate their level of agreement on a five-point Likert scale that the positions were appropriate for a new graduate. No action was taken on the equivalent titles. In Round 5, panelists were given medians, IQRs, and their response from the first round and allowed to make any changes they thought necessary based on the feedback provided. If their response was outside the IQR, they were asked to provide an explanation for their choice. In Table 22, results are organized first by difference (N_{yes} - N_{no}) and then by final median. None received a ranking of 'agree strongly'.

Table 22

Frequencies R3 N_{ves} Median IQR Median IQR **Position Titles** Yes No -N_{no} **R4 R4** R5 R5 Clinical 12 2 10 2.00 1.00 2.00 2.00 research associate I 2.25 3.00 3 11 8 2.00 2.00 Associate 1.00 2.00 product manager 3.00 3.00 4 5 Data 9 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 management -coordinator 3.00 3.00 Pharmaceutical 9 4 5 2.00 1.25 3.00 2.50 technical writer --3.75 4.00 1.75 2.00 Document 8 4 4 2.00 2.00 analyst -_ 3.00 3.00 5 3 2.00 Licensing 8 1.00 2.00 1.50 associate --3.00 3.00 Application 7 5 2 2.00 2.00 2.00 1.00 scientist -2.00 1.00 2.00 Regulatory 7 6 1 2.50 2.00 -_ analyst 3.00 3.00 Analytical 1.75 2.00 scientist, 7 6 1 2.00 3.00 -knowledge 3.25 3.00 management Biological 3.50 2.50 database 7 7 0 4.00 4.00 -_ 4.00

Positions suggested by panelists in addition to those from the literature.

Table 22 continued.

	Freque R	encies 3					
Position Titles	Yes	No	N _{yes} - N _{no}	Media n R4	IQR R4	Media n R5	IQR R5
Plant quality compliance manager	2	10	-8	4.00	2.00- 4.25	4.00	3.00- 4.00
Clinical manager, scientific communications	2	11	-9	3.00	2.00- 3.00	3.00	3.00- 5.00
Sr. knowledge analyst	1	10	-9	4.00	2.00- 5.00	4.00	3.00- 5.00

Note: The scale used was 1=agree strongly and 5=disagree strongly.

When results were analyzed for differences between subgroups, significant differences occurred for the industry and academic subgroups and for the confidence level subgroups. Industry and academic subgroups differed significantly on three positions. The 'high confidence level' subgroup differed significantly on four positions.

For the industry and academic subgroups, tabulated values were significantly different from expected values for 'manufacturing associate', 'clinical data associate', and 'QA document coordinator'. These three are included in Table 23 for comparison.

Table 23

Significant differences between industry and academic groups occurred for three

		L	evel c	of Agro	eeme	nt	df	Value	р
Manufacturir Associate	ng	1	2	3	4	5			
Academic	0	2	3*	-	-	-			
	Е	3.8	1.3	-	-	-	1	5.600	.045 ^b
Industry	0	7*	0	-	-	-			
	E	5.3	1.8	-	-	-			
Clinical Data Associate									
Academic	O E	0 2.5	2* 1	3* 1.5	-	-	2	10.00	.007 ^a
Industry	0 F	5* 2.5	0	0	-	-		U	
QA Documer	nt	2.0	1.0	1.5					
	\circ	0	4 *	0*	- *	- *			
Academic	E	2.3	.9	2 .9	ו .3	.3	4	8.983	.062 ^a
Industry	O E	5* 2.7	1 1.1	0 1.1	0 .5	0 .5			

positions appropriate for new graduates.

Note: The scale used was 1=agree strongly and 5=disagree strongly. a=Chi Square results and

b=Fisher's Exact results. O=observed and E=expected counts.

*p<0.10.

Results were analyzed to determine if significant differences occurred between those respondents who had a high level of confidence in their answer and those who did not. 'High confidence level' respondents were significantly closer to "agree strongly" in their responses for four different job titles (Table 24).

Table 24

One-way analysis of variance comparing means for high and low confidence groups for entry level positions appropriate for new graduates.

Item	Confidence Level	Mean	df	F	р
Manufacturing Associate	Low High	1.50 1.00	1	5.000	.049
Clinical Data Associate	Low High	2.33 1.00	1	10.240	.013
QA Document Coordinator	Low High	3.00 1.20	1	7.364	.024
Marketing Research Analyst	Low High	2.17 1.17	1	8.182	.017

Note: The scale used was 1=agree strongly and 5=disagree strongly.

p<0.10

Roles for the Industry Advisory Board

Nine roles for an industry advisory board were identified in Round 1.

Initially, "Advising on funding" and "Providing funding" were combined. However,

we separated them in subsequent rounds due to the observation by three panelists that it was not the role of industry to provide funding. Medians and IQRs changed little between rounds. No panelist chose "disagree strongly", so all items were in consensus. Frequencies, medians and IQRs are provided (Table 25).

Table 25

Role	Freq R1	Median R 2	IQR R2	Median Round 3	IQR Round 3
Needs assessment & curriculum review	16	1.50	1.00- 2.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00
Internship development	9	1.00	1.00- 2.00	1.00	1.00- 2.00
Suggest or provide seminars, team projects, case studies, etc. to supplement faculty teaching	8	2.00	1.00- 2.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00
Student job placement	6	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00- 3.00
Identifying issues & trends in industry	5	1.50	1.00- 2.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00
Program evaluation through feedback on success of interns and graduates hired.	4	2.00	1.00- 3.00	2.00	2.00- 3.00
Establishing university/industry ties	2	2.00	1.00- 2.00	1.50	1.00- 2.00

Roles identified for the industry advisory board.

Table 25 continued.

Role	Freq R1	Median R 2	IQR R2	Median Round 3	IQR Round 3
Represent a cross-section of industry through diverse membership	2	2.00	1.00- 2.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00
Advising on private sources of funding	1	2.00	2.00- 4.00	2.50	2.00- 4.00
Providing private sources of funding	1	2.00	2.00- 4.00	2.50	2.00- 4.00

Note: The scale used was 1=agree strongly and 5=disagree strongly.

Minimum Hands-on Experience Required for New Graduates

Two themes emerged from Round 1 regarding the minimum amount of hands-on experience that should be required for every new graduate. Some panelists focused on actual clock hours of experience, with responses ranging from zero at the graduate level with students required to have laboratory experience coming in to one year of full-time experience. Other responses focused on outcomes rather than actual hours.

When results from Round 2 were examined, it became evident that the amount of hands-on experience required would be affected by the issue of tracks that had emerged earlier. We combined this question in subsequent rounds with the question identifying specialized tracks. In Round 3, this question was rephrased to ask how much hands-on laboratory experience should be required in each track. Panelists were asked to answer a simple yes or no and if yes, give the number of semesters recommended.

In Round 4, panelists were given frequencies of yes and no for each track. The tracks were ranked in order by the difference between yes and no $(N_{yes}-N_{no})$ and the mean number of semesters suggested for each track was provided. Panelists were asked to indicate their level of agreement on a five-point Likert scale for the amount of hands-on experience required for each track. In Round 5, panelists were given medians, IQRs, and their response from the first round and allowed to make any changes they thought necessary based on the feedback provided. If their response was outside the IQR, they were asked to provide an explanation for their choice. In Table 26, results are organized first by N_{ves} - N_{no} , then by final median and IQR.

Table 26

Minimum semesters of hands-on experience that should be required of all

students.

Track	N _{yes} - N _{no}	# Sem	Median R4	IQR R4	Median R5	IQR R5
Science	14	3	2.00	1.00-	2.00	1.00-
Preclinical/Clinic al Development	10	2	2.50	1.00- 3.00	2.00	1.50- 3.00
Manufacturing	7	2	2.50	1.00- 3.75	2.00	2.00- 3.00
Business Development	2	1	2.00	2.00- 4.00	2.00	2.00- 3.50

Note: The scale used was 1=agree strongly and 5=disagree strongly.

Other Issues

In the first round, panelists were asked to list other issues they thought should be considered in this study. Ten issues were identified. In Round 2, panelists were asked to choose the issues they thought should be included in this study. Two issues received a simple majority. Twelve of 18 panelists said that the goals of the program should be clarified in this study and nine selected teaching innovations.

We decided to address goals in Round 2.1 before we developed the questions for Round 3 because of the effect it could have on all the questions in the study, particularly tracks and skills. A scenario (Appendix I) was provided and panelists were asked to state up to five objectives for the program, which were sorted into goals for Round 3. Five goals emerged as a result of Round 2.1 (Table 27).

Many people emphasized specific industry knowledge and skills for goals. However, no one topic or discipline predominated. Because of that, we decided to classify them under one goal (Goal 5) that emphasized a broad range of industry topics.

In Round 3, panelists were asked to indicate their level of agreement on a five-point Likert scale for each goal. Medians and IQR were calculated for each. In Round 4, panelists were given their response from Round 3, the median and IQR and asked to indicate their choice a second time, using the same five-point scale. If their response in Round 4 was outside the IQR, they were asked to explain their response.

Table 27

Goals identified by Delphi panel.

	Median	IQR	Median	
Goal	R 3	R3	R 4	
Students will demonstrate mastery of written and oral communication skills [literature review, writing in a variety of business and scientific formats, oral presentations supported by visual aids for technical and nontechnical audiences, communication for interpersonal and supervisory situations.]	1.00	1.00-2.00	1.00	1.00- 1.25
Students will participate in experiential learning opportunities that focus on working in the industry environment, including at least one internship in an industry setting.	1.00	1.00- 2.00	1.00	1.00- 2.00
Students will demonstrate mastery in the theories and techniques of a scientific discipline basic to the biotechnology industry [molecular biology, biochemistry, cell biology].	1.00	1.00- 2.00	1.00	1.00- 2.00
Students will have a functional understanding of basic business principles in: 1. Marketing 2. Finance 3. Accounting 4. Management 5. Project management	1.50	1.00- 2.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00
Students will have knowledge of the current issues and trends that are important to the biotechnology industry and important to their success in the industry.	2.00	1.00- 2.00	2.00	1.00- 2.00

Note: The scale used was 1=agree strongly and 5=disagree strongly.

We asked panelists to make recommendations for the second issue,

teaching innovations, but only four responded. Those comments are listed in

Table 28. We did not go further into this issue due to limits of time and the lack

of response in Round 3.

Table 28

Comments made in response to recommendations for teaching innovation.

Industry/ Academic	Comment
A	"Develop a cross-disciplinary course with business students where students work in teams to analyze and evaluate businesses."
I	"This is not a good area for me to comment on. However, I feel strongly that whatever methods are utilized, they should teach the most relevant information available to meet the industry needs. Therefore, the fingers of the program should be on the pulse of the industry, preferably through the knowledge of the advisory board."
I	"I am preparing a mini [Company Name] MBA. 2 hours each of three days. It covers (VERY QUICKLY) all MBA topics you would normally be exposed to in any US MBA program. All the examples used are from real [Company Name] data, from NPVs to valuations to buy vs lease examples. It makes the connection between book knowledge and the practical application of MBA topics. Maybe something like this would also benefit a M.S. Biotech program."
А	"Outcomes assessment"

Assessment of the Delphi Technique

At the end of Round 5, panelists were asked three questions:

- 1. Why did you choose this format (paper version or Web-based)?
- 2. How useful do you think this Delphi process was in designing a new degree program?
- 3. What recommendations do you have for improving the process?

Of eight responses to question one, seven were positive. All panelists used the Web-based model, though they were given the option of using paper based at the very beginning. One panelist did not recall being given a choice at the beginning and stated that they would have preferred a paper format because they "hated computers". Panelists' positive comments were that the Web-based technique was the easiest form of communication, more easily accessible, more convenient and faster.

On question two, 10 panelists responded. Five responded that the process was somewhat useful in program design, though two of that group thought face to face conversations would have improved the process. Three panelists were not sure, but preferred to wait and see what the results were before determining value. Two responded that the process was not useful or was marginally useful. One panelist thought that it was too time consuming, tedious, and continuity was lost between rounds because there was so much time from one round to another in some cases. The second thought the topic was too broad and complex to address in a Delphi study.

Several comments were made in response to question three. Several related to the benefit of meeting face to face, shortening the time between rounds, and the structure of each round. Those comments are summarized below in Table 29.

Table 29

Suggestions from panelists to improve the Delphi process.

Industry/ Academic	Comment
I	The discussion would provide more reasons behind the data.
А	I have not evaluated from the program developer perspective. I think it was fine for a contributor.
Ι	If you use a Delphi process again, questions must be very short with quick answers. Also, I'm not sure this process is truly helpful for developing curriculum because there are too many extenuating circumstances for answers - I think it needs to be done in person so that the person analyzing the data has all information - not just what the person answering has time to type in.
Ι	Allow participant to choose their own password-so they do not have to keep track of one that is assigned. Provide more clarification in the questions- rather than writing a paragraph of what to do to answer the questions, perhaps provide brief instructions and then RESTATE the question in bold before asking for ratings: Example:? To WHAT level do you agree that(additional titles) is an entry point position for graduates of this program? (restate scale here). Provide an out line of what you hope to accomplish in the beginning to the participants, I felt very scattered each time I entered a round because I did not have a visual of what areas (internship, jobs, tracks) we were trying to come up with.

Table 29 continued.

Industry/ Academic	Comment
A	Have a higher level summary after every round to focus the issues. I did like the way the responses were layed out and we could see where ours fit. Can you ask us this question again after we get the results?
Ι	Live discussions, preferably face-to-face, would have been better.
Ι	This may not be practical but getting together mid way through the process to clarify certain positions would have been very helpful

Summary of Results

Twenty four panelists started Round 1 and participation in subsequent rounds varied from 17 in Round 2 to 11 in Round 4. Education level varied and included all levels of education in science and business. They resided in nine states spanning from east to west coast.

Round 1 started with eight open-ended questions designed to investigate (a) learning objectives, (b) internships, (c) thesis vs. non-thesis, (d) program focus (e) possible entry level positions, (f) roles for the industry advisory board, (g) recommended hours of hands-on experience and (h) other issues of importance. The final round ended with three questions to assess the panelists' perception of the usefulness of the Delphi for program development in higher education. For Question 1, 116 skills were identified, with 40 categorized as core curriculum, 52 as appropriate for tracks and 23 dropped because they did not receive a majority in the final round. An issue emerged with the recommendation that the program should have at least two different tracks that emphasized different curriculum. Ultimately, four tracks were chosen by a simple majority (50% or higher).

When differences between industry and academic panelists were analyzed using Chi Square, tabulated values exceeded expected values for two tracks-preclinical/clinical research and business development. Tabulated values exceeded expected values for six skills designated for tracks-experimental design, writing a business plan, conducting market research, in situ hybridization, SDS-PAGE, and quality assurance. When results were analyzed by high or low confidence level, significant differences occurred between groups that knowledge of gene expression should be included in core curriculum or that product development, basic accounting, microeconomics of a company, SDS-PAGE, transformation, use of bacteria, ISO 9000 or quality assurance should be part of the curriculum for tracks rather than core curriculum.

Four considerations were identified and examined for internships-length, level of responsibility, evaluation of the student, and compensation. At the end of Round 4, four to six months emerged as the most desirable length for an internship with a high level of responsibility. A combination of qualitative and quantitative evaluation was recommended with compensation at one-half to three-quarters of what would be paid to a full-time entry-level person in that position. Chi Square analysis of results revealed that significant differences emerged between industry and academic responses for the method of evaluating the internship in what each group chose as least desirable. When results were analyzed by high or low confidence level, the recommended level of compensation was significantly different. High confidence level disagreed that interns should be paid the full time equivalent while low confidence level agreed that interns should be paid the full time equivalent.

The question of thesis versus non-thesis changed during the course of the study. All respondents agreed that there should be an experiential component emphasizing a written product, though not necessarily a thesis. The only point of disagreement was whether or not every student, regardless of the track they were in, should be required to have a minimum amount of hands on experience. The question was changed to address that in Round 3 and combined with Question 1 in subsequent rounds.

Five themes emerged initially for the focus of the program-national, national overview with tracks, national overview with regional specializations, regional and local focus. The consensus was that the program should have a national overview with tracks that allow students to specialize in different curricular areas.

The question of entry level positions appropriate for new graduates changed after Round d1 because panelists were using different titles for the

same position. In Round 2, titles were chosen from the literature and a copy provided of the article with the caveat that panelists could add position titles they felt were not represented in the list provided. In the final round, thirty position titles were identified as appropriate for new graduates. When results of industry and academic responses were analyzed using Chi Square, tabulated values exceeded expected values for manufacturing associate, clinical data associate and QA document coordinator. When results were analyzed for high or low confidence level, four entry-level positions were significantly different.

Nine roles were identified for the industry advisory board. There was consensus that all roles were appropriate.

The question regarding the amount of hands-on experience that should be required of a new graduate became more complex because of the issue of tracks. It was combined with Question 1 after Round 2 and became two questions-how much experience should be required of all students regardless of track and how much should be required of students in each track. Results indicated that every student should have a minimum of one semester of handson experience in a research laboratory before during the master's program regardless of track. For each track identified, the number of semesters of handson experience varied from 3 semesters for a science track to 1 semester for a business development track. When results were analyzed by high or low confidence level, the number of semesters recommended for all students was

significantly higher for panelists having a high degree of confidence in their response.

In the final question regarding other issues to be discussed, 10 were identified initially. Identifying program goals and teaching innovations appropriate for a professional science master's program were the only two that received a simple majority (50% or higher). Five goals were identified. Panelists were asked to give recommendations for teaching innovations, but only four provided comments.

Only 10 panelists, less than half the original group, responded to the questions to evaluate the usefulness of the Delphi process. Half those responses were positive with several suggestions for improving the process.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary purpose of this research was to develop a model for a professional science master's program combining biotechnology and business. The objectives were to identify stakeholder preferences for various dimensions of a professional science master's program combining biotechnology and business and to identify differences in priorities between subgroups. A secondary purpose was to examine user preferences between Web-based and traditional methods of conducting a Delphi study and their impressions of its usefulness for program development.

Prior to the first round, demographic data was collected on panelists regarding their gender, age, years experience in their current field, position title and education levels. Round 1 started with eight open-ended questions designed to investigate (a) learning objectives, (b) internships, (c) thesis vs. nonthesis, (d) program focus (e) possible entry level positions, (f) roles for the industry advisory board, (g) recommended hours of hands-on experience and (h) other issues of importance. The final round ended with three questions to assess the panelists' perception of the usefulness of the Delphi for program development in higher education.

Twenty four panelists started Round 1 and participation in subsequent rounds varied from 17 in Round 2 to 11 in Round 4. Education level varied and included all levels of education in science and business. They resided in nine states spanning from east to west coast.

One hundred sixteen skills were identified initially. In subsequent rounds, 40 were categorized as core curriculum, 52 as appropriate for tracks and 23 were dropped because they did not receive a majority. An issue emerged with the recommendation that the program should have at least two different tracks that emphasized alternative curriculum. Ultimately, four tracks were chosen by a simple majority (50% or higher).

Chi Square analysis revealed that tabulated values exceeded expected values for two tracks and six skills designated for tracks. Significant differences occurred between high and low confidence groups on inclusion of gene expression in core curriculum and eight skills designated for tracks.

Four considerations were identified and examined in more depth for internships. Chi Square analysis of results revealed that significant differences emerged between industry and academic responses for the least desirable method of evaluating the internship. The recommended level of compensation was significantly different when results were analyzed by high or low confidence level.

The question of thesis versus non-thesis changed during the course of the study. All respondents agreed that there should be an experiential component emphasizing a written product, though not necessarily a thesis. The only point of disagreement was whether or not every student, regardless of the

track they were in, should be required to have a minimum amount of hands on experience. The question was changed to address that in Round 3 and combined with Question 1 in subsequent rounds.

Five themes emerged initially for the focus of the program-national, national overview with tracks, national overview with regional specializations, regional and local focus. The consensus was that the program should have a national overview with tracks that allow students to specialize in different curricular areas.

The question of entry level positions appropriate for new graduates changed after Round 1 because panelists were using different titles for the same position. In Round 2, titles were chosen from the literature and panelists could add position titles they felt were not represented in the list provided. In the final round, 30 position titles were identified as appropriate for new graduates. When results of industry and academic responses were analyzed using Chi Square, tabulated values exceeded expected values for three positions. When results were analyzed for high or low confidence level, four entry-level positions were significantly different.

Nine roles were identified for the industry advisory board. There was consensus that all roles were appropriate.

The question regarding the amount of hands-on experience that should be required of a new graduate became more complex because of the issue of tracks. It became two questions-how much experience should be required of all students regardless of track and how much should be required of students in each track. Results indicated that every student should have a minimum of one semester of hands-on experience in a research laboratory regardless of track. For each track identified, number of semesters of hands-on experience varied from three semesters for a science track to one semester for a business development track. When results were analyzed by high or low confidence level, the number of semesters recommended for all students was significantly higher for panelists having a high degree of confidence in their response.

In the final question regarding other issues to be discussed, ten were identified initially. 'Identifying program goals' and 'teaching innovations appropriate for a professional science master's program' were the only two that received a simple majority (50% or higher).

Five goals were identified by having panelists list five objectives each, then sorting those into themes, which were restated as goals. Panelists were asked to give recommendations for teaching innovations, but only four provided comments.

Only 10 panelists, less than half the original group, responded to the questions to evaluate the usefulness of the Delphi process. Half those responses were positive with several suggestions for improving the process.

Evaluation of the Web-based Delphi

Several problems emerged with this particular Delphi that could be a problem in others. Originally, we told panelists the study would be completed in about eight weeks, but due to unforeseen circumstances, this stretched to ten months. We relied on a third party to program the interactive Web site, which resulted in long waits between rounds, sometimes as much as three months. Participation varied considerably from round to round, in part due to this extended length. This had a negative influence on the panelists' perceptions of the effectiveness of the Delphi. However, use of the Delphi allowed us to gather opinions from a very diverse and geographically distant group of participants. Face-to-face meetings would have been costly both in time and money.

Threats to internal and external validity should also be considered because they create the unique place and time in which this study was conducted. The snowball technique for identifying panelists was not as effective for this study as in others cited in the literature (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Linstone & Turoff, 1975). There are no nationally recognized experts in this particular field, in part because it is still an emerging field that combines very different disciplines, disciplines that do not normally intercept.

We also had difficulty keeping panelists focused on the intended goal of developing a program that combined biotechnology and business. This could have been due to the wide variety of backgrounds and experiences. Choosing a panel with a narrower range of experience might have corrected this, but at the

same time, it may not have uncovered issues like tracks or non-science disciplines that should be considered.

The political climate has changed considerably in just the past two years. The war on terror and the ups and downs of the economy could be changing the face of the biotechnology industries, particularly with the increased emphasis on biosecurity. Terror alerts, increased security, students and faculty called up to fight in the war in Iraq, and budget cuts have affected universities as well.

The unexpected length of the study affected the ability of panelists to participate consistently. A shorter time frame could have increased participation and changed the results. As the study progressed, some panelists may have become more knowledgeable about professional science master's programs, which could have affected their answers. The amount and quality of interaction between the panelists and the facilitator varied as well due to differences in interpersonal communications and familiarity. Some panelists also knew each other, and even though the identities were not disclosed during the study, may have discussed the study at some point.

Panelists were from different regions of the country, where the local biotechnology industries could be very different from those found in Texas. Many of the industry panelists were from small companies, and some of those were in Texas, where the industry is not as mature as on the east or west coast. Many of the faculty panelists were from professional science master's programs

supported by the Sloan Foundation, which does set specific criteria for the programs that it will support.

A different time and different panelists could change some of the results in this study. However, given the variety of backgrounds and experience of these panelists, I think we would find that the priorities probably wouldn't change much--hands-on experience for every student, curriculum with authentic assessments that encourages critical thinking, problem solving, and communication skills, and nonscientific topics combined with more traditional science topics to prepare students as science professionals.

Knowledge, Skills and Abilities

The question relating to knowledge and skills quickly became too complicated for the scope of this particular study. The recommendation to identify goals through the group process and have at least two alternate tracks added layers of complexity that were not anticipated and could not be adequately addressed in this study.

Of the tracks that were suggested, only four received a majority, with preclinical and clinical development having the highest frequency. It was the only track that received a ranking of 1, agree strongly, through Rounds 3 and 4. There was consensus on three tracks--preclinical/clinical development, manufacturing, and business development. The suggested science tracks-molecular biology, biochemistry, and cell biology--did not reach consensus. This could be due, in part, to the view that they were too discipline specific and that topics or classes should be chosen from each to create a research track. There seems to be lack of agreement on what science skills are most appropriate for graduates planning careers in industry. The traditional disciplines may not be the best preparation.

Significant differences occurred between industry and academic panelists on two tracks. Due to the exploratory nature of the study, we differentiated between the five different levels of agreement used on the five-point Likert scale rather than lump them into categories of 'agree' and 'disagree'. For the preclinical/clinical development track, industry panelists agreed strongly that it should be a track while academic panelists were not quite as strong in their agreement. For the business development track, industry panelists chose 1 (agree strongly), while academic panelists were evenly divided between 2 and 3 on the scale, indicating that they may not have agreed as strongly on this point.

It is notable that the knowledge and skills identified for core curriculum did not include specific lab skills. The lab skills were designated as track or eliminated because they did not receive a majority. Thirteen of the 23 skills eliminated after Round 2 were laboratory skills. Despite this, there was agreement that every student should have at least one semester of laboratory experience regardless of the track they were in.

Elimination of these skills could be due, in part, to a design flaw. Panelists were asked to evaluate each skill and indicate if it should be part of

core curriculum for all students or a specialized track by choosing one of three radio buttons (blank, core, track). If a competency was not appropriate for core or track or outside a person's area of expertise, they were asked to leave it blank. In retrospect, this was not the best way to structure this question. Panelists should have been allowed to choose "outside expertise" or "neither core nor track" to differentiate between choices. More of these might have been retained had the question been structured for more precise answers. However, given that 18 of the 24 panelists had science degrees, it is surprising that laboratory skills did not receive a majority.

Some respondents stated that the science track was too general and should be more specialized, so in subsequent rounds "science" was divided into molecular biology, biochemistry and cellular biology. In Round 3, two panelists commented that this was too discipline specific and that classes from each of the disciplines should be combined to form a track more appropriate for industry. This indicates that there may be considerable disagreement on the particular science knowledge that students should have for the biotechnology industry.

Many of the skills and knowledge that were identified as core curriculum were not science skills. Basic business skills and industry specific topics are rarely included in science master's programs, yet predominated in core curriculum for this model. Those skills receiving an overall ranking of 1, agree strongly, focused on critical thinking, problem solving, interpersonal and communication skills. There was unanimous, strong agreement that critical

thinking and problem solving skills should be emphasized in the core curriculum. Interpersonal and teamwork skills were strongly supported as were written and oral communication skills.

Six items did not reach consensus for inclusion in core curriculum. One person chose "disagree strongly" as an answer for resume writing, survey of the biotechnology industry, interviewing skills, eagerness to adapt to new directions, preparing an abstract for a meeting, and basic information technology and information systems needs of biotechnology companies.

Only one skill, Good Clinical Practice, received a rating of "agree strongly" for inclusion in a track. All other skills had medians falling between 1.5 and 3.0. Nine were not in consensus as skills that should be designated to tracks-marketing, conducting market research, microeconomics of a firm, understanding the venture capital process, how to write a business plan, project management, use of bacteria, transformation and SDS-PAGE. What is not clear is if the disagreement was that these should be in core curriculum or eliminated from the curriculum altogether, due largely to the design of the question.

There were significant differences between industry and academic panelists on six skills designated for tracks. Industry panelists agreed more strongly on experimental design, writing a business plan, in situ hybridization, SDS-PAGE and quality assurance as suitable for tracks than did academic panelists. The differences were even more notable for conducting market research, with industry panelists agreeing and academic panelists disagreeing that this skill should be part of a track.

Dimensions of the Internship

Universities frequently view internships as most appropriate for the three months in the summer. They often are not credit bearing courses and the student does not have the academic oversight of a faculty member. Many traditional life science graduate programs don't allow a student time for an internship, particularly if they are completing research for a thesis.

At the end of Round 3, the most desirable length of time for an internship was 0-3 months, or one semester. However, by the end of Round 4, that had shifted and 4-6 months, or two semesters, was the most desirable choice. This means the internship would have to be at least a summer and fall or spring and summer, or possibly alternating semesters. This could cause problems for students because they are not on campus or may not be enrolled as a full time student during the fall or spring semester. Many traditional age students must maintain full-time student status to be covered by their parents' medical insurance and to qualify for financial aid. It would require either that they intern locally while taking classes, which could seriously limit their opportunities, or classes be created that allow the student to be considered full time while not on campus. This would be similar to the design of some co-op programs, which may be a better model for internships for some professional science master's programs.

The level of responsibility remained fairly stable across all rounds. Panelists chose a high level, about a half-step below the position that a student could be hired for, as the most desirable level of responsibility.

Similarly, the most desirable method of evaluation was a combination of qualitative and quantitative and that stayed stable across all rounds. This would indicate that the evaluation of an internship should be a combination of written products, such as evaluation forms with a numerical scale or a written report, or both, coupled with a performance review and verbal or written feedback from the supervisor.

When the data was analyzed for differences between the academic and industry subgroups, qualitative and quantitative combined was the unanimous first choice. Qualitative was the second choice of industry panelists and quantitative third. The reverse was true of academic panelists, who rated quantitative second and qualitative third. Quantitative evaluations would be more conducive to assigning a grade. Qualitative, on the other hand, was defined as performance evaluations, verbal evaluation or supervisor's letter, which would come from the industry internship supervisor.

Level of compensation was not as clear-cut. Salaries equal to one-half or three-fourths of that paid to a full time entry-level person in that position received equal weight. The only difference between the two was that, at the end of Round 4, the IQR of three-fourths pay was narrower than the IQR of one-half, indicating that there was closer agreement. This would warrant further research because internship salaries vary widely, which could be due, in part, to a lack of experience in the industry with graduate level interns. Most internship positions are geared to undergraduates who lack the knowledge and experience of students in a professional science master's program.

Hands-on Experience vs. Writing a Thesis

Six respondents stated specifically that a thesis was not appropriate for students who plan to work in industry. All respondents agreed that there should be an experiential component that culminated in a written product that emphasized critical thinking, problem solving, and organizing and presenting information. What is not clear is to what extent that writing product should be based on laboratory research or if satisfactory products could be developed for non-laboratory experiences. Alternative products should be identified or developed that would be more beneficial to the specific career development of the students. This would require close collaboration with industry and it is unknown how involved industry advisory boards are with these professional science master's programs. Having an advisory board and effectively involving an industry advisory board are two very different situations. Current models for working with industry advisory boards should be examined closely to determine if a satisfactory model exists for a professional science master's program.
The question of tracks evolved to address how much hands-on laboratory experience should be required of every student in this professional science master's program, regardless of what track they chose. The consensus, with strong agreement, was that every student should have at least one semester of laboratory experience, but that it could be gained as an undergraduate before entering the program. This should be investigated more closely on a case by case basis. Again this is where an industry advisory board, if used effectively, could help clarify the minimum that would be expected of the graduates that they are expected to hire.

Program Focus

A mistake occurred between Rounds 3 and 4 for this question. In Round 3, panelists were given the scale 1=most desirable and 5=least desirable, but in Round 4, they were inadvertently given two scales. At the top of the page was the original scale, but lower down in the page, they were given the scale of 1=agree strongly and 5=disagree strongly. Even though changes between rounds were small, it's hard to determine which scale panelists were referring to when giving their answers. Regardless of whether the two different scales had an effect, the top choice in each round was national overview with tracks to meet student goals, closely followed by national focus and national overview with regional specializations. However, panelists did not consider how a lack of

university resources or lack of expertise in the area students were interested in could affect development of tracks.

Entry Level Positions Appropriate for New Graduates

Realistically, employment opportunities that would be available to students should be considered as they are prepared for the workforce. We might like to think we are preparing them for a management level position, but are those positions out there? Can they be found in the job banks? What skills do students need to get a job in a company and then advance on a career path of their choice? We asked this question specifically in hopes of clarifying the kinds of positions that were out there for students.

Strongest agreement for those positions taken from the literature was for research associate, manufacturing associate, process development associate, and quality assurance technical writer. Of those positions that were suggested by participants, there was no strong agreement that any were appropriate for new graduates.

When the data was analyzed for differences between the two subgroups, industry and academic, significant differences occurred for manufacturing associate, clinical data associate, and quality assurance document coordinator. The industry panelists agreed strongly on all three as appropriate for new graduates. However, agreement was not as strong for the academic panelists. In particular, academic panelists were widely divergent for the position of quality assurance document coordinator, with responses ranging from 'agree' to 'disagree strongly'. This could be due, in part, to a lack of familiarity with the work involved in quality assurance and other positions unique to the biotechnology industry.

Roles of the Industry Advisory Board

There was strong agreement on only two items of the nine identified-internship development and establishing university/industry ties. The two items garnering the most disagreement were related to funding. Two panelists commented that it was not the role of industry to provide funding. The median moved more strongly toward disagreement from Round 2 to Round 3. However, there was no strong disagreement on any of the nine items, so they did reach consensus.

Given the negative reactions of industry members to the idea of providing any kind of funding, and the assumption of many academics that industry should pay to support these industry specific programs, this particular item warrants more discussion. As budgets get tighter on college campuses, other sources of funding will have to be tapped to sustain these nontraditional programs. Nonthesis programs often do not have the traditional sources of funding for students, such as assistantships. This makes it difficult to compete for and support students in these programs.

Minimum Hands-on Experience Required for New Graduates

Despite the fact that science skills were not emphasized in the core curriculum, there was agreement that every track should require at least one semester of laboratory experience for all students in that track. For the science tracks, the consensus was that there should be at least three semesters of experience. Two semesters each were recommended for the preclinical/clinical development and manufacturing tracks and one semester for the business development track. This may speak to graduate as well as undergraduate programs regarding the amount of hands-on experience that is expected when a new graduate is hired. As noted in the literature review, it is often hard for new graduates to find jobs because "they can't even make solutions" (Kennedy, 1993a).

Other Issues

A strong majority of panelists identified program goals as an issue that should be addressed in this study. Understandably, a program really can't be designed unless goals are clear. Goals should be articulated and written early in the development of a program. Continuity should be planned for because staff and administration can come and go.

The goal that received the strongest support was mastery of written and oral communication skills. Experiential learning and mastery of science theory and techniques were close seconds. There was agreement on basic business

139

principles and industry specific topics, but not as strong as the first three goals. The fifth goal, having to do with knowledge of issues and trends in industry, was very broad because no particular theme or topic emerged. However, panelists were in agreement that clearly articulated goals should precede development of the program.

Teaching innovation could be a worthy study on its own. Only four panelists responded, but that may have been due to the length of the study and the loss of interest and perseverance.

In summary, this study points out the significant differences in opinion that can occur between academic professionals and the industry managers that are expected to hire the graduates from our universities. It is noteworthy that many of the participants in this study were experienced with professional science master's programs. Participants who lack that experience could offer even more divergent opinions. This emphasizes the need to use a structured process for program development and getting all stakeholders involved. It also speaks to the necessity of carefully selecting participants for a Delphi study.

Other considerations are the non-science disciplines that should be included, the tracks structure, and the emphasis on experiential education and authentic assessment. This points to a need for a new way to educate students as the life science industries continue to grow.

Recommendations for Practice

Study Design

While a Web-based Delphi may seem more convenient for panelists and more efficient for data collection, my recommendation is not to conduct a Webbased study unless you have the budget to hire a programmer dedicated to the study or you can do all the programming yourself. The lag time between rounds, waiting for the programmer, had a very negative impact on the study.

Another consideration is the questions asked. I would not recommend a study of this scope for one Delphi study. It became too cumbersome and time consuming for the participants due to the number and complexity of questions we were attempting to address. A better scenario would be to conduct a Delphi study before a program is developed and choose panelists that can help you determine what the needs are for education programs. From that, a plan could be created for developing the program model and curriculum.

Other technologies could be used to enhance the communication between panelists, such as online forums or threaded discussions, and still keep them anonymous to one another. Supporting materials or information could be provided in an online community.

Anyone considering a Delphi should read all available literature before designing the first questionnaire. Determine from the beginning how data will be analyzed, with complete agreement between all parties involved on the definition of factors like "consensus". The method has been used, misused and modified for various purposes across many fields since the traditional Delphi was first introduced by Norman Dalkey in the 1960's. There are several good critiques of its strengths and weaknesses that should be considered (Dalkey, 1967, 1968, 1969; Dalkey et al., 1969; Dalkey & Rourke, 1971; Linstone & Turoff, 1975; Powell, 2003; Sackman, 1975).

Program Development

The issue of knowledge and skills appropriate for this model needs far more exploration than we could provide in this study. It merits a study of its own. An in-depth analysis devoted just to curriculum should be conducted as part of the development of any new program. However, given the differences in the biotechnology industries and the rapid changes that occur in platform technologies, one national study would not be appropriate. This could be better addressed by having industry advisory boards for individual programs that could advise on the most appropriate skills based on the strengths of a particular college and the growth of regional industries. Though graduates will be competing for jobs in a national market, companies typically look in their own backyards for bachelor's and master's level employees rather than conducting a national search, such as they would for a Ph.D. level person (Kennedy, 1993a). Public universities, and in particular land grant universities, are charged with supporting the development of industries and workforce in their home states first.

Regardless of student interests, the university involved has to look at the resources they can realistically garner to support a professional science master's program. This should be done in the context of national trends and what would appeal to students. However, as a graduate advisor of a professional science master's program for four years, I found that students often didn't know what opportunities were available and looked to the program to provide that information. Many thought that having a bachelor's degree in the life sciences meant that they would be working in a laboratory. They knew very little about other opportunities beyond graduate or professional school unless they had been in the workforce and were returning to school.

Goals should be clearly articulated and formally recorded early in program development. Issues of different stakeholder groups--industry, faculty, and students--should be identified early and addressed. This study demonstrated on several occasions that there could be significant differences in the priorities of industry and academic panelists. This again emphasizes the need for a model that effectively gathers information from all stakeholders.

Internships could be an important capstone for these professional programs. A six-month internship could be a summer plus one long semester, alternating semesters or parallel, allowing students to work while they take classes. It would provide ample time for students to gain practical experience and could allow them to work in different units in a company to get both business and science experience. On-campus experience, providing the necessary

143

hands-on experience, could precede the internship, but would require development of adequate laboratory placements for all students. The longer internship would also allow time for the student to complete a major written project that would serve as an authentic assessment, emphasizing critical thinking, problem solving, and written and oral communication skills.

The combination of business, science and other topics taught in these programs provide a perfect avenue for innovation. Nontraditional approaches, such as classes that bring together students from different disciplines to work on real problems, should be explored further for all kinds of degree programs, not just professional science master's programs.

Recommendations for Research

Several recommendations for research become apparent from this study. The Delphi method could be very useful in program development, but further research is needed to refine the processes for program development and evaluation. This includes research on the effective use of technologies to support the Web-based Delphi.

And effective model for working with an industry advisory board is also needed. Community colleges have a long history of working with industry advisory boards, but those are typically more focused on vocational training. A graduate program could use similar methods, but the focus would have to change to incorporate strategies for developing core competencies in students such as critical thinking and problem solving in addition to technical and business skills. Industry advisory boards could also be instrumental in development of authentic assessments to meet the unique requirements of individual programs.

A critical area of research will be the continued assessment and evaluation of professional science master's programs and their graduates. These are still relatively young programs and take many forms. Tracking graduates for many years into their careers and carefully evaluating all aspects of programs as they mature will provide critical data needed to develop best practices for these programs, as well as document failures. These programs could be the beginning of the science equivalent of an MBA, or they could be a trend that dies out in one or two generations. Careful observation and documentation will benefit not only the professional science master's programs, but help fill the gaps in the limited literature available on graduate education.

In academia, we frequently operate under the perception that we are not preparing students for careers, but are preparing them to be well-rounded, educated citizens. As noted in the section on core curriculum, the emphasis of employers is not just on skills, but on competencies that will serve a student for life-long success as a citizen--critical thinking, problem solving, communication and working with multidisciplinary teams. Employability skills are something that can and should be integrated across the curriculum. A high quality, well-rounded education and basic employability skills should not be mutually exclusive.

REFERENCES

Advisory Committee to the National Science Foundation Directorate for Education and Human Resources. (1996). *Shaping the future: New expectations for undergraduate education in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology* (Report No. NSF 96-139). Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation Directorate for Education and Human Resources.

- Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. (1999). *Program rationale: What this initiative seeks to accomplish*. Retrieved June 20, 2004, from http://www.sciencemasters.com/program rationale.html
- Association of Graduate Schools. (1995). AGS statement on the COSEPUP Report: Reshaping the graduate education of scientists and engineers. Retrieved July 15, 1999, from http://www-

ags.ucsd.edu/cosepup/statement.htm

- Association of Graduate Schools. (1996). *Descriptions of successful graduate programs and policies*. Retrieved July 15, 1999, from http://wwwags.ucsd.edu/cosepup/innovate.htm
- Ausubel, J. H. (1996). Malthus and graduate students: Checks on burgeoning ranks of Ph.D.'s. *The Scientist, 10*(3), 11.
- Ausubel, J. H., & Tobias, S. (2002). *Mastering science: Graduate schools invigorate the MS in science and math.* Retrieved May 20, 2003, from http://sciencemasters.com/articles_mastering_science.html

- Barton, P. E., & Lapointe, A. (1995). Learning by degrees: Indicators of performance in higher education. Princeton, NJ: Policy Information Center, Educational Testing Service.
- Belden, Russonello, & Stewart Research & Communications. (July 1998). *Results of the ASCB survey: Executive summary*. Retrieved July 5, 1999, from http://nexwave.sciencemag.org/
- Benjamin, R., & Carroll, S. J. (1996). Impediments and imperatives in restructuring higher education. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 32(Supplemental), 705-719.
- Biotechnology Industry Organization. (2004). *Biotechnology: A collection of technologies*. Retrieved September 26, 2004, from http://www.bio.org/speeches/pubs/er/technology_collection.asp
- Bowen, D. (October 25, 1996). *Restructuring graduate school*. Retrieved July 1, 1999, from http://nextwave.sciencemag.org/
- Butcher, J. (2002, Spring). Consensus depends on the situation. *Group Facilitation, 4*(1), 58-61.
- Caffarella, R. S. (1994). *Planning programs for adult learners: A practical guide for educators, trainers and staff developers.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Caudron, S. (1999, July). The hard case of soft skills. *Workforce*, 60-66.
- Charp, S. (1998). *Industry/education partnerships*. Retrieved June 28, 1999, from http://www.thejournal.com/journal/magazine/98/oct/editorial.html

- Committee on Education & Human Resources. (2003). *Task Force on National Workforce Policies for Science and Engineering* (Draft report No. NSB 0369). Arlington, VA: National Science Board.
- Conrad, C. F., Haworth, J. G., & Millar, S. B. (1993). *A silent success: Master's education in the United States*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Cotton, K. (1993). *Developing employability skills.* Retrieved October 5, 1999, from http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/sirs/8/c015.html
- Cusack, J. (1994). A forum brief: Behavioral skills in the workplace: What do young people need to succeed? Retrieved September 28, 1999, from http://www.stw.ed.gov/products/aypf/fbbehive.htm
- Dahms, A. S. (2001a). Biotechnology: En route to filling the proto-employee pipeline of industrial biology and the life science industries. *Biochemical and Molecular Biology Education, 29*, 121-122.
- Dahms, A. S. (2001b). The US biotechnology industry: the importance of workforrce quality in the maintenance of corporate competitive advantage. *Biochemical and Molecular Biology Education, 29*, 206-208.
- Dahms, A. S., & Bourque, J. (2001). Careers in the biotechnology industry: What do our students do in the industry and what degrees and training are necessary? *Biochemical and Molecular Biology Education, 29*, 257-261.
- Dalkey, N. C. (1967). *Delphi* (Government report No. P-3704). Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corp.

- Dalkey, N. C. (1968). Experiments in group prediction. Paper prepared for national meeting of the American Chemical Society, San Francisco, CA, April 1-4, 1968. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corp.
- Dalkey, N. C. (1969). *The Delphi method: An experimental study of group opinion* (Government report No. RM-5888-PR). Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corp.
- Dalkey, N. C., Brown, B., & Cochran, S. (1969). *The Delphi method, III: Use of self ratings to improve group estimates* (Government report No. RM-6115-PR). Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Dalkey, N. C., & Rourke, D. L. (1971). *Experimental assessment of Delphi* procedures with group value judgments (No. R-612-ARPA). Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corp.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and Internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Dooley, K. W. (1995). The diffusion of computer technology and telecommunications: a comparative case study of middle schools in the Texas Education Collaborative. Unpublished Dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station.
- Dunn-Rankin, P. (1983). *Scaling Methods*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Ferguson, R. L. (1995, August). Workforce improvement and lifelong learning: A new paradigm for education and training in the USA. *Industry & Higher Education*, 241-247.
- Finch, C. R., & Crunkilton, J. R. (1999). Determining curriculum content: The Delphi technique. In V. Lanigan (Ed.), *Curriculum development in vocational and technical education: Planning, content and implementation* (5th. ed., pp. 158-159). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Fiske, P. (1998, July 24). *The curse of brains: Overcoming the bad habits you learned in grad school*. Retrieved July 1, 1999, from http://nextwave.sciencemag.org/
- Freeman, M. (2002, Spring). Consensus is primary to group facilitation. *Group Facilitation,4* (1), 56-59.
- Graham, A., & Nicholas, T. (2001, September). Broken ranks. *The Washington Monthly Online*. Retrieved November 3, 2001, from http://www.washingtonmonthly.com
- Greenberg, D. S. (2003). The mythical scientist shortage. *The Scientist*, *17*(6), 68.

Griffith, A., & Martinez, C. (2003). *Texas biotechnology industry report*.
 Retrieved July 10, 2004, from
 http://www.bidc.state.tx.us/PharmaceuticalsBiotechnologyIndustry.htm

Gwynne, P. (2001). *Careers for B.S. and M.S. scientists inside and outside the laboratory*. Retrieved August 22, 2001, from http://recruit.sciencemag.org/feature/advice/bs ms.shl

Hays, S. (1997). *Stanford survey of grad students finds diversified training is needed.* Retrieved July 1, 1999, from

http://nextwave.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/1998/03/29/69?ck=nck

Hoover, S. (1999). Filling in the skill standards gap. *Quality*, 38(5), 34-42.

International Conference on Harmonisation. (2004). *Welcome to the official web site for ICH*. Retrieved October 16, 2004, from http://www.ich.org/

International Organization for Standardization. (2004, September 2004). *ISO* 9000 and ISO 14000 - in brief. Retrieved October 16, 2004, from http://www.iso.org/iso/en/iso9000-14000/index.html

Jensen, D. (1996, November 8). *M.S. or Ph.D.: Your future in science*. Retrieved July 1, 1999, from http://nextwave.sciencemag/org

Jensen, D. (1997, June 13). A clash of cultures: What it takes to work in industry. Retrieved July 1, 1999, from http://nextwave.sciencemag.org/

- Jensen, M. N. (1999). Reinventing the science master's degree. *Science, 284* (5420), 1610-1611.
- Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, F. P. (2002). *Joining together: Group theory and group skills* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Judd, R. C. (1972). Use of Delphi methods in higher education. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *4*,173-186.

- Kellogg Commission. (1999). Kellogg Commission report-returning to our roots:
 The engaged institution (No. 3). Washington, DC: National Association of
 State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges/Kellogg Commission.
- Kennedy, K. (1993a). *North Carolina's biotechnology workforce.* Research Triangle, NC: North Carolina Biotechnology Center.
- Kennedy, K. (1993b). *Windows on the workplace: North Carolina's biotechnology workforce*. Research Triangle, NC: North Carolina Biotechnology Center.
- Kreeger, K. Y. (1995, June 12). Occupational standards developed for bioscience industry workers. *The Scientist, 9*(12), 3-7.
- Kuh, G. (2004, October 14). *National survey of student engagement*. Retrieved October 16, 2004, from http://www.iub.edu/~nsse/
- Kumagia, J. (1999). Professional master's degrees promise quicker entry into jobs. *Physics Today, 52*(6), 54-55.
- Laab, J. L. (1993). Employers need their workers to upgrade their basic skills. *Personnel Journal, 72*(12), 22.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Linstone, H. A. (1975). Eight basic pitfalls: A checklist. In H. A. Linstone & M. Turoff (Eds.), *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications.* (pp. 559-571). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.

- Linstone, H. A., & Turoff, M. (Eds.). (1975). *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- Massy, W. F., & Goldman, C. A. (2001). The Ph.D. factory: Training and employment of science and engineering doctorates in the United States.
 Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- McCollum, M. (1998, September 4). A report from the National Institute for Science Education's Graduate Education Forum. Retrieved July 1, 1999, from http://nextwave.sciencemag.org/
- McCormick, D., & Hodgson, J. (1993). Jobs in biotechnology: A window of opportunity. *Nature, 365*, 676-678.
- Mertl, M. (1998, November 1). *Biomedical funding news*. Retrieved July 1, 1999, from http://nextwave.sciencemag.org/
- National Academy of Sciences. (1995). Reshaping the graduate education of scientists and engineers: NAS's Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy Report (Government document No. 19). Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.
- National Academy of Sciences. (1997). *Preparing for the 21st century: The education imperative*. Retrieved July 1, 1999, from http://www2.nas.edu/21st/

National Academy of Sciences, & National Academy of Engineering. (1996). Careers in science and engineering: A student planning guide to grad school and beyond. Retrieved July 1, 1999, from

http://www4.nas.edu/osep/cpc.nsf

- National Academy of Sciences Committee on Science Engineering and Public Policy. (1995). *Reshaping the graduate education of scientists and engineers: NAS's Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy Report* (Government document No. 19). Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences Committee on Science, Engineering and Public Policy.
- National Governors Alliance. (1998). *Preparing students for the twenty first century.* Washington, DC: National Governors Alliance, Education Policy Studies Division.
- National Science Board. (1996). *U.S. science and engineering in a changing world*. Retrieved April 19, 1999, from

http://www.nsf.gov/nsb/documents/1996/nsb9622/se_chwo.htm

National Science Board. (1998). *Science and engineering indicators 1998*. Retrieved April 20, 1999, from

http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/seind98/access/intro.htm

National Science Board. (2003). *Task force on national workforce policies for science and engineering* (Draft report No. NSB 03-69). Arlington, VA: National Science Board/Committee on Education and Human Resources.

- National Science Foundation. (1996). *Academia, industry and the NSF: What are the interactions and how are they evolving?* Retrieved June 23, 1998, from http://www.nsf.gov/
- National Survey of Student Engagement. (2004a). *NSSE e-news*. Retrieved September 18, 2004, from http://www.indiana.edu/~nsse/enews/vol3_issue4.htm
- National Survey of Student Engagement. (2004b). *Quick facts*. Retrieved June 20, 2004, from http://www.iub.edu/~nsse/html/facts.shtml
- Office of Legislative and Public Affairs. (2003). *Workshop: Will today's innovations in graduate education meet the challenges of the future?* Press release. Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation.
- Perry, R. (2001, December 5). Governor Perry announces creation of Texas Council on Science and Biotechnology Development. Retrieved February 6, 2002, from http://www.governor.state.tx.us/divisions/press/pressreleases/PressRelea

se.2001-12-05.5058.

- Powell, C. (2003). The Delphi technique: Myths and realities. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 41*(4), 376-382.
- Rae Dupree, J. (1997, October 27). California knowledge industry is booming. San Jose Mercury News, 1E.
- Riggs, H. E., & Galas, D.J. (1998). Life science professionals of the future. *Genetic Engineering News, 18*(21), 6+.

- Rutherford, G. S., Schofer, J. L., Wachs, M. & Skutsch, M. (1973). Goal formulation for socio-technical systems. *Journal of the Urban Planning and Development Division, 99* (2), 157-169.
- Sackman, H. (1975). *Delphi critique: Expert opinion, forecasting and group process.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Sandow, S. A. (1972). Educational policy formulation: Planning with the focus Delphi and the cross-purpose matrix. Washington, DC: Syracuse Univ. Research Corp.
- Scheele, D. S. (1975). Reality construction as a product of Delphi interaction. In
 H. A. Linstone & M. Turoff (Eds.), *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications.* (pp. 37-71). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Scheibe, M., Skutsch, M., & Schofer, J. (2002). Experiments in Delphi methodology. In H. A. Linstone & M. Turoff (Eds.), *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications* (pp. 257-281). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Sciencemasters.com. (1997). Startup checklist for professional science master's degree programs. Retrieved May 20, 2003, from http://sciencemasters.com/startup_checklist.html
- Sciencemasters.com. (2003, February). *Professional science masters program update: News & notes*. Retrieved May 20, 2003, from http://sciencemasters.com/new.html

- Simmons, C. A. (2003). Trends in education: Creating the scientific equivalent of the MBA. *Executive Action, 46*, 1-5.
- Smith, K. R., Swanson, G. J., & Tobias, S. (2004, February). Creating a tech workforce that is outsource proof. Retrieved April 15, 2004, from http://www.sciencemasters.com/articles_providence.html
- Stasz, C., Ramsey, K., Eden, R., Melamid, E., & Kaganoff, T. (1996). Workplace skills in practice: Case studies of technical work. Retrieved September 20, 1999, from http://ncrve.berkeley.edu/AllInOne/MDS-773.html
- Susskind, L. (1999). A short guide to consensus building. In L. Susskind, S.
 McKearnan; & J. Thomas-Larner (Eds.), *The consensus building handbook: A comprehensive guide to reaching agreement.* Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Syverson, P. D. (October 1996). The new American graduate student-challenge or opportunity? *Communicator, October 1996,* pp. 7-8,11.

Syverson, P. D. (2003, March). Data sources. *Communicator*, 5,8.

- Texas Healthcare and Bioscience Institute. (1998). *1998 index of the Texas healthcare technology industry*. Austin, TX: Texas Healthcare and Bioscience Institute.
- Texas Healthcare and Bioscience Institute. (2001). *The 21st century life science roadmap*. Austin, TX: Texas Healthcare and Bioscience Institute.
- Texas Science and Technology Council. (1998). *Science and Technology Council Report*. Austin, TX: Texas Science and Technology Council.

Tobias, S. (1999). *An overview of the new M.S. degree programs*. Retrieved August 22, 2001, from

http://www.sciencemasters.com/programs_elsewhere.html

Tsapogas, J., Rausch, L.M., and Collins, M. (1999). Will small business become the nation's leading employer of graduates with bachelor's degrees in science and engineering? (No. NSF 99-322). Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Studies.

- Turoff, M. (1971). Delphi and its potential impact on information systems. Proceedings of the American Federation of Information Processing Societies Conference, 39, 317-326.
- Turoff, M., & Hiltz, S. R. (1995). Computer based Delphi processes. In M. Adler
 & E. Ziglio (Eds.), *Gazing into the Oracle: The Delphi method and its* application to social policy and public health. London: Kingsley
 Publishers.
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2004). *A-Z index*. Retrieved October 16, 2004, from http://www.fda.gov/

University of Texas Institute for Cellular and Molecular Biology. (2003, May 12). Biotech life sciences resources and reference tools. Retrieved October 16, 2004, from http://www.icmb.utexas.edu/links/mb resources.asp

US News & World Report. (2004). America's best colleges 2004. Retrieved June

20, 2004, from

http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/college/rankings/rankindex_brief.php

Zey, M., Luedke, A., & Murdock, S. (1999). Changing employment demands and requirements for college graduates: focus group interviews with industry, agency and school district representatives in Texas. (Report). College Station, TX: Texas A&M University System, Texas State Data Center.

APPENDIX A

ROUND 1 INSTRUMENT

	Microsoft	Citientet
A fet view Franker frak National Schools Source Sou		[Dee

toke rebe undut/dept/incurdite and undut/dept/incurdite and undut/dept/incurdite and undut/dept/incurdite and the mark of the control of	Toto Hoto mutatulative contractions and the second	Internation Fatticipant Information Fatticipant Information Fatticipant Information Internation Fatticipant Information	Jelphi - Microsoft Internet Deplorer		
Image: Second	Sove Demographics	Construction C	Tools Heb		14
In antideletificantiti and Participant Information T in my current field: Addie C Female C Male C Female C Male C Female C I in my current field: I in my current fiele	In additionation and interviewee the second and fields of study in a family of Fermale C in the additionation is the additionation in a state contribution in a difference of study in a difference of the degree of centificate. Some beingentiates as well Also in the degree of centificate is as well Also in the degree of centificate. Some beingentiates as well Also in the degree of centificate is a second and the degree of centificate is as well Also in the degree of centificate. Some beingentiates as well Also in the degree of centificate is a second and the degree of centificate	mutual/detriforantit.mg Participant Information Participant Information Participant Information Participant Information Participant Information If In my current field: Participant Information Participant Information If In my current field: Participant Information Participant Information If In my current field: Participant Information Participant Information If In my current field: Participant Information Participant Information If In my current field: Participant Information Participant Information If In my current field: Participant Information Participant Information If In my current field: Participant Information Participant Information If In my current field: Participant Information Participant Information If Information Participant Information Pa	🖬 🐔 🔎 Search 🧩 Favortes 😻 Meda 🚱 🙆 - 🖓	in 10 − 10 − 10 − 10 − 10 − 10 − 10 − 10	
Participant Information Participant Information It in my current field: Male C Female C It in my current field: Image: Compare	Participant Information Participant Information It in my current field. Male It is to be a complete served and fields of study In it is career-triated, perceited in an it is career-triated, perceited in a well. Also It is a well with a wear ded the degree or centificate. It is a well with a wear ded the degree or centificate.	Participant Information Participant Information It In my current field: Male C Female C It In my current field: Male C Female C It attained: Provide and and fields of study It attained: Provide and and field It attained: Provide and and fields It attained: Provide and and and fields It attained: Provide and	eru athibitito and thuasp		- 5 60 Links *
It in my current field. It is career related. It is career related. It is car	Allale Female Male Female Male All Allale Female Male Male All Allale Allale Male Male Allale Allale <	It in my current field: It is career related or a fladds of study It is career related. For an and and fields of study It is career related. For an and and fields of study It is career related. For an and and fields of study It is career related. For an and and fields of study It is career related. For an and and fields of study It is career related. For an and and fields of study It is career related. For an and and fields of study It is career related. For an and and fields of study It is career related. For an and and fields of study It is career related. For an and and fields of study It is career related. For an and and fields of study It is career related. For an and and the degree of certificate. For an an and and the degree of certificate. For an and and the degree of certificate. For an an and and the degree of certificate. For an an and an and the degree of certificate. For an an and and the degree of certificate. For an an and an an an and an an an and an	Participant Inform	ation	4
It in my current field:	It in my current field. It in my current field. It is disprese or centificates earned and fields of study elist attend. If you are currently enrolled in an at is carterer related, please indicate that as well. Also that arvarded the degree or centificate. Sove Demographics	It in my current field.		Male C Female C	
It in my current field.	It in my current field. It is career certificates earned and fields of study enclied in an at its career related, please indicate that as well. Also that anarded the degree or certificate. Sove Demographics	Int in my current field:			
st degrees or certificates earned and fields of study el attained. If you are currently enrolled in an it is career-related, please indicate that as well. Also nat awarded the degree or certificate.	Ist degrees or certificates earned and fields of study eli attained. If you are currently enrolled in an of its career-related, please indicate that as well. Also that awarded the degree or certificate. Sove Demographics	Ist degrees or centificates earned and fields of study ela attained. If you are currently enclose that as well. Also that awarded the degree or certificate. anoled) anoled) anoled Bave Demographics anoled Bave Demographics another are the analysis and an and an analysis and an	ant in my current field:		
st degrees or certificates earned and fields of study el attained. If you are currently enrolled in an fi is career-related, please indicate that as well. Also nat awarded the degree or certificate.	Ist clastrees or certificates earned and fields of study ell attrained. If you are currently enrolled in an at is career-related, please indicate that as well. Also that awarded the degree or certificate. arrolled) enrolled) enrolled	Ist degrees or certificates earned and fields of study oil attained. Fyou are currently enrolled in an at is career-related, please indicate that as well. Also that awarded the degree or certificate. Seve bemographics anoled) and a second area of the degree of certificate. Seve bemographics anoled area of a second area of the degree of			
Incled)	Incled)	enroled) Sove Demographics Sove Demographics	Ist degrees or certificates earned and fields of study vel attained. If you are currently enrolled in an at is career-related, please indicate that as well. Also that awarded the degree or certificate.		
	Sove Demographics	Save Demographics Save Demographics	enrolled)		N
1 Internet		🗐 Doomenti - Mor 🖉 roundireadis - M) 😰 Qisammay - Mor 👹 Web-based Del 💘 Parit Stop Pro-In 🔮 ए 🦝 🐊 🤮 3:39 PM			Internet

	22		Links *		<				1			-				>	14	2:09 RM
			8			tton. You may return to ryou choose. You may ecision in lieu of an		tte from a professional		am One is that the upht is that the 1 your experience which completion of the	national needs, or it can ers program should be	ers' program in	ogram in biotechnolog/2	fessional science or one 15 week			 Internet 	2965
		• 🛃 🖌 💭 🖨 🕉		options 🤌	su	a of comfort while answering that ques may answer the questions in any order ease provide a brief reason for your d	ate page):	udes) should be expected of a gradus		ance accomplished in a masters programmer of the other school of the dence gained. The other school of the dwriting a thesis is equally valuable. It dwriting a thesis is equally valuable. It he hands on experience gained or the	cts of industry" focus to meet general I you think a professional science mast	aduate of a professional science mast	for a professional science masters pro	perience that a new graduate of a pro of employable? (i.e20 hrs per weak f	d in previous questions?	(W)		🍓 Paint Shop Pro - [Jina
Explorer		Search 🏋 Favorites 💕 Media 🚱 🔗	nd1c.asp710=520Pass=1	earch web 🔹 🍘 🗗 to blocked 👔 A D T	Questio	you to provide an estimate of your lew it your answer until Round 1 ends. You uestion. If you choose not to answer, p	each question is linked to the appropri	ng objectives (knowledge, skills or atti m in biotechnology?	e ideal intemship situation?	through regarding the research expen of s degree is in the hands-on lab expe- t and completing a research project ar of to the future success of the students	nasters program can have an "all aspe pional or local focus. To what extent do al or national workforce needs?	s would be appropriate for a recent or	ate for an industry advisory committee	mber of hours of practical laboratory el echnology should have to be consider hours).	d be addressed that were not discusse	Save & E		🗐 Documenti - Microsof 🚺 Round I
i Delphi - Microsoft Internet	w Fovortes Tools Help	S S S S . O	pul/www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/rou	10		ach question, we will asl uestion at any time to ed choose not to answer a c er for that question.	tuestions are as follows (What outcomes or learn science masters' progra	What would constitute #	There are two schools o primary value of a maste experience of organizin of these is most importa thesis?	A professional science have a more specific re focused on local, region	What entry level position biotechnology?	What roles are appropri	What is the minimum nu masters program in biol semester would be 300	What other issues shoul			🛃 web-based Dephi
Web-based	File Edit Ne	• Hack •	Address A http	Google -		For e any q also : answ	The c	-	5	τ. Γ	पं	Ś	6.	7.	8.		9	🐮 start

	22	Go Links *		¢		list or		>	arret	200
	rtes 💜 Meda 🍘 🔗 🚵 🔟 - 🛄 💮 🛱 🎎		🛃 40 blocked 🕤 Autoriti 🛃 options 🖉	Question 1 dge and experience in regard to answering the question below.		edge, skills or attitudes) should be expected of a graduate from a professional The list below is provided simply as a starting point. Please add to the followin	Southern blotting Good Laboratory Practice (GLP) Preparing a budget Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP) Reditation safety Proposal writing Polymenase Chain Reaction (PCR) Laboratory safety	Save & Conánue Save & Exit		Surveyor for
🗿 Web-based Delphi - Microsoft Internet Explorer	File Edit View Favorites Tools Help 🔕 Back • 🕥 • 💌 😰 🐔 🖉 Search 😽 Favor	Address Shttp://www.aped.tamu.edu/delph/fround1d.ap?tD=528Q=	Google - 🔹 🏟 Search web - 🧃	I feel very comfortable with my level of knowle	 Strongly disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly Agree 	What outcomes or learning objectives (knowle science masters' program in biotechnology? delete anything you feel is unnecessary. Be sure to click Save when you are finished.	Examples: Electrophoresis Project management Personnel management SDS-PAGE		Done Done	

	4	× > 60 Linis *	¢		r (spring.	>	Internet.	P 4 2 6 200
🛃 Web-based Delphi - Microsoft Internet Explorer	Fie Edit View Favorites Tods Help 📀 Back • 💽 • 💌 🌌 🐔 🔑 Search 🌟 Favorites 😻 Mada 🐼 🔗 🛃 • 🧾 🚯 🚴 🖏 🖄	Address 🔕 http://wew.aped.tanu.edu/delphihound1d.asp70=528Q=2 Cocogle - 🔹 🕷 Search Web - 🧭 🔁 40 blocked 🗐 Address 🖉 Options 🥒	Question 2 I feel very comfortable with my level of knowledge and experience in regard to answering the question below.	 Strongly disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly Agree 	What would constitute the ideal internship situation? Please describe the internship in terms of length of time, time of year summer, fall), level of responsibility, suggested compensation, methods for evaluation of the intern, etc. Be sure to click Save when you are finished.	Seve & Continue Seve & Exit	Done	🛃 start 🔰 Webbased Debri 🔤 Round 1 🐚 Rant Stop Pro - Images 🖉 🖉

	2	1 india 16		< C						>	-++	AP1 2212
									that the primary ience of these is most		Dirternet	1040
i - Microsoft Internet Explorer	vortes Tools Help	💌 💌 🚺 🔑 Seaton 💥 Favores 🐨 France 😸 🔯 - 🥁 🔝 - 🔛 🛃 - 🔜 🛃	- 😸 Search Web - 🥨 🗗 Obtobed 🕤 Antolfi 🛃 Optons 🥒	Question 3	ormfortable with my level of knowledge and experience in regard to answering the question below.	ongly disagree agree	decided	ongly Agree	wo schools of thought regarding the research experience accomplished in a masters program. One is the naster's degree is in the hands-on lab experience gained. The other school of thought is that the experien and completing a research project and writing a thesis is equally valuable. In your experience-which of the o the future success of the student-the hands-on experience gained or the completion of the thesis? click Save when you are finished.	Save & Continue Seve & Exit		l Web-based Dedark 🌄 Round 1 😽 Paint Stop Pro - Brag
Web-based Del	The Edit Wew	Defence Shine fun	Google -		I feel very	000		0	There are value of a organizin important Be sure b		Done	l start

	22	ris ×		>	-#	2.610
		3	needs, or it can have should be focused on	3	Internet	2 1 6 8 1 (s) 212
	Favorites 💞 Meda 🔕 🙆 💑 📓 - 🧾 🤀 🔅 🕉	20Quet	Question 4 owledge and experience in regard to answering the question below.	Seve & Continue Seve & Exit		💘 Part Stop Pro - Imag
net Explorer	🖉 Search 🤺	hound id. asp?ID=5	my level of kni sters program local focus. T orkforce need you are finist			E Round 1
elphi - Microsoft Interi	Favortes Tools Heb	(www.sged.tamu.edu/deph/	rry comfortable with I Strongly disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly Agree ssional science mat specific regional or egional or national w b to click Save when			🛃 Web-based Depte
Web-based D	rle Edt Ven	Address () http://	A profe a more local, re Be sure		Cone	start

	V N Go Links	asters program in	S Internet
nsed (belphi - Misrosoft Internet Explorer New Favortes Tools Help	・ 🕟 - 🛃 🛃 🏠 🖉 Search 🌟 Favorites 🥶 Media 🐼 🙆 🍰 📓 - 🔜 🕼 🖧 🍰	Guestion 5 eel very comfortable with my level of knowledge and experience in regard to answering the question below. Strongly disagree O indecided O indecided	

	 S60 LPRS 	¢			ology?		>	S Internet	1 1 4 2 1 6 2 2 2 M
Web-based Delphi - Microsoft Internet Explorer e Edit Wew Favortes Tools Heip	🕽 Back + 🚫 - 💌 🕰 🕼 🔑 Search 🌟 Favortes 😻 Neda 🐼 🔗 🔄 📓 + 🦲 🚯 🤱 🕉 🐇	00gle - Stant Web - Stant Web - Stant Barton Stant Sta	I feet very comfortable with my level of knowledge and experience in regard to answering the question below. O Strongly disagree O Disagree	O Undecided O Agree Strongly Agree	What roles are appropriate for an industry advisory committee for a professional science masters program in biotechno Be sure to click Save when you are finished.		Save & Continue Save & Exit	Done	j Statt 🔰 Web-tesed Dephi 🕞 Rund 1 💘 Park Ship Pro - Indy

trongly Agree trongly Agree in biotechnology should have to be considered employable? (i.e. s). o click Save when you are finished.	gree trongly Agree	trongly disagree lisagree ndecided	r comfortable with my level of knowledge and experience in regard to answering the	Question 7	erw.eged.terru.edu/delph/nourd1d.eg/21D=528.0_7 Search Web 🔹 💋 40 blocked 🗐 Autoriti 🛃 Options 🥒
---	-----------------------	--	--	------------	---
	V 🛃 Ga Linis »	¢	 Internet 	2	
---	---	---	---	---	
Veb-based Delphi - Mismooft Internet Explorer Edit Vew Favortes Tools Help) Back · 💟 · 💌 😂 🕼 🔑 Search 💥 Fervates 🤠 Meda 🕙 💋 · 🥥 📓 · 🕌 🕒 🖓 🕉 ass 💩 http://www.aged.tamu.edu/deth/incurdid.agr/D=526Q=0 ogle · 🔰 💧 Search Web · 🐼 🛃 40 thoched 🗐 Activity 🛃 Options 🥒	Iteles wery confortable with my level of knowledge and experience in regard to answering the question below. Strongly disagree Cundecided Undecided Strongly Agree Strongly Agree Number of an experience in regard to answering the question below. Oundecided Strongly Agree Strongly Agree Strongly Agree Oundecided Strongly Agree Strongly Agree Strongly Agree Strongly Agree Strongly Agree Strongly Agree 	Date of the second s	start 📑 web tand Debri 📩 Rourd 1 👘 Part Stop Pro - Imeg	

APPENDIX B

EMAILS SENT TO PROSPECTIVE PANELISTS

EMAIL TO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM IN

BIOTECHNOLOGY REQUESTING REFERRALS

I am conducting a Delphi study to develop a model for a professional science master's program combining biotechnology and business. The specific objectives of the study are (1) to identify and clarify critical core components that should be included in the program, (2) to identify differences in priorities of industry and academic professionals for a program of this nature, and (3) to evaluate the Web as a mechanism for conducting Delphi research.

This study could provide valuable data to inform course and program development for this new type of Master's degree program. Decision-makers at education institutions rely heavily on published information when redirecting resources in support of these programs for science students. Studies like this one provide that information.

Today, I am asking for your assistance in identifying other people who could contribute to this process. Your participation is strictly voluntary and will be greatly appreciated. In order to identify the very best people for this Delphi panel, please recommend at least two other people, here at TAMU or nationally, that you think would have the necessary expertise to participate in this process. Again, your contributions will remain strictly confidential.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

EMAIL TO PANEL REQUESTING

THEIR PARTICIPATION AND REFERRALS

I am conducting a Delphi study to develop a model for a professional science master's program combining biotechnology and business. The specific objectives of the study are (1) to identify and clarify critical core components that should be included in the program, (2) to identify differences in priorities of industry and academic professionals fro a program of this nature, and (3) to evaluate the Web as a mechanism for conducting Delphi research.

This study could provide valuable data to inform course and program development for this new type of master's degree program. Decision-makers at education institutions rely heavily on published information when redirecting resources in support of these programs for science students. This is an opportunity for you to influence those decisions.

Knowing the demands made on your time already, we have designed the study so that it would be more convenient for you. It will be available on-line, and does not have to be completed all at one time. You may answer as many questions online as you have time for, exit, then return later to continue anytime you find a minute.

Delphi studies, unlike surveys, provide participants with more than one opportunity to engage with the topic. Your initial responses allow us to refine our questions, clarify issues, and expose new issues that we, as a Delphi panel, need to examine. This process normally takes between 2 and four "rounds." Each of these "rounds" will be available online 7-24 for approximately 2 weeks. The entire process will be completed in approximately 8 weeks.

Through my professional contact with you, I have identified you as a person who would bring valuable expertise to this Delphi panel. The panel will consist of approximately 20 individuals identified for their expertise in biotechnology research, business, or education.

Today, I am asking for your assistance with two tasks. First, I would like for you to serve on this Delphi Panel. Secondly, I would like your help in identifying other people who could contribute to this process. You may choose to do both, either, or neither, but in any case please respond to this email informing me of your choice.

Your participation is strictly voluntary and will be greatly appreciated. Your identity will be confidential and you may withdraw from the study at any time. There is no personal risk involved. When all panelists have been confirmed, I will email the URL of the study's website to the panelists. All panelists will have the option of participating via the web or through more traditional, paper and US Postal Mail, methods.

Please consider participating in this study. Whether or not you decide to participate, please help identify the very best people for this Delphi panel by recommending at least three other people that you think would have the necessary expertise to participate in this process. Again, your contributions will remain strictly confidential.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

EMAIL TO NOMINEES OF PANEL

I am conducting a Delphi study to develop a model for a professional science master's program combining biotechnology and business. The specific objectives of the study are (1) to identify and clarify critical core components that should be included in the program, (2) to identify differences in priorities of industry and academic professionals fro a program of this nature, and (3) to evaluate the Web as a mechanism for conducting Delphi research.

You have been identified by your peers as a person who could bring considerable expertise to this study. The panel will consist of approximately 20 individuals identified for their expertise in biotechnology research, business, or education.

This study could provide valuable data to inform course and program development for this new type of master's degree program. Decision-makers at education institutions rely heavily on published information when redirecting resources in support of these programs for science students. This is an opportunity for you to influence those decisions.

Knowing the demands made on your time already, we have designed the study so that it would be more convenient for you. It will be available on-line, and does not have to be completed all at one time. You may answer as many questions online as you have time for, exit, then return later to continue anytime you find a minute.

Delphi studies, unlike surveys, provide participants with more than one opportunity to engage with the topic. Your initial responses allow us to refine our questions, clarify issues, and expose new issues that we, as a Delphi panel, need to examine. This process normally takes between 2 and four "rounds." Each of these "rounds" will be available online 7-24 for approximately 2 weeks. The entire process will be completed in approximately 8 weeks.

Your participation is strictly voluntary and will be greatly appreciated. Your identity will be confidential and you may withdraw from the study at any time. There is no personal risk involved. When all panelists have been confirmed, I will email the URL of the study's website to the panelists. All panelists will have the option of participating via the web or through more traditional, paper and US Postal Mail, methods.

Please consider participating in this study. Again, your contributions will remain strictly confidential.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX C

FOLLOW UP EMAIL TO PANELISTS AFTER ROUND 1

April 11, 2003

In response to different questions throughout the study, five people suggested that programs should offer two or more tracks for students. Before we go on to Round 2, we need to clarify the issue of offering different tracks for students because it will determine how questions are structured for Round 2. The different responses regarding tracks are listed below. Please read them and respond to this email and tell us if you think a professional master's program should offer two or more tracks or should it concentrate on one set of skills for all students. The responses regarding tracks are listed below:

Response 1:

"For the third option it might be possible to have two separate tracks in a professional program, one for the technical or research oriented person and one for the more general management of lab management person."

Response 2:

"The biotechnology field is vast (as alluded to in the last question). I would say that several categories of knowledge and skills would be appropriate, with specific geared to the industry and level the student aspires to."

Response 3:

"You might also consider a Prof M.S. with various tracks, some of which might have a wet-bench component...e.g., emphasis in proteomics."

Response 4:

"There can be no ONE program to meet the needs of all students however, a program that started with "all aspects of industry" and then branched off to several specialty areas would be ideal. Specialty areas should include not only laboratory functions but also drug discovery, product development, preclinical, human factors, clinical, regulatory, and medical writing areas. Most students may be initially attracted to one aspect of a program only to find out later they are more interested in some other aspect. The needs of the local, regional and national workforce are such students should be exposed to all job functions in order to fill all the gaps. "

Response 5:

A separate presentation of analytical methods would have great value, however these disciplines can be very diverse and specialized. To suggest that a single graduating master's professional would need to be somewhat proficient in all techniques is ambitious. If the approach could be targeted to a particular discipline, that may have merit and present options to the student. Examples follow:

- 1. QC methods, classical biotechnology:
 - a. HPLC
 - b. SDS-PAGE Electrophoresis and 2D gels
 - c. Southern/Northern blotting
 - d. Western blotting
 - e. Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR)
 - f. Protein analysis (BCA/Lowery)
 - g. Endotoxin analysis
- 2. QC methods, Cellular Therapies:
 - a. Flow Cytometry
 - b. Cell Counting-hemacytometer
 - c. Trypan blue cell evaluation
 - d. ELISA
 - e. LAL
 - f. Coulter-cell counter
- 3. Manufacturing production:
 - a. Classical fermentation-prokaryotes, fungi
 - b. Roller Bottle cell expansion
 - c. Stirred Tank production (eukaryotic cells)
 - d. Hollow fiber continuous feed systems
 - e. Fluidized beds
 - f. Classical chromatography
 - i. Size exclusion
 - ii. Ion exchange
 - iii. Affinity
 - iv. Etc
 - g. Filtration
 - i. End point
 - ii. UF
 - iii. DF

APPENDIX D

ROUND 2 INSTRUMENT

	22	Linius 🍋	c					×	1	2:35 PM
		3		iesday, May 14, 2003, weeks. Responses	a professional masters les appropriate for	on, you will be asked to orking toward		opment-rather than any ing experience that chomotor skill development in an effort	Internet	249622
			Round 2 hi for Identifying Critical Components of a Masters' Program in Biotechnology	rd will be available for two weeks beginning Wed	acks or areas of emphasis should be provided in ound, we will identify tracks and those competenc	sbility, evaluation and compensation. In this quest ell as other issues that were identified, to begin w n.		of the development and emphasis on cognitive development and emphasized the need for a learn either cognitive development or cognitive and psychomotor vs. cognitive them the standpoint of psychomotor vs. cognitive		💐 Part Stop Pro
Explorer	Search - Favortes	nd2.esp serit web • 50 El eo Nool	se of a Web-based Delp Professional Scienc	eb-based Delphi. This rou 28, 2003. You may return rized as follows	dedge ajority think that different logy and business. In this	in emerged-time, respon the four dimensions, as v level within each dimensi		xperience or thesis thesis on psychomotor s sets. Eighteen out of twent then product emphasizing will approach the questio this issue.		🙆 Roud 2
i Delphi - Microsoft Internet	w Favortes Tools Help	or(hwww.oped.terru.edu/defhiltour		ome to Round 2 of this we inding Wednesday, May 2 Round 1 have been organ	stion 1: Skills and know onses indicate that the m am combining blotechnol s and for core cumculum.	tion 2: Ideal Internship dimensions of an internsh and specifically to each of ensus on the appropriate	Time Responsibility Evaluation Compensation Other	tion 3: Hands-on lab e. dimensions emerged -em lasts on thesis vs. non-the nated in some type of writ opment. In this round, we we toward consensus on		🛃 Web-based Debhi
Web-based	File Eck We	Address al http: Consile -	6	Welc and e from	Que: Resp progr track	Que: Four conse	≓લંજં¥છં	Ques Two - empt culmi devel	Done Cone	🐮 start

	*	Linia 8	(>	1.04	ALB Z PM
	8 8 2	8	cognitive development-rather than any need for a learning experience that gnitive and psychomotor skill for vs. cognitive development in an effort	e issue of specialized knowledge and will be addressed in question 1. In addressed in Question 1.	or the same position. To simplify the to agree with those titles that seem	s program. In this round, you will	d on the number of hours, which ranged ed on outcomes or the kinds of rould that be considered when	sidered in this study. Only those issues tese topics are not worthy of further	Dinternet	「日本国人
	tes 💞 Prodo 🙆 🙆 🛃 📃	A obtacted 1 Advin Cottons	chomotor skill development and emphasis on chomotor skill development and emphasis on out of twenty-four responses emphasized the n nphasizing either cognitive development or co. the question from the standpoint of psychomot	cus prepare for a national job market. However, the ndustry needs, also emerged in this question a s solved or is related to the issue of the tracks	Ins appropriate for new graduates my people seemed to be using different titles for provided) has been provided with the option t	oard sory board for a professional science master's d address any roles that may be lacking.	experience for recent graduates nours and outcomes. Some responses focuse of full-time experience. Other responses focuse nours. Given the emerging issue of "tracks", sh	red to choose those, if any, that should be cons will be pursued further. This is not to say that th is time as part of this study?		🙀 Part Sho Pro-(r2n
Explorer	Search 🌟 Favo	vd2.asp serch Web • 🚮	phasis on psy ssis. Eighteen ten product er will approach i this issue.	or national fo ad the need to al or regional i this question i	sional position given and ma titles (reference ional titles.	ry advisory b in industry advi int with each an	t of hands-on other of actual f to one year of er than actual f	consider You will be asl ble as relevant to pursue at th		Pourd 2
Delphi - Microsoft Internet	v Farottes Tools Help	(//www.aged.tamu.edu/de/ph/hour	imensions emerged -err asis on thesis vs. non-the lated in some type of wri prment. In this round, we is toward consensus on	tion 4: Local, regional en responses emphasize , rather than focus on loc und, we will determine if	tion 5: Kinds of profes ad range of answers was on, a list of specific job t appropriate or add addit	tion 6: Roles of Indust oles were identified for a be your level of agreeme	tion 7: Expected level: imensions emerged-nur aro (at the graduate leve ences students had rath ssing this issue?	tion 8: Other issues to n issues were identified. I of by a majority of peor but are they appropriate		A Web-besed Debth
Web-based I	File Edit View	Address a http:	Two di emptis culmin develo to mov	Quest Thirtee tracks this rou	Quest A broc questi most a	Quest Nine n indicat	Quest Two di from z experi addres	Quest Elever identifi study,	Done Done	A start

🗿 Web-based Delphi - Microsoft Internet Explorer			
File Edit Wew Favorites Tools Help			1
🚱 Back 🔹 🕥 - 💌 🌌 🐔 🔎 Search 🤺 Faront	** 😍 hada 🕹 🙆 🛃 🗟	🛚 · 💟 🚯 🕉	
Address 🛃 http://www.oged.tamu.edu/debhi/Round2_1.asp700=52		3	Links »
Google - · · · · · ·	Protected Transfer a optime	· ·	
Question 1, Round 2 Responses to question 1 indicate that the maj professional masters program emphasizing i provided. Please answer each question below	ority think that different tracks or biotechnology and business as completely as possible	r areas of emphasis should be provided in a . A sample of responses that support tracks is also	<
Question 1.1 What kind of tracks or areas of emphasis shou biotechnology?	lid be developed for a professio	onal masters program emphasizing business and	
		8	
Question 1.2 What skills and knowledge should be included provided a list of competencies identified in R	in specific tracks and what shou ound 1.	uld be included in core curriculum? We have	
 If you think the competency belongs in a If you think the compentency belongs in t radio button for "core" If you think the competency is not approp button. 	specialized track, choose the ra he core curriculum for all student riate for core or track or it is out	adio button for "track". Its, regardless of what track they are in, choose the Itside your area of expertise, choose the "blank"	
			×
Done Done		Internet	14
😼 start 🔰 Webbased Debri 🐱 Rourd 2	😽 Part StopPro	2 10 2 1 2 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	1139 FM

• A loss of Depth Altsmark Logicity 		22		Links N		¢			1.										>	1	2:40 PM
Lister Conditional Lighter All Conditional Lighter Condine Lighter Conditional Lighter Condit Ligh				8		orized the answers into									a variety of audiences					 Internet 	2040
Bink Favortes Tots Netrosoft Internet Explores Edit New Favortes Tots Neb Edit New Favortes Tots Neb Bink - O Important Internet Explored Important Internet Explored Bink - O Important Internet Explored Importex Important			* Favortes 💞 Media 🚱 🙆 🔏 📓 - 🧾 🚯 🕉 🕉		👘 🗗 40 blocked 🗐 Autoriti 🛃 Options 🥒	onse to Question 1 in Round 1. We have summarized and catego business, technical and industry specific.	Employability	Making posters	Preparing an abstract for a meeting	Present a business plan for a biotechnology company	Present findings with Powerpoint type presentation	Proposal writing	Scientific and technical writing	Writting brief trip reports	Writing on, speaking about and presenting technical material to with varying levels of knowledge in the field	Experimental design *Appropriate controls *Potential sources of error *Other experiments needed before drawing final conclusions *Interpreting data *Planning the next step	Critical thinking skills	Problem solving skills	Literature review skills		z 💘 Part Stop Pro - rûgts
Back Leighti - Microsoft Internet Edit New Favortes Tods Heb Back - O Image: Tods Heb Back - O Image: Tods Heb Simple Hebrichterun adu/det/Hito Simple Hebrichterun adu/det/Hito Simple C Image: Tods Hebrichterun adu/det/Hito Simple C Simple Hebrichterun adu/det/Hito Simple C Image: Tods Hebrichterun adu/det/Hito Simple C Image: Tods Hebrichterun adu/det/Hito Simple C Simple C Blank C Thack C OCore Simple C O Blank C Thack C Ocore C O Blank C Thack C Ocore C <t< td=""><td>t Explorer</td><td></td><td>Search</td><td>und2_1.45p780</td><td>Search Web</td><td>ills d as a resp bloyability, t</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Second Second</td></t<>	t Explorer		Search	und2_1.45p780	Search Web	ills d as a resp bloyability, t															Second Second
Back Mean Farvates Tot Back 	ft Interne	s Help	3	duldelphiltic	-	and Sk Jenerate ries: emp		O Core	O Core	OCore	O Core	O Core	O Core	Core	O Core	O Care	OCore	Core	OCore		belahi
eb beread Delpl Edit New Fa Buck • Buck • Buck • Buck • Buck • Buck • Buck • Blank	Ni - Microso	workes Tool	1	-aged temu.e		nowledge flow was g		OTrack	OTrack	OTrack	OTrack	OTrack	O Track	O Track	Track	OTrack	 Track 	O Track	Track		Web-based (
	eb-based Delph	Edit View Fa	Back • O	sse 🗳 http://www	gle -	List of Kr The list be four gener		 Blank 	 Blank 	 Blank 	Blank	Blank	Blank	OBlank	O Blank	 Blank 	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	8	start 3

	22		Links *		<						1.									>	+	1441.641
		B 35	8							trained in biology or biotechnology	ember of a research team	s-section of people					f the field		ulture, emvironmental, human health,		Internet	2000
		7 Farotes 💞 Meda 🚱 🙆 🖉 - 🥃 🗷 - 🧾 💬 🤉	-52	🔹 🍏 🖥 40 blocked 🕤 Autoriti 📑 🛃 Options 🥒	Literature review skills	Interpretation of scientific literature	Trouble shooting	Understanding other people's research	Teamwork in scientific investigation	Working on teams with professionals who are not tr	Work both as an individual and as a productive mer	Interpersonal skills-ability to work with diverse cross	Resume writing	Interviewing skills	Ethics of research and business	Eagemess to adapt to new directions	Awareness of history, current state and direction of	Time management	How biotechnology is used in different fields-agricuettc.	Business		z 😻 Part Stop Pro - rögib
4 Explorer		Search 🗙	ound2_1.asp?ID	Search Web																		Second Second
ft Interne	diaries and	0	du/delphi/Pic	-	O Core	O Core	O Core	Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	Core	O Care	O Core	Core	O Core	Core	Core	O Core			kelthi
ii - Microso	worites Tool	1	r-sped-terru-e		 Track 	OTrack	 Track 	OTrack	 Track 	O Track	 Track 	OTrack	 Track 	Track	O Track	OTrack	O Track	O Track	 Track 			web-based (
ased Delph	Wew Fa	0	Http://www	L	OBlank	 Blank 	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	Blank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	Blank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank			E C
Web-b	Fie EQ	Back	Address	Google.																	E) Done	star

Image: A manual function in the main fun
Internet Lapter Image: Total Internet Lapter Image: Total Internet Lapter Image: Total Image
Ii - Microsoft Intermet Explore Motes Tods Mot Motes Mot Search Appet Learus ad (Abbh/Round2, Lang Motes Search Web Appet Learus ad (Abbh/Round2, Lang Motes Motes Appet Learus (Abbh/Round2,
 Mitcrmont Mitcrmont Mitcrmont Mitcrmont Allertmanued Track Trac

Web-based	Delphi - Microso	ft Internet	et Explorer		
File Edit View	Favorites Too	da Help			ł.
G Back -	2 × · C	0	🖓 Sauch 🌟 Favories 😻 Mada 🐼 🙆 🍰 📓 - 🧾 🤀	57 CP	
Address A http:	(/www.oged.teru.e	du/delphi/P.ou	Round2_1.esp?tD=52	8	Links *
Google -		5	🏷 Search Web 👻 🐻 🗗 40 blocked 👔 Autorit 🛃 options 🥒		
OBla	nk OTrack	 Core 	e Contract law		C
			Technical		
OBIa	nk © Track	O Core	e Agarose Gel Electrophoresis		
OBIa	nk OTrack	Core	 Apply basic principles to new situations in the use of including writing algorithms 	computers and computer software,	
OBIa	nk Track	O Core	e Automated sequencing		
OBIa	nk OTrack	Core	 Awareness of differences that can occur with difference 	nt lots of reagent	
OBIa	nk © Track	O Core	e Bioinformatics		
Bla	nk O Track	O Core	e Elostatistics		
OBIa	nk Track	O Core	e Northern blotting		
OBIa	nk OTrack	Core	e Southern blotting		
OBla	nk OTrack	Core	e Western blotting		
OBIa	nk Track	O Core	e cDNA library construction		
OBIa	nk O Track	Core	e Cell therapies		
OBIa	nk OTrack	O Core	e Cloning a gene		
OBIa	nk OTrack	O Core	e DNA isolation		
OBla	nk OTrack	O Core	e DNA sequencing		
OBIa	nk O Track	O Core	 Expression profiling (microarrays) 		
OBla	nk OTrack	O Core	 In situ hybridization 		-
a) Dense		ć	العاد فقحم فمحمصا مقامس	S Internet	>
🐮 start	Mich-based	Detri	😂 Round 2 酸 Paint Shap Ino - ràigid	2045	2:43 PM

	22		D Links *		3											.01	1							>	-	2:44 BM
			•																						 Internet 	2049
		9444 🙆 🙆 🍒 🗷 - 🛄 🤀 🔅 🕉		bioched 🚡 Autoriti 🛛 🛃 Options 🥒	dization	slation	scription	of gene expression	gents	creening	ic labeling techniques	A isolation	nide gel electrophoresis	nerase Chain Reaction)	pime	ression, isolation and characterization		inscription	fication	afety	safety	afety	on	11		🎉 Paint Shap Sho - rigite
Explorer		Search 🌟 Favortes 🤮	nd2_1.asp?ID=52	earch Web 🔹 🦚 🗗 40	In situ hybr	In vitro trar	In-vitro tran	Knowledge	Making re-	Microbials	Non-isotop	Poly(A) RN	Polyacryla	PCR (Poly	PCR-Real	Protein ex	Proteomic	Reverse tr	RNA ampl	Chemical	Laboratory	Radiation	RNA isolat	SDS-PAG		🙆 Round 2
ft Internet	diat s	0	du/delphi/Rou	•	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Care	O Core	O Core		kelphi
hi - Microsol	svorites Tool	1	w-oped-terrulet		O Track	 Track 	OTrack	O Track	O Track	O Track	O Track	OTrack	OTrack	O Track	OTrack	O Track	OTrack	 Track 	OTrack	OTrack	O Track	O Track	 Track 	OTrack		Web-based D
Web-based Delp	File Edit Wew Fa	G Back -	Address 🗿 http://www	Google -	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	O Blank	OBlank	OBlank	O Blank	O Blank	OBlank	OBlank	Done Done	start 3

	-		o Links *		3																		>	*	M 245 M
			•																					S Internet	2025
		0 B &																							
		tada 🙆 🙆 👹 📓 - 🛄		ocked 👔 Autoriti 🔤 Options 🥒		d mutagenesis techniques	organ replacement	e		IOI	sria	cular biology software	n-viral gene therapy	Industry Specific	atory Practice (GLP)	acturing Practice (GMP)	diatory process	al Practice (GCP)	e Practice (GTP)		nsider documents	scuments	notebooks In datatic of avnarimente		💘 Part Sup fro-right
Explorer		Search 🌟 Favortes 🥙	vd2_1.esp?t0=52	arch web 🔹 🦪 🗗 40 bi	SDS-PAGE	Site directed	Tissue and o	Tissue cultur	Transfection	Transformati	Use of bacte	Use of mole	Viral and not		Good Labor	Good Manuf	Federal regu	Good Clinics	Good Tissue	21CFRx00	Points to Co	Guidance do	Keeping lab		🙆 Round 2
ft Internet	s Help	0	du/delphi/Hour	- B	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core		O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core			Xelphi
hi - Microsol	svorites Tool	1	w-eged-terrule		OTrack	OTrack	OTrack	O Track	O Track	OTrack	O Track	O Track	OTrack		OTrack	OTrack	OTrack	OTrack	OTrack	O Track	O Track	OTrack			Web-based E
Web-based Delp	File Edit Wew Fi	G Back - O	Address 🗿 http://www	Google -	OBlank	OBlank	O Blank	O Blank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	O Blank		O Blank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank		Done Done	🖞 start 🔰 🧧

	22		Links N		٢.													>		2:45.84
		5 B 3	8					ment	ment	opment	ulture		10.5%			S needs for biotech companies	inderstanding of HVAC, water systems, facility		Internet	04907
er		📌 Favories 💞 Mada 🕗 🔗 🌺 🕱 .	sp/10=52	eb 🔹 👘 🖥 et blocked 🗐 Autoriti 🔤 Options 🥒	Guidance documents	Keeping lab notebooks *Recording details of experiments *When experiments were done *Conclusions drawn *Signed off by supervisor	Intellectual property issues	Understanding drug discovery & develop	Know about current drugs under developi	Know about medical devices under deve	Understand value and role of corporate c	Survey of biotechnology industry	Acquiring funding for biotech companies	ISO 9000	Biotechnology market knowledge	Basic Information Technology (IT) and MI	Facility design and engineering ("Basic u layout and design)	Quality Assurance *Materials management and control		ound 2 😽 Part Stap Pro-12419
internet Explo	Help	Search	delphi/Round2_1.	Search W	O Care	O Care	O Core	O Core	O Care	O Core	O Core	O Care	O Core	O Core	O Care	O Core	Core			0
i - Microsoft I	vortes Tools	1	-aged terru eduly		O Track (O Track (O Track (O Track	O Track (O Track (O Track (O Track (O Track (O Track (O Track (O Track (O Track (Web-based Delp
Teb-based Delph	Edit Wew Fav	Back - O -	ess 🗿 http://www.	ogle -	OBlank	Bank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	O Blank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	1	orre	start 3

	4		Linio N		<												>		2:45 PM
		D 23 48	•				ds for biotech companies	tanding of HVAC, water systems, facility			deline							D Internet	0 4 8 B A
		vortes 💕 Meda 🚱 🙆 👹 🖬 🗸 🗾 🔮		🐉 🛃 et blocked 🗐 Admin 🛃 options 🤌	0000	iotechnology market knowledge	asic Information Technology (IT) and MIS need	acility design and engineering (*Basic underst yout and design)	uality Assurance *Materials management and control *Change control *Documentation systems *Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) *Validation	noviledge of clinical trials process	termational Conference on Harmonization Guid	ational and International Scope of Interest	reclinical testing	uman Factors testing	linical testing	ledical writing	Sove Answers	Paint Shop Pro - r2q1h	By Part Press Pro-rough
Explorer		Search Stra	nd2_1.asp7ID=52	earch Web - §	21	0		ш	0	×	Ē	Z		I	0	2			Proved 2
t Internet	Help	0	huldelphilhou	5	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core	OCore	O Core	O Core	O Core	O Core			elphi
ii - Microsof	svortes Tools	1	-aged.tamu.ed		O Track	OTrack	OTrack	OTrack	Track	OTrack	OTrack	OTrack	 Track 	O Track	OTrack	O Track			Web-based D
Web-based Delpi	File Edit New Fo	📀 Back - 🜔 -	Iddress Bhttp://www	Google -	OBlank	OBlank	O Blank	OBlank	O Ellank	O Blank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	OBlank	O Blank		Done Done	stan 3

	22		Links *	4							>	4	1:45 PM
		Mada 🚱 🔗 👹 🖬 👡 🖨 🕄 🕉		Noted Distort de Occas	ideal internship? Inship emerged-time, responsibility, evaluation and compensation. The range of mension, the answers have been arranged on a scale to provide a tinuum, but examples of responses most representative of each level on the ope of the answers. Please read ALL the answers listed with each dimension in to fittis question, please base your answers on the ideal internship you are hip should be one year long, then base your ideal level of responsibility and al with time, responsibility, evaluation and compensation in four individual	ip vary from one month to one year to experiences combining industry and f answers that best reflect the different levels of response are given below. sp in mind that your response to this question should reflect what you think is in a professional masters program combining biotechnology and business. norths long the internship should be. Other issues such as level of lifferent part of this question. Frequencies are provided in parenthesis.		th and preferably two or three months with a company or institute separate vant.	ably okay, given that it is at least 8 weeks and that the project in mind can be	semester off-campus.		Internet	🍓 Part Strokto - Img 🔰 🛃 💰 🄇
Explorer		Search 🔆 Favortes 🥰	nd2_2_1.esp?10=52	au web . 🕲 🗗 🕬 u a	would constitute the dimensions of an inter siderably. Within each y response on the con you an idea of the sco vyou answer each pa internship. We will de internship. We will de	ed time of the internst a co-op. Examples o efore answering, Ke tramship for a student terms of how many n il be considered in a (:0	volve at least one mor r is not especially rele	sy that any time is prob ne.	ild be restricted to one	100		😂 Rourd 2
slphi - Microsoft Internet	Favorites Tools Help	0 2 2 2 0	www.eged.temu.edu/delphi/Rour	8	2, Question 2: What vane to question 2. Four inse to question 2. Four ers for each varied con im are provided to give providing a response. A ing. For example, if you restion on that length of r this question.	ponses for recommend experiences, similar to read all responses b if fine for an in response, think only in ibility and evaluation wi	les of responses give	nths (6) deal internship would in university. Time of yea	development is so craz ted within that time fram	th of the internship shou	nths (4)		🗿 Web-based Delphi
Web-based De	File Edit View	G Back -	Address Shttp://	- 31800D	Round In respo of answ continuu continuu before p describi describi parts for	I. Time The rest campus Please For this For this respons	Examp	0.3 mor 1. The ic from the	2. Drug complet	3. Lengt	4-6 mol	Corre	🐮 start

luddress 🍓 http://www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/Round2_2_1.asp?ID=/	20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2	Tinks #
Google - 👘 Search Web 👻	🐼 🔂 40 bisched 🚡 Autorit 🛃 options 🥒	
 4-6 months (4) 4. Ideal intemship situation for the company takes time to train someone and it often isn time 	y would be a long-term situation (longer than a semester if possible) only because it it worth the time it takes to train an intern because they are with a company such a short	C.
The internship should be very short (8 we company short to limit resource commitmer person to be adequately trained to so that h point of view.	seks) or fairly long (4-6 months). The short one keeps the time commitment from the at but allows the student to learn some interesting things. The longer term allows the he/she may actually contribute to the work. Time of year is irrelevant from the company's	
Longer than 6 months (8) 6. A one year internship that is full time in th afterwards to finish the project and write up	is summer and preceded by part time work to set up the project and part time work the results.	
 A rotating internship which is broken up t is ideal example: summer- intern; fall- class allows a student to grow and develop in lew back they would begin a new project or wor 	by 1 semester of study and allows the student to return 2-3 times to the same company s; spring-intern, summer-class, fall - intern, spring-class. The reason being that this el of responsibility each time they return to the company. Ideally each time they came ik in a different area of the company.	
 Two levels of internship 1. Short-term (me basically to familiarize intern with aspects o employee and employer in cases where this considered for long-term in the same field. responsibilities. This would further expose a functional skills. At the end of this, intern sho 	aybe one summer term) early in program with more administrative responsibilities of working in a corporate environment. Shorter commitment would work well for both is is a mismatch. If intern makes it through the short-term internship, could be 2. Long-term (maybe whole fall or spring semester) with higher level, functional students to the corporate environment and development of their work ethic and ould be able to work at an entry level job at most biotech companies.	
9. One Year Assistant to VP Business Devi	elopment of a Biotech Company	
10.3 months, 6 months, one year, doesn't n would like the option to hire immediately fol	matter unless the end of the internship doesn't release the student for employment (we llowing the internship).	
	Save Answers	>
		I

Web-based	Delphi - Microsoft Internet	Explorer			
File Edit No	w Favorites Tools Help				22
Back -	0 0 0 0 0	Search of Favortes	uda 🙆 🙆 👹 🛛 - 📔	0 B &	
Address 🛃 http	r.//www.sged.temu.edu/delphi/Rou	vd2_2_2.asp?ID=52		8	Links *
Google -	5	arch Web - 🍘 🗗 40 bl	ocked 🚡 Autoriti 🛃 Options 🥒		
Rour In res contin befor descr comp parts	1d 2, Question 2: What ponse to question 2: four swers for each varied con nuum We did not put ever nuum are provided to give a providing a response. A ibing. For example, if you ensation on that length of for this question.	would constitute the i dimensions of an interr siderably. Within each y response on the conti you an idea of the scol is you answer each par internship. We will dea internship. We will dea	deal internship? ship emerged-time, responsib dimension, the answers have b nuum, but examples of respons oe of the answers. Please read t of this question, please base ip should be one year long, the liwith time, responsibility, evalu	Ifly, evaluation and compensation. The range een arranged on a scale to provide a ses most representative of each level on the ALL the answers listed with each dimension your answers on the ideal internship you are n base your ideal level of responsibility and ation and compensation in four individual	¢
II. Re Resp an int involv provic	sponsibility onses regarding level of r Jestion, please direct you emship. Please read eac e. For this response, thin ded below. Other dimensi	esponsibility range fron r answer to the level of t h answer carefully and l < only in terms of what ons will be addressed	n apprentice-level to just below esponsibility that you think sho eep in mind this relates to the level of responsibility should separately. Frequencies are pr	that of an entry-level employee. In this part of uld be expected for a masters level student in ideal time that you think and internship should ide expected and describe that in the space ovided in parenthesis.	
Exan	nples of responses give	:			
Low 1. Lev	Level (4) rel of responsibility would	be at an apprentice lev	el		
Mode 2. Re busin profe	rate Level (4) alistically, most internship ess and management sid ssional in one of the vario	s will not likely resemble to of science. Level of r us departments related	e what it is they really are drivin esponsibility variable, but ide to research, manufacturing, cli	g to do, which is to be involved in the ally, would start out by shadowing a nical, etc.	
A The 3. The quick	Level (5) i ideal would seem to me y as the student demonst	to be an internship that rates her/his ability to h	: begins with a low level of resp andle and desire to assume ac	onsibility and expectations and builds that as iditional responsibility, with a goal of having	2
Done				Dirterret	-
🐮 start	🛃 Web-based Delphi	😂 Kound Z	💘 Paint Shap Pro	S 2 2 2 2 2	M4 5512 1

	a.		Links a		C					10	>	*	2157 911
			8		o be involved in the ut by shadowing a	ectations and builds that as bility, with a goal of having	practiced (required for magine that level would be	or the intern to work				Internet	20676
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	[d 🚡 Auto Hi 🛛 🛃 Options 🥒	that it is they really are driving to do, which is sonsibility variable, but ideally, would start o research, manufacturing, clinical, etc.	sgins with a low level of responsibility and exp die and desire to assume additional responsi employee.	3.A or regulatory position) and the techniques would determine the level of responsibility. I i of OUT.	personality, but the ideal situation would be f	ill be sought upon earning the degree.	KI	Save Answers		Baint Shap Pro - ritigit
Explorer		Search 😿 Favorites 💕 Med	urd2_22.asp?10=52	earch Web 🔹 🛃 40 block	ps will not likely resemble v de of science. Level of resi ous departments related to	e to be an internship that b strates her/his ability to han same level as an entry-lev	on learned (especially in a g or process development) echnician with 3-12 months	d vary based on the intern's weekly oversight.	w a full-time position that w				🙆 Kardiz 🔰
Delphi - Microsoft Internet	w Favorites Tools Help		ou//www.aged.tamu.adu/delphi/Rou	5	srate Level (4) alistically, most internship ess and management sid ssional in one of the vario	Level (5) e ideal would seem to me by as the student demons term function much at the	plication of the informatic ons in QC, manufacturing stent with an entry level to	vel of responsibility would endently on projects with	hould be a half step belor				🛃 Web-based Delphi
Web-based	File Edit Vie	- Hack	Address A http:	Google -	Mode 2. Re busin profe	High 3. The quick the in	4. Ap positi consi	5. Lev indep	6. It si			Done Done	🐮 start

	a.		Links »		4						>	Inside the
			8		and compensation. The range 1 a scale to provide a entative of each level on the rs listed with each dimension the ideal internship you are al level of responsibility and ensation in four individual	ation, written report and/or ver and indicate which answer	Biotech companies have so up. Perhaps verbal	r should suffice as evaluation. Ig them. Otherwise, they get a	ideal for evaluation b/c it	pination, integrity, motivation,	Contract Contract	2025
		1446 🙆 🙆 · 👼 🗷 · 🧾 🤀 🔅 🕉		octed 📷 Patrictif 🛛 🛃 Options 🥒	ideal internship? Iship emerged-time, responsibility, evaluation a dimension, the answers have been arranged o nuum, but examples of responses most repres pe of the answers. Please read ALL the answers of this question, please base your answers or to finis question, please base your answers or p should be one year long, then base your ide i with time, responsibility, evaluation and comp	titve to quantitative means that result in a public uation of the internship. Please read each ansi juencies are provided in parenthesis.	evaluation should not be too time consuming. I b is have to take a long time to write something the student though.	r at the company to the intern's program adviso act with a limit of trauma to everyone surroundir	company evaluates its own employees with) is ance in a real life setting.	int employee - skills, attitude, contribution, ima		🍓 Part Stop Pro - Imag
Explorer		Search 😽 Favorbes 😍	nd2_2_3.asp?t0=52	earch web - 🦪 🗗 40 bk	would constitute the i dimensions of an interm nsiderably. Within each of response on the cont e you an idea of the scot As you answer each part u think the ideal intermship. We will deal f internship. We will deal	terms varied from qualits ve will address only eval sition on this issue. Freq	the company I think the of someone wants to do uid be as worthwhile to t	etter from the supervisor can get through the proje	lar in format to what the f their skills and perform	ould a full time permane e, lab skills, etc.	1-11-1 KEY	🖨 Round 2
Delphi - Microsoft Internet	Fevortes Tools Help	0 . 5 5 5	//www.eged.temu.edu/deph/Plou	560	d 2, Question 2: What onse to question 2, four wers for each varied con um. We did not put eve um are provided to giv providing a response bing. For example, if yo nisation on that length o or this question.	aluation inses on evaluation of in oduct. In this guestion, v nk best reflects your poi	ative (10) luation of the intern - for going on that the last this tion? Don't know if it wo	ompleted project and a l uid get a "pass" if they of Hard to grade otherwise	erformance review (simi the most realistic view o	evaluate them like we w ship, science knowledg		Web-based Dephi
Web-based I	File Edit Vew	G Back -	Address 🛃 http:/	Google -	Rounx In resp continu continu before descrit parts fo	Respo Respo end pro you thin	Qualit 1. Eval much g evaluar	2. A co All sho "fair. F	3. A pe gives t	4. We citizen:	A new	start

		Co Turks	b/c it	otivation, intem's	o, I view of the ind leably			>	Internet
	🕇 Favortes 💞 Mida 📀 🙆 🛃 · 🧾 🖨 👌 👶 🕉	p10-62	met to what the company evaluates its own employees with) is ideal for evaluation blo Ills and performance in a real life setting.	II time permanent employee - skills, attitude, contribution, imagination, integrity, motiv IIs, etc. It by a report on the internship prepared by the student and by feedback from the inte	stionnaire to be filled out by the company where the internship took place and also, I ould be part of the agenda as well. The written report should provide both on overvie products in the pipeline, their challenges, an overview of the company structure, and	the thesis and be written and defended in a similar manner. otentially publishable results.	8	Save Answers	
net Explorer	🖉 Search 🤺	(Round2_2_3.asp?)	similar in forme	e would a full t edge, lab skills antitative (5) should be both	evelop a quest the intern short internship.	mparable to the			
based Delphi - Microsoft Inter t New Favortes Tools Help		 http://www.aged.tamu.edu/dephi 	3. A performance review (s gives the most realistic view	 We evaluate them like w citizenship, science knowle Both Qualitative and Qua Evaluation of the intern si supervisor 	Quantitative (4) 8. Method of evaluation: De Delieve, a written report by 1 company, their products on where they fit in during the ii	 This project would be col The project would be one 			
File Ed	B IA	Address	8						E) Done

	ł.		Links *		4	1					>	-14	M8 101
		ى ئە ئە	8		valuation and compensation. The range tranged on a scale to provide a ost representative of each level on the the answers listed with each dimension inswers on the ideal internship you are a your ideal level of responsibility and and compensation in four individual	TE) non-student position. In your ideal sepect, what would be the reasonable se read all responses carefully and give	,000/month. For an 8 week internship,		(yer the company, the higher the pay.	Dirterret	2045
		Preda 🕗 🔗 🐇 🗷 - 🛄 🤀		blocked 🚡 Auto H 🛃 Options 🥒	e ideal internship? Imship emerged-time, responsibility, ev h dimension, the answers have been an minuum, but examples of responses mo tope of the answers. Please read ALL art of this question, please base your a art of this question, please base your a ship should be one year long, then base all with time, responsibility, evaluation a	aro to just below a full time equivalent (F id the level of responsibility you would e evel student to receive per month. Plea ncies are listed in parenthesis.	ttant and probably should be around \$1		ge and \$10/hr (\$880-\$1,600 per month	month)	.2,400 per month).		💘 Paint Shap Aro - 12405
Explorer		Search Stavates	nd2_2_4.asp?ID=52	earch web - 🔊 Bre	would constitute th dimensions of an inte nsiderably. Within eac ry response on the co syou an idea of the so As you answer each p u think the ideal intern i ntiemship. We will de	isation ranged from z gth of the internship a lid expect a master's ovided below. Freque	compensation is impo	r living expenses.	between minimum wa	nt (\$1,300-1,833 per	er the map depending \$15 per hour. (\$1,600		😸 Pound 2
Delphi - Microsoft Internet	Favorites Tools Help	0 0 0 0 0	(/www.eged.temu.edu/delphi/Plou	5	d 2, Question 2: What corse to question 2. four wers for each varied cor num. We did not put eve num are provided to give providing a response. / providing a response. / bing. For example, if you institon on that length of or this question.	mpensation nses regarding comper hip, considering the len f compensation you wou sponse in the space pro	ples of responses: Mhour (3) a long-term internship, c mation is not necessar	npensation should be for	gested compensation -	15/hour (3) -\$22k per year equivale	npensation will be all ow t anywhere from \$10 to \$		🗿 Web based Delphi
Web-based D	File Edit View	G Back -	Address 🛃 http:/	Google -	Rouns In resp continuu continuu before descrit parts fo	N. Co Respo internsi level of your re	50-510 50-510 1. For a	2. Con	3, Sugi	\$10-\$1 4. \$16-	5. Con Expect	Done Cone	🐮 start

Web-based Delphi - Micrusoft In	nternet Explorer		0	
Edit Wew Favorites Tools	Help			22
Back - 💽 - 💌 🕰 🌏	Search of Favo	rbs 💞 hida 🚱 🔓 🕹 📓 - 📙	0 A &	
ass 🛃 http://www.aged.tamu.edu/d	delphi/Round2_2_4.asp?ID=52		3.	Links »
ogle -	🛃 👘 Search Web 🔹 🕡	🗼 🛃 40 blocked 🗐 Autoria 📲 Options 🥒		
<pre>Examples of respons \$0-\$10/hour (3) 1. For a long-term intern compensation is not net</pre>	es: nship, compensation i cessary.	is important and probably should be arou	nd \$1,000/month. For an 8 week internship,	¢
2. Compensation shouk	d be for living expense	es.		
3. Suggested compensi	ation - between minim	num wage and \$10/hr (\$880-\$1,600 per	month)	
\$10-\$15/hour (3) 4. \$16-\$22k per year ec	quivalent (\$1,300-1,80	33 per month)		
 Compensation will be Expect anywhere from \$ 	e all over the map dep \$10 to \$15 per hour. (?	\$1,600-2,400 per month).	a bigger the company, the higher the pay.	
Near non-student FTE 6. Paid internships, abo because they provide no employee effort and rew	E level (4) We the normal univers eeded support for the vard.	sity student stipends but below entry-leve student and also because they create the	employee salaries, are desired, both e desired "causal" relationship between	
7. We pay slightly less th the family. (Approximate	han a FTE non-studer e FTE based on avers	nt. We do not pay benefits to temporary ages provided by Monster com: \$36,000	mployees. Otherwise, they become part of year [\$3,000/month or \$18.75/hour])	
Range of suggested : \$0-	salaries:	/000'8\$	month	
		Please type a numerical answer here. 2.000.00		
		Save Answers		>
ore			Internet	1
start 🔰 🚽 web-based Dept	N 🍋 Roudz	👹 Part Stop No - CQ3	2 (a) 4 (b) (a) 2 (c) 2 (c) 2	M8 201

V. In Question 2, we address you think there is another dia you ther factors to consider: These issues did not pertain to program. Please indicate your h appropriate. A. Working with a company	the four dimensions of internships-time, responsible ad four dimensions of internships-time, responsible the four dimensions identified, but may or may not be in evel of agreement with each by choosing the radio but that is familiar with the science master's curriculur	mp, evaluation and compensation. Do hese four? In under the response that you think is most m and goals.
Not important	Important, but not absolutely necessary	Important and necessary
B. Good supervision provid-	ed by the company.	
Not important	Important, but not absolutely necessary	Important and necessary
C. Both individual and team	experiences should be provide during the interns	hip.
Not important	Important, but not absolutely necessary	Important and necessary
D. The student and the scho program.	ol should evaluate the position each time to be su	re it should be continued within the
Not important	Important, but not absolutely necessary	Important and necessary
	Save Answers	

	22		Links *		¢				2	140	100 801
		0 2 3	8		igan on the side of hands-on experience erstand the problem and how what you are at the MS level. As such, I am in support of at	Experience in a cutting-edge laboratory is I believe the student must write a formal a addressed to a faculty, the report to	ould be introduction to working after careers in biotechnology - finance, marketing, rtart later in ones career. Hands-on lab ibility (sales, marketing, technical service, ndustry.	ears, I have had a multitude of college urification, tissue culture, etc. Unfortunately, the set class time and these students did not presenting the project. I do not feel that there pager" that should be reviewed and sent back ding that most of these students would not i in a seminar setting.	experience without the experience of aniculum, the level of accomptishment is ut for the Professional degrees; it is still if these students are not going to be the main rise in project management that prepares the	Ditterret	< i> 27 m Z
		Nada 🙆 🔗 👹 🛛 - 📘		blocked 📷 AutoHill 🛃 Options 🥒	, my beliefs are in transition. I be orwinced that being able to unde trant concepts, even for students	he is a future project manager. E e and communicate their results. different documents; the thesis is	Ik at it as a stool. The third leg w unctional areas as they relate to project and writing are very impo previous experience adds cred npany - and many others in our it	s-on lab experiences. Over the y cal experiences; PCR, protein pl s needed to be concluded within alue is doing a project and them entreviewed journal (understand required to present their findings	estion. You can have hands on e werse. In a standard master's cu degree in regards to research. E its in the commercial workplace is experience. We require a cou		🍓 part Shaphro-1243a
t Explorer		Search 🔆 Favortes 🥰	ound2_3.esp/10=52	Search Web • 🔊 🗗 40	ils issue. More correctly oecoming increasingly or problem are more impo to the program.	ate is not a lab rat. He/s as the ability to organize is these are entirely	able. I would actually loc would include all other f vice. Organization of a vork in areas where that remployment in our cor	al "demonstration" hand impressive list of practio or them, the experiment or they spent. The real v at they spent, the stul ubmitted a paper to a p II). They should also be	ssue than the stated quild a thesis, but not the rout wants to do with the control wants to do with the eydon not need the these eydon not need the these even untrop theorem.		S transf 2
Delphi - Microsoft Interne	w Favorites Tools Help	S S S S . O	ruliwmw.eged.temu.edu/delphi/Ro	5	n of mixed feelings on th priority, however I am t begins to address the t offering a thesis option t	itive Abilities (18) professional MSc gradu bib, but not as valuable inch report but not a thes gers.	ink both are equally valu- letion of a degree. This uction, QC, technical ser- tence prepares one to v facturing). It is critical fo	ere is little value in typica lates that come with an i lagents were prepared f benefit from the time th but of value in producing a student as if they had s it their first paper to Cell	ink there is more to the i ming a project and writin mined by what the stude what unclear what the to incher in a company, the		🛃 Web-based Delphi
Web-based	File Edit Vie	G Back -	Address Shttp	Google -	4.1 ar taking doing least	Cogr 5. A p valuat resea mana	6.1th comp produ exper manu	7. Thi gradu the really really to the to the subm	8. Ith desig some resea	Dorre	🐮 start

	this #		C				_92	>	
🔾 Buch • 💟 - 🗶 🜊 🏠 🔎 Saurch 🤺 Favorias 😻 Muda 🕢 🔗 😓 📓 • 🧾 🖑 🔅 🕉	bäross 🙆 http://www.aged.temu.edu/debhi/Round2_3.esp/10=52	Joogle - 💽 🚯 Search Web 🔹 🥨 🗗 40 blocked 🕤 A JoH 🛛 🗾 Options 🥒	8. I think there is more to the issue than the stated question. You can have hands-on experience without the experience of designing a project and writing a thesis, but not the reverse. In a standard master's cumculum, the level of accomplishment is determined by what the student wants to do with the degree in regards to research. But for the Professional degrees, it is still somewhat unclear what the options are for the students in the commercial workplace. If these students are not going to be the main researchers in a comparty, they do not need the they are able to coordinate the activities of the scientists and keep the programs on track and project management positions where they are able to coordinate the activities of the scientists and keep the programs on track and project management positions where they are able to coordinate the activities of the scientists and hends-on expenses best teaches these concepts, instead of a thesis, we require students to do a final project that reflects a component of a science-best teaches these concepts, instead of a thesis, we require student to the business, or any other project that the advisor thinks appropriate. The work is usually based on the intermeting that the student does.	9. I understand the reluctance of trained researchers (facufty) to give up the individual research component of a master's program. But business/industry advisors appear to want science professionals who are: a. Able to design/execute experiments with minimal supervision b. Able to write (and to read) research papers and reports c. Able to present technical information to varied audiences d. Able to interface between research and marketing, research and business development, research and legal/regulatory issues, policy and legislative issues 	for which the time spent locating and solving a research problem independently and writing it up as a thesis is not necessary.	10. Hands on experience in wet bench mode can be very valuabledepends upon the specialization but some require NO further wet-bench experiences beyond a well-constructed undergraduate degree program. If you select the students on the basis of having substantial wet lab undergrad training and hopefully basis research experience, your life will be far easier. Those without such experience should drop back and take the requisite courses as a requirement for entry. Organizational skills, team-based approaches, etc. are paramount. We have 4 years experience in the matter of a thesis, in contrast to a MBA-style cohort group project write-up we demand a thesis in many cases these theses are NOT dependent upon wet bench processes. Further experience in writing a thesis is important. The importance of defending the thesis in the face of experts and peers cannot be experience in writing a thesis is important. The importance of defending the thesis in the face of experts and peers cannot be experience in writing a thesis is important. The importance of defending the thesis in the face of experts and peers cannot be experience to a some state of a locked safe for five yearsavailable to university administrators and acceleric program reviewers.		Save Answers	Cone
-	A	0							10

	22		Links #		٢.		11				>	- 14	13.80
		B 38	8		d in parenthesis. Examples are on.	Suestion?	wide range of opportunities both now change and knowledge grows old very s and starting with a broad base	field of biotechnology, based on the a "big picture" view of their field. The ursued depending on their particular	pating on advisory boards for several lational worldorce focus and some a of students that the university serves. In life as in other regions, this is not an	tituents and their needs. In general, I ties and elite privates - to have a more	hat offers concentrations in specific proach is as valuable as one with	Internet	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
		14da 🕗 🔗 😓 🗷 - 🛄 ઉ		blocked 🚡 Autoriti 🛃 Options 🥒	or question 4 with frequencies liste of answers given for each dimensi	"tracks" that was raised in an earlier o	ch. It will prepare the participant for a we immediate appeal, circumstances set over time under any circumstances	multinational) focus as it relates to the i and that they should be able to take a tential of the job market and can be pu	thought about several times. In partici ave thought that some should have a r aphics of the area and the population agion is limited by their resources whe point.	flon, its mission, and its primary cons ersities" - the "flagship" state universi elocal or regional focus.	ertain, however I feel that a program to program that has an "all aspects" api		🐞 Pairt Strap Pro-12435
Explorer		Search 🌟 Favortes 🥰	nd2_4.asp?I0=52	earch web - 🥡 🗗 401	answers provided fontative of the range of	related to the issue of	actus is a better approa egional or local may ha ve to update their skill s hat a very narrow one.	tional (and possibly a r svely mobile population more directly to the pol	5) on, and one that I have on biotechnology. I he is biotechnology. I he to be a stand or psychological stand	given the type of institu at "major research univ titutions to have a more	 needs or not I am not c not feel that a masters 		😂 Kourd 2
Delphi - Microsoft Internet	Fevorites Tools Help	0 0 0 0 0	(/www.sged.tsmu.edu/delphi/Rou	5 5	/ is listed the range of that are most represe	question "solved" or is it	al (13) all aspects of industry for the future. While the re in The participant will have an easier transition the	fents should obtain a na sition that we are a relate r regional focus relates objectives	I on local conditions (is an interesting questi- sional master's program sonal master's program ocal focus. This is really areas, the students' abil either from a monetary.	er focus is appropriate, expect PSM programs (all" focus, and other inst	nal/Regional Tracks (2 ather you call it regional s more to the point. I do		🗿 Web-based Delphi
Web-based D	File Edit Vew	G Back -	Address 🛃 http:/	Google -	Below	Is this (Nation 1. The and int quickly provide	2. Stud suppos local or career	Based 3. This profes: more k some s issue	4. Eithe would : "nation	5. Whe fields it	Done	🐮 start

×	22	2		<u>x</u>			1.15	344	ε
		and a second	LINK						3:14 #
				concentrations in specific as valuable as one with with "all aspects of industry" iny laboratory functions but al writing areas. Most students some other aspect. The needs	avt to impossible to attempt an presented that connect with ommunicated to an academic they are and develops the	r promoting biotech in Texas gional (win Texas) needs.		Dirtemet	20480
		🕈 huda 🙆 🔗 💺 🗷 - 🛄 🤀 🔅 🕉	Discrete 🖬 Autoriti 🛃 Options 🥒	certain, however I feel that a program that offers c s program that has an "all aspects" approach is a uld be ideal. Specialty areas should include not of al, human factors, clinical, regulatory, and medica n only to find out later they are more interested in s	If pre-industrial career experiences it would be ne be choices made as practical opportunities are p nal needs are much more likely to be effectively co but that the academic institution figures out what duates.	o focus on national worldorce needs. However for rogram it is important to focus on the local and reg	Save Answers		💘 Part Stop Pro - 1244a
based Delphi - Microsoft Internet Explorer	It Wew Favorites Tools Help	k - 🐑 - 💌 🛃 🏠 🔎 Search 🔆 Favortes 🥥	 http://www.aged.tam.ed.joephi/Round2_4.asp/ID=52 ••	National/Regional Tracks (2) 5. Whether you call it regional needs or not I am not fields is more to the point. I do not feel that a master specialized focus. 6. There can be no ONE program to meet the needs and then branched off to several specially areas wo also drug discovery, product development, preclinic may be initially attracted to one aspect of a program of the local regional and barbool workforce are sur-	Regional/Local (2) 7. If a program is serious about providing meaningh "all aspects of industry" focus. There simply need to industrial careers. In that context then, local or region institution. It is not important that the needs are local resources to properly train/educate it's master's gra	 For internship opportunities I believe it is crucial to and finding jobs for students who come out of this pr 			🕂 🔰 Web-based Delphi 😂 Bourd Z
a web	File Ed	Bac	Google	The second second second second second	and an and a second			E Dorre	🐮 sta

at 	(eb-hased [Delphi - Microsoft Internet E	xplorer				
Introlution Stanta And	At New	 Favorites Tools Help 					22
Our offerment set development, 5, according and the control of the product of the control of	• •	0 · N S & 0	each Revolutes	💞 Hada 🙆 🔗 🕹	🛚 · 💟 🚯 🕉 🕉		
At road range of arrives vision and the available to a student newly graduated from a professional science matter program. At road range of arrives was given and many people seemed to be using different titles for the same position. To simplify the generating are dimensional science matter program. At road range of arrives was given and many people seemed to be using different titles for the same position. To simplify the generating the dimensional science matter program. At road range of arrives was given and many people seemed to be using different titles for the same position. To simplify the generating of a first of species in Round to meson to many people seemed to be using different titles for the same position. To simplify the generation set of a student to be arrows or any and mucher of years experimence (0.3). Frequencies are provided in parenthesis with those job classes that were mentioned in responses to question 5. For eachly the title, choose the road compare title areas combile empty point for a student to be employed in a student to be arrows or the arrow arrest segret for the last or button thank. In the textbox at the bottom of the page, add any additional titles that you befree the use of college, then here are not represented by the list. For each point immedately out of college, the field and the employed in this parenthesis with those polyced in the second second and the second second and the second second second and the second	Athres (//www.sged.tsmu.edu/delph//Hound	£_5,asp?10=52			8	Links #
Question 5 asked for the most reasonable entry level positions that would be available to a student newly graduated from a professional science masters program. A broad range of answers very server and note that the four responses to a student newly graduated from a professional science masters program. A broad range of answers very server and note the state of parts about the server book of answers very of the published extension at stort is a server that a lew tibes from responses in Round 1 added that did not seem to fut under any of the published education investmence filter to acticle an entities from responses in Round 1 added that did not seem to be under any of the published education level (MS of RS) and number of year conventence filter to acticle have transity and Molecular Bay of the published education level (MS of RS) and number of year conventence filter to acticle have transity and molecular Bay of the published that were mentioned in responses to question for a student newly graduated for a student newly research (MS of RS) and number of year conventence filter to a reasonable entry point for a student newly expension mediated in parenthesis with those job classes that were mentioned in responses to question for a concert new responses to question for a student newly and concertain responses to question for a concert new response to the page, add any the just. For each job tile, choose the checkow for a reasonable entry of a student newly and ditional titles position rime diaded that all of not estate at the policy of a student newly and ditional title store each of the second of an estate store of concertain the store store of the page, add any additional titles are positive at the page, add any additional titles are provided the reasonable extended that and the class of the production of the page, add any additional titles are prote at the policy of the page, add any addititient at the page, a		Pages 1	rah web 🛛 👩 🗗	140 blocked 👔 Autoriti 🛃 Opti	ors 🔌		
Trond Procession Provided (Datimis, A: S, & Bourque, J. 2001. Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Education, Vag Pr27-261) with a text tiltes from responses in Round 1 added that due for the same position. Categories: The article is available on line of the provided (Datimis, A: S, & Bourque, J. 2001. Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Education, Vag Pr27-261) with a text tiltes from responses in Round 1 added that due for the published categories: The article is available on line of yvers experience (0.3). Frequencies are provided in parenthesis with those job classes education level (MS or BS) and number of yvers experience (0.3). Frequencies are provided in parenthesis with those job classes addreaded from a professional master's degree if you think this position is a reasonable empectation for a student newly additional titles that you believe are not represented by the list. For each Dills: Choose the clanelable on line of where the buttom blank. In the textbox at the bottom of the page, add any additional titles that you believe are not represented by the list. Agree Pre-clinicaldiscovery research (16) Benein Collego, then have the radio buttom blank. In the textbox at the bottom of the page, add any additional titles that you believe are not represented by the list. Agree Pre-clinicaldiscovery research (16) Benein Chaese classes Scientist is Process development, manufacturing and production (1) Process development associate Process development associ	Quest	tion 5 asked for the mos	st reasonable en	try level positions that w	vould be available to a student newly g	graduated	<
education level (MS or ES) and number of years expensence (U-3) Frequencies are provided in parenthesis with those job classes that were mentioned in responses to question 5. For each job title, choose the checkbox (or "Agree" if you think this position is a reasonable entry point for a student newy agaduated for the ise checkbox with the page, and any additional titles that you believe are not represented by the list. Agree Pre-clinical/discovery research (16) Calier Pre-clinical/discovery research (17) Calier Pre-clinical/discovery research (18) Calier Pre-clinical/discovery research (18) Ca	A broe questi educa catego	a professional science r ad range of answers was on, a list of specific job titl tion. V29 p257-261) with mes. The article is availab	masters program given and many pe es has been provi a few tibes from re ble on line for your	 apple seemed to be using ded (Dahms, A. S. & Bour seponses in Round 1 adde convenience [<u>link to antick</u> 	different titles for the same position. To sin que, J. 2001. Biochemistry and Molecular of that did not seem to fit under any of the p <u>e here) (212 kB)</u> . Tibes were chosen base	mpirty the Biology published d on	
For each job tibe, choose the checkbox for "Agree" if you think this position is a reasonable entry point for a student newly graduated from a professional master's degree. If you do not think it is a reasonable expectation for a student to be employed in this position immediately out of college, then leave the radio button blank. In the textbox at the bottom of the page, add any additional titles that you believe are not represented by the list. Agree Pre-clinical/discovery research (16) Scientist 1 Scientist 1 Scientist 1 Research Associate Process development, manufacturing and production (1) Process development associate Process development associate Manufacturing and production (1) Manufacturing and production (1)	educa that we	tion level (MS or BS) and are mentioned in response	number of years e es to question 5.	xperience (0-3). Frequenc	cies are provided in parenthesis with those	e job classes	
Agree Pre-clinical/discovery research (16) Scientist 1 Scientist 1 Scientist 1 Scientist 1 Elesearch Associate Scientist 1 Elesearch Associate Process/product development, manufacturing and production (1) Elected Revelopment associate Process development associate Elected Revelopment technician Intervelopment associate Manufacturing and production (1) Intervelopment associate Intervelopment associate Intervelopment associate Intervelopment associate Intervelopment associate Intervelopment associate Intervelopment associate	For ea gradua this po additio	tch job title, choose the ch ated from a professional n isition immediately out of mal titles that you believe	eckbox for "Agree naster's degree. If college, then leave are not represents	" if you think this position i you do not think it is a real the radio button blank. In ed by the list.	s a reasonable entry point for a student ner sonable expectation for a student to be en the textbox at the bottom of the page, add	wly nployed in any	
Scientist I Senior Research Associate Senior Research Associate Senior Research Associate Process development, manufacturing and production (1) Process development associate Process development associate Process development associate Manufacturing and production (1) Imanufacturing and production (1) Imanufacturing and production (1)	Agree	e Pre-clinical/discovery	research (16)				
Senior Research Associate Research Associate Process development, manufacturing and production (1) Process development associate Process development associate Process development associate Manufacturing and production (1) In Manufacturing and production (1) In Manufacturing and production (1)		Scientist I					
 Research Associate Agree Operations: process/product development, manufacturing and production (1) Process development associate Process development technician Process development technician Agree Manufacturing and production (1) Agree Manufacturing and production (1) Manufacturing and production (1) Manufacturing and production (1) Manufacturing and production (1) 	3	Senior Research Assoc	ciate				
Agree Operations: process/product development, manufacturing and production (1) Process development associate Process development associate Process development technician Process development technician Agree Manufacturing and production (1) Manufacturina accoriate Process development technician Image: State Sta	D	Research Associate					
Process development associate Process development associate Process development technician Process development technician Agree Manufacturing and production (1) Ip Manufacturing and production (1)	Agree	e Operations: process/	product develop	ment, manufacturing an	nd production (1)		
Process development technician Agree Manufacturing and production (1) In Manufacturing and production (1)	Þ	Process development a	associate				
Agree Manufacturing and production (1) Izi Manufacturinu accordate Manufacturinu accordate Image: Im	Þ	Process development to	echnician				
Tot Manufacturing accordate Att A web based Deptions	Agree	e Manufacturing and pr	roduction (1)				
11. 💧 🖄 west-seed Depti 🐱 Reved 2. 💘 Part Srop Pro	5	Manufacturing accordate	a				>
11 📑 West-seed Depti 😁 Hand 2 💘 Part Propino						S Internet	144
	art	🛃 Web-based Delphi	🍅 Rourd 2	🐞 Part Ship Pro		2 1 2 2 2 C	115.6M

	■ · 🔜	V 5 60 Links *	ptons 🤌	¢																2	B Internet	
	💞 Hada 🙆 🔗 🕌		140 blocked 🗐 Autom Nd Op																			
dphi - Microsoft Internet Explorer	revontes 1005 help	www.aged.temu.edu/delph(Round2_5.asp?ID=52	- 🤁 Search Web - 🐖 🗗	Manufacturing and production (1)	Manufacturing associate	Manufacturing technician	Aseptic fill	Aseptic fill associate	Aseptic fill technician	Quality Control (2)	Chemistry - QC analyst	Microbiology - QC microbiological	Quality Assurance (3)	QA Documentation specialist	QS Technical writer	QA Documentation coordinator	Clinical Trials (2)	Biostatistician	Clinical Data Associate	Clinical database programmer analyst		
Web-based Del	- 170 O	Address 🛃 http://ww	Google -	Agree A	2		Agree A	2		Agree G	2		Agree C	2	5	Ð	Agree C		D		Core	

Web-based	Delphi - Micrusoft Internet	Explorer																	
Edit Wei	w Favorites Tools Help				4														
Back -	0 S S S . C	Search 🌟 Favorbes 🤤	* Heda 🙆 🔗 - 🌺 🗷	1 · 🔵 🛱 🐮															
tress Shitp	U/www.sged.temu.edu/delphi/Rou	nd2_5.asp?10=52			V 🛃 Go Links 🏘														
ogle -	5	sarch web 🔹 👩 🗗 🕫	blocked 📷 AutoMi 🛃 Options	1															
Agre	e Clinical Trials (2)				τ.														
	Biostatistician																		
3	Clinical Data Associa	E																	
	Clinical database pro-	grammer analyst																	
Agre	e Regulatory affairs (5	6																	
	Scientific writer																		
Þ	Documentation assist	ant																	
Agre	e Business Developm	ient/Marketing and \$	sales (17)																
	Business developmer	it research analyst																	
Þ	Marketing research ar	nalyst																	
Agre	e Additional titles fron	n Round 1																	
	Technical service rep	(2)																	
3	Product management	associate (1)																	
	Junior position in Lice	nsing/tech transfer off	ice (1)																
	Project manager (3)																		
5	Lab manager (2)																		
Э	Purchasing (1)																		
one					Sinternet														
start	A web-based Debbi	S to the	🐞 Batt Stratho		A 1 4 1 6 1 1 1 1														
NIBIC																			
		🗸 🎝 Go Innis 🏕		C												71	>	S Internet	
----------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------	-----------------	----------------	-----------------------------	---	----	--------------	------------	--
	🗤 🙆 🙆 📓 · 🔜 🚯 🔅 🕉		obed 🗐 Autoriti 🌉 Options 🖉	les (17)						e (1)				ented in the list above.	3	3	Save Answers		
net Explorer	Search 🔆 Favortes 😍	(Round2_5.esp?t0=52	Search web · 🔊 Brook	opment/Marketing and Sa	ment research analyst	h analyst	rom Round 1	rep (2)	ient associate (1)	Licensing/tech transfer offic	3)			here if they are NOT repres					
Fevorites Tools Help		www.eged.temu.edu/delphi	•	Business Develo	Business developr	Marketing research	Additional titles fi	Technical service r	Product managem	Junior position in L	Project manager (S	Lab manager (2)	Purchasing (1)	list additional titles I					
File Edit Ven	📀 Back - 💽	Address S http://	Google -	Agree		Þ	Agree					•	Þ	Please				E) Dorre	

File Edit View Favorites Tools Help					22
🔾 Back + 🕥 - 💌 🕰 🏠 🔎	Search SFavorber	💞 Heda 🙆 🛜	? 💬 🦳 · 🗷 🦿	22	
Address 🎒 http://www.aged.tamu.edu/dephi/Ho	ound2_6.asp?10=52			8	Links 🌣
Coogle -	Search Web 🔹 🔊	B to blocked Tartorit	🖌 Options 🥒		
Question 6 Below are nine roles identifier indicated in parentheses. In th think this list is complete as is has been identified by choosi	d for an industry at the text box below. I please answer s ing the appropriate	thisory board for a profi- please add any role you o in the space provided s checkbox.	essional science maste i think may not be adeo I. Please indicate your l	r's program. Frequencies are uately represented by this list. If you evel of agreement with each role that	<
Needs Assessment and cu	urriculum review	(16)			
Agree strongly	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Disagree strongly	11
Internship development (9	(6				
Agree strongly	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Disagree strongly	
Identifying issues and tren	nds in industry (5				
Agree strongly	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Disagree strongly	-
Establishing university/inc	dustry ties (2)				
Agree strongly	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Disagree strongly	
Suggest or provide semin teaching (8)	lars, team project	is, case studies, etc. t	hat are typical of indu	stry to supplement faculty	
Agree strongly	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Disagree strongly	
Student job placement (6)					
Agree strongly	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Disagree strongly	>
🛃 Dorre				Sinternet	-
🐮 start 🔰 🗿 Web based Delphi	😁 Round z	💘 Part Shap Pro		2068	3:15 BM

×

		Go Links N		K.)		A 119 BW
	29			Disagree strongly		Disagree strongly		Disagree strongly		Disagree strongly		Disagree strongly		S Internet	御御御を
	8 (D) (D) (S) (S) (S) (S) (S) (S) (S) (S) (S) (S		Options 🥒	Disagree		Disagree		Disagree	nip (2)	Disagree	graduates hired (4)	Disagree			24
	💞 Mada 🙆 🙆 - 🖉		D to blocked S Autoria	No opinion		No opinion	funding (1)	No opinion	igh diverse membersh	No opinion	uccess of interns and	No opinion	Save Answers		🐞 Paint Share Pro
Explorer	Search of Favories	nd2_6.45p?ID=52	earch web 🔹 👩 🖥	Agree		Agree	rivate sources of	Agree	of industry throu	Agree	gh feedback on su	Agree			🙆 Rourd 2
Delphi - Microsoft Internet		I/www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/Rou	5 55 .	Agree strongly	ent job placement (6)	Agree strongly	sing on or providing p	Agree strongly	esent a cross-section	Agree strongly	ram evaluation throug	Agree strongly			🛃 web-based Dephi
Web-based I	• 1911 •	Address Shttp:	Google -		Stude		Advis		Repre		Progr			Done	start

	22		Links *		٤.	1						>	- 44	3120 FM
		🗾 🗇 A 🔹	3		experience would be expected of a student ss.	s focused on the number of hours, which ranged es focused on outcomes or the kinds of "hours" is defined as actual clock hours or	vitcomes as a measure for success Job elfned experience required to be considered for is successfully completed rather than outcomes pected of the recent graduate when they seek mployers who may know nothing about the	and ending with the highest for hours. This is not ve of the different levels within the continuum.	ch time that you think a master's student should fferentiate between time spent in a teaching lab sistant on a research project or on an	stion 1, please provide that response in the text		great deal of exposure to mass spec, etc),	S Internet	2000
		avates 💞 Meda 🙆 🙆 🚵 📓 -	22	🐌 🗗 so blocked 🗐 Autoriti Na Options 🥒	how many hands-on clock hours of combines biotechnology and busines	al hours and outcomes. Some response ar of full-time experience. Other respons al hours. [For purposes of this study, s.]	her industry nor academia tends to use o ation level and number of years of very di issed on a specific number of credit hou tion, please keep in mind what will be ex How will they be evaluated by potential e	 beginning with the lowest requirement were chosen that were most representation 	fy your position regarding the actual ben a biotechnology and business. Please dif is compared to working in a lab as an as	d by using "tracks" as discussed in Que		in areas such as proteomics (requiring a		👸 Paint Share Pro
Explorer		Search St	nd2_7.asp?10=0	earch web +	imation of gram that o	nber of actu () to one ye er than actu redit hour	comes, neit imum educ are usually t arthis ques onal world.	vided below d answers v arentheses	please clari n combining zed class) a	better solve		cializations		Shound 2
Jelphi - Microsoft Internet	r Favorites Tools Help	0 0 0 0 0	f/www.sged.tessu.edu/delphi/Hou	5	ion 7 asked for an est ig from a masters prog	imensions emerged-nun ero (at the graduate leve ences students had rath iours, NOT semester c	te the importance of out ptions typically list a min tion. Degree programs a pplished. When answerin y point into the professi in they come from?	inuum of answers is pro answer given, but instea encies are indicated in p	axtbox provided below. 1 a professional program ment (part of an organiz indent research project:	hink this issue could be low.	(11)	vcept in the case of spec		Web-based Delphi
🛃 Web-based E	File Edit View	Such -	Address 🖨 http:/	Google -	Quest comin	Two di from ze experie man h	Despit descrip a posit and entr	A contr every a Freque	In the tr have in enviror indepe	lf you th box be	Hours	1	Dorree	🐮 start

ditess 😫 http://www.aped.tamu.ed.(delch(Round2_7, asp?)D=52	Links *
00gle - 💽 🚯 Sawth Web 🔹 🖏 🗗 40 blocked 🗟 Aurold 😼 Options 🥒	
Hours (11) 1 excent in the case of shectializations in areas such as proteomics (requiring a great deal of exposure to mass shect arc)	¢
large database management (computer labs), biopharm quality (in some cases only) etc., you will not have to have wet labs	
300 hours on a specific project such as a thesis. This would be above the basic lab courses which would include chemistry, biology and a basic course in microbiology and biochemistry. If a thesis is not done, then 300 hours in advanced biotechnology lab courses.	
3. A minimum of 300 and a maximum of 500 hours for the total master's course.	
4. Given that a semester long internship would provide 400-500 hours of hands-on opportunity the real question I believe is what will best prepare the student to take full advantage of the internship. I believe that four hours of lab 3 days a week for two to three semesters prior to the start of the intern period should be quite satisfactory if supported by a well constructed set of classroom instructions.	9
Ibelieve 2 semesters - approx 600 hours of BiOTECH SPECIFIC skills- cell culture, blotting, ELISA's, gels, DNA instrumentation and HPLC (protein work).	
6. 1000 to 2000if they are going to work in the lab. Basically one year of "full time" experience.	
Outcomes (4) 7.1 would emphasize the hours less and the projects more. Formal laboratory sessions are important to give an understanding of the techniques available, but it is in the implementation of those techniques in an organized project that would make the student more valuable. This does not have to be a thesis, but rather term projects, preferably involving collaboration between multiple courses.	
8. If's not so much the number of hours as it is how many different techniques one is exposed to and the depth of the knowledge acquired. In other words, if one were to work in a lab doing nothing but automated sequencing then the student may have good depth with sequencing but lack depth elsewhere. Likewise, if the student was exposed to every lab technique but is not required to analyze their results then they would have broad coverage (superficial understanding) but a depth of inches. So, difficult answer to be quantitative.	
Save Answers	
	2
Procession of the second secon	

212

Took Heb 2 1 1 2 Search 1 2 Favortes 1 Heda 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
mu edulokeh (flourdz, 8. espito=92
consider priate to address these issues in this survey? Please choose questions listed below, if any, cussion in this study. Additional comments may be added in the textbox at the bottom of the
I graduate programs provide turiton waivers as well as fellowships or assistantships for stud ams do not, mirroring instead the professional school model of students being self-support d to this: you attract life science graduate students to a program in which they will need to pay tuition? students in a professional master's program be financially supported? If so, what kind of fina sirable for these students?
lership at the administrative level and faculty who are able to engage these students 2
e program differentiate between students who are employed and have extensive undergradu lose who come de novo to the program?
e program differentiate between students in a free-standing terminal master's and those that
ation in program development is possible? (e.g. distance learning)
by-building experiences can be developed for degree participants? (i.e. orientation, colloquiantance group dynamics)
someone get a masters degree in biotechnology? If they are working in a lab, it might be be going into business, sales, etc bookwork could be more useful
e goals of the program? Is it to produce graduates in the business side of biotech companie for the lab?
sed Debris 🍋 Pound 2 💘 Paint Shap Pro

	22		tinks #	3			-				>	-	24 811
			3		colloquia, and lectures that	fit be better to just get a job or	ompanies or to produce		some extent) is the inability to licle for this training but I would an this be accomplished?			 Internet 	2020
		uta 😵 🔗 👹 🗷 🖬 🛛 🔂 🚯 🕉	oted 10 Atorn 10 Octors 10	sible? (e.g. distance learning)	oped for degree participants? (i.e. orientation.	otechnology? If they are working in a lab, it mic work could be more useful.	ice graduates in the business side of biotech o	learning be incorporated into the program?	ecent non-Ph.D. graduates (and even them to The project and thesis writing may be the velictably train and measure this aptitude. How c	31	Save Answers		😽 Part Stop Pro - 1205a
Explorer		Search 🔆 Favortes 🥎)	each web • # Point	am development is pos	periences can be devel p dynamics)	t a masters degree in bi Jsiness, sales, etc book	e program? Is it to produ	m-based approaches to	equently encounter with seess a logical next step her means to more pred	ints here:			😂 Peared 2
Delphi - Microsoft Internet	Fevorites Tools Help	0 . 3 3 4	(/www.aged.tamu.edu/delph(Plou	What innovation in progr	What identity-building ex media to enhance group	Mhy would someone gei If they are going into bu	What are the goals of the cal people for the lab?	Where and how can tear	The issue that I most fre e results and critically as e university to explore of	e add additional comme			🗿 Web based Dephi
Web-based D	File Edit View	G Back -	Address Conte -	1.5 D	0 6. V act as	a PhD.	technic	0.6	2 10. analyzk like the	Please		Done Done	🐮 start

APPENDIX E

ROUND 2.1 INSTRUMENT

Web-based	I Delphi - Microsoft Internet	Explorer			
the Edit We	ew Favorites Tools Help				22
G Back .	0 0 0 0 0	Search 🌟 Favorites 🧶)	uda 🙆 🙆 🔮 📓 🛛	0 3 3	
ddress 🗿 http	p.//www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/rour	d2-1-asp		8	Links *
oogle -	×	sarch web 🔹 👩 🗗 40 bk	oled 🗐 Autoriti N Options 🥒		
			Part I of Round 2.1		٢.
Prog majo and (the re the re which	gram Objectives in questicular study. We gave providents, one of the other of th	on number 8 of Round 3 is that was of Round 3 if those we will deal with with now rather than we siness side of biotech of eaded further discussion he process works more to goal later in the study	2, we asked you to identify othe a lin Round 1, and only two issu in Round 3, but we have decic liting for round 3. Issue number ompanies or to produce techn ompanies or to produce techn in this study. A quick review o smoothly if the panel is asked	er issues that should be addressed in this es emerged from Round 2 as important to a bed that the issue of identifying program goals r 8.8.("What are the goals of the program? Is it ical people for the lab??], was chosen by % of it literature on developing goals and objectives to suggest specific objectives to begin with,	
We h We some clear clear quan detei	ave provided a brief scen are asking that, from this, y a cases, but not all, progra by communicate anticipate tifiably measurable. There se keep in mind that yo mine how a track may emented.	iario detailing inputs ave ou provide up to 5 obje an objectives may be m outcomes or accomp e should be a clear relati ur role is to determine be implemented giver	illable for the program and a b ctives for the program. Good o easurable and may relate to le lishments achieved in the prog onship between the objective. what SHOULD be, not nec- i available resources, but in	rief statement of rationale for developing it. bjectives should be practical and doable. In arring or operational objectives. They should gram, should be unambiguous, and and the idea or need that has been identified ¹ . essarily what is. You do not need to stead identify those that should be	
Exan	nples of a program object	ive: Students will master	the techniques of technical w	titing.	
Deci This Interr Biote	sion scenario: program is in a Research ges of Agriculture and Lif disciplinary professional s chnology, with membersh	I university, one of few v e Sciences, Science, V clence masters prograr iip representing the five	with federal Land Grant, Sea G eterinary Medicine, Business a n combining biotechnology and colleges, has been formed to	rant and Space Grant designation. The and Liberal Arts are willing to support an d business. An interdisciplinary Faculty of provide academic oversight for the program.	
Ratio	male for the program is the	at numerous governmer professionals for the inc	tt, and other resources, have in reasing opportunities in resea	indicated a need for a new kind of science rch and non-research positions in industry.	>
Done				S Internet	14
🖌 start	🛃 Web-based Delphi	😂 Hound 2-1	👹 Paint Shap Pro	2007 C	01205-000

×	ł.		Links *		¢	Т		>	-	M4 921
		27	8		eed for a new kind of science research positions in industry. clences who are well-qualified al schools or doctoral programs. al schools or doctoral programs. al schools or doctoral with no sters experience of the students who the no experience with		ce colleges, ng, accounting and finance), ratories, centers and institutes, ersity research park, agriculture ersity research park, agriculture cus on? Please list no more		S Internet	2 4 8 8 4 9 V
		Mada 🚱 🙆 👹 📓 🛛 🛄 🚯 🔅		kocked 📷 Rutorffi 🛛 🌄 Options 🥒	Int, and other resources, have indicated a n creasing opportunities in research and non mate choice for those students in the life so arithan that offered by traditional profession ate research experience, some do not, so t ing from a few students with several semes logy and chemistry classes. The majority ha ogy and chemistry classes.		In numerous departments in the three scien s (survey courses in management, marketi es technology commercialization; and in a variety of environments-numerous labo cialization and market research in the unive portunities in biosecurity are increasing.	Part II of Round 2.1		👹 Part Stop Pro - 12-1A
Explorer		Search 🌟 Favorites 🤮	nd2-1.esp	earch web 🔹 💋 🛃 40 t	lat numerous governme professionals for the in need to provide an afte sking a career path othe smiphasize undergradu am is quite varied, rang ssociated with their biol argraduates.		for non business major for non business major neurship that emphasize contunities for students cet, technology commer and much more. I homeland security, op thomeland security, op			🖨 Round 2-1
Delphi - Microsoft Internet	i Favorites Tools Help	0 0 0 0 0 0	//www.aged.temu.edu/deph/rou	· 60	ale for the program is th a that prepares science iversity has identified a mically, but who are see undergraduate majors enter the masters progreenter the beyond the labs as andent research as under	urces identified to date	An almost endless numb A certificate in business A certificate in entrepren Experiential learning opp echnology licensing office, communications office, a Due to a recent focus on Due to a recent focus on n this information , 5 objectives.			🛃 Web-based Delphi
Web-based I	File Edit New	G Back -	Address 🛃 http:/	Google -	Ration degree acder some might (experiv	Resou	Giver		🖨 Done	🐮 start

	22		Links N		<			17 - 17 - 17 - 17 - 17 - 17 - 17 - 17 -					>		01205 PM
			8	I IIIII		he objectives you ind that a track should jects that can be	mber. In this section, we	t in the text box at the	Not appropriate for this program					S Internet	2020
		S & a 🗌 💮 A &		doHi 🛃 Options 🖉	f Round 2.1	sional science masters degree based on t gested earlier in Round 2. Please keep in m e a well-rounded education in that area. Sub	cular kind of track was listed by a panel mer k, please indicate if it should be:	r track (as a course or classroom topic) OR ters' degree program? ad below should be added, please provide it	Should be part of another Track (please list suggested track in blank)						hap Pro - r2-1b
		Favortes 💞 Media 🔕		B B to blocked	Partllo	ropriate for this profes the various tracks sug tiple classes to provid ot constitute a track.	nber of times that parti r each suggested trac	t be included in anothe essional science mas ifferent from those list	Should be maintained as a Track						1 😸 parts
net Explorer		D Search	fround2-1.45p	Search Web		trify tracks app ted below are trequires mul class should n	cating the num four tasks. Fo	pic that should be for this profit tis distinctly d	Frequency	7	9	9	ষ		Broad 2
d Delphi - Microsoft Inter	ten Favorites Tools Help		tpul/www.eged.temu.edu/delphi	•		<pre>utifying Tracks we will ask you to ider te in Part I above. List n area of emphasis the tuately covered in one</pre>	quencies are given, indi ssking you to complete	Maintained as a seps is it, in your view, a to is it just not appropria if you think a track tha bottorn of this page.	Suggested Track	rufacturing	ence	clinical and Clinical elopment	iness Development		🛃 web-based Delphi
Web-base	File Edit V	G Back.	Address Ah	Google -	100	Ider Now Wroi De a	Frec			Mar	Sai	e á G	Bus	Done	🐮 start

	4		D Links *		3												3	-			>	4	M46210 (3
			•	11111			Þ		Þ		Þ		Þ		Þ		Þ		A		Þ	S Internet	2042
	4	x 23 €																					
	1	S & 3		Nutoffi 🛃 Options 🥒										6						0			Shap Pro - 12-14
		as 💕 Nada 📀		B to blocked		Ъ	•	D		Þ		D		Б		Þ		ъ		Ъ			Service Service
i Explorer		Search Search	und2-1-asp	Search Web 🔹 🔊	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	5		<u>ः</u>	-		+		-		😂 Roud 2-1
Delphi - Microsoft Internet	Fevorites Tools Help		//www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/nov	*	ess Development	latory	Discovery	gement	gung	uct development	Aanagement	ral Business	y Assurance	ational gement	ctual Property	preneurship	nacological omics	'ormatics	sics	nology transfer	in factors		🛃 Web-based Delphi
Web-based I	File Edit View	- Hadt	Address 🛃 http:	Google -	Busin	Regul	Drug	Mana	Marke	Produ	Lab N	Genet	Qualit	Opere Mana	Intelle	Entre	Pham Econc	Bioinf	Foren	Techn	Huma	Done Done	🐮 start

3		Go Links *		K				_				Ξ.	>	44	
		1		•		Э		Þ		is track.		000	+100	S Internet	
	\$ B \$									ould be included in th			/roass rubiishers. 8/		
			🔬 options 🥒		an.		3	>	M	v the elements that sh	ſ	sebourse L	an Francisco, Jossey		
	s 💞 Heda 🙆 👔		ED 40 blocked 1 Autor	0	Б		D		Б	cs, please list below		A month of the second sec	or Aquit Learners. 2		
	Search K Favorle	ound2-1-asp	Search Web 🔹 👰	Ŧ	-	्र		-		tional track or trac			anning Programs n		
Favorites Tools Help		www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/n	5	cs	ogy transfer	factors	management	al analysis	sty technologies	ve identified an addi		10 10 00 0 0 0 T	9113, K. S. (1994). P.1		
File Edit Vew	G Back -	Address 🛃 http://w	Google -	Forensi	Technol	Human	Project	Financia	Discove	If you han			- Carrare	Done Done	

APPENDIX F

ROUND 3 INSTRUMENT

🖉 Sauch 🌟 Favortes 💞 Meda 🔕 🔗 😓
hand) asp Count was - 10 En astrodad - 10 and 10 con
dy to develop a model for a Professional Sc biotechnology.
ince in this study. This round will complete some jority by Round 4. There may be 1 or 2 question
4/7 from 8/27 to 9/10. If you have any question: amu edu or call 979-862-4935.
the goals identified, tracks identified to meet the um. A text box for comments is provided at the
Linformation gathered for various components ink is most desirable. We made some change es in salaries.
ding national, regional, or local focus are prov
🎃 Round 2-1 🛛 🝓 Paint Shap Pro

	22		*	<				11			>	÷
			a Lin					a		1 10 10		100
		5 B B B B		in a name of a summaria farmania and a sub-far		the internship and ask you to rank the choices for the question on compensation to address	ed with frequency counts and you are asked to rank	raduates of a masters program in biotechnology ou are asked to indicate your level of agreement with	e provided with opportunities to make changes (if	ed as an issue in Round 2 that the majority of in this round and summarize them for the next round.	Dirterret.	70.67
		tada 🙆 🔗 🌺 🗵		octed Autom a options		rr various, components of 6 made some changes t	or local focus are provide	s into the workforce for g stitute suggested, and y	tustry advisory board are	ddressed here. It emerg dy. We will collect ideas		🐞 Part Sup No - rat
Explorer		Search 🔆 Favortes 🥩)	rd3.esp	earch web · 🗿 🗗 40 M		Linformation gathered fo ink is most desirable. W	ding national, regional, r	e suitable as entry point ified, plus additional poi	e various roles of the inc comments.	thing and curriculum is a be addressed in this stu		c panel 😋
Delphi - Microsoft Internet	w Favorites Tools Help	2 0 0 0 0	Ulwww.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/rou	of adaptistely covered	Program Goals Tracks Skills	tion 2 ill look at the summary o according to what you th ble geographic differenc	tion 3 narized responses regal 1 through 5.	tion 4 an positions that would b usiness have been iden	tion 5 haries of the ratings of the loose) and to make fina	tion 6 sue of innovation in teal indents believed should		🛃 web-based Debhi
Web-based	File Edit View	G Back •	Address 🛃 http:	Google -	- Ci m	Quest We wi each s possit	Quest Summ	Quest Sixtee and bi	Quest Summ	Quest The is respon	B	🐮 start

Web-bar	sed Delphi - Microsoft Internet	Explorer			
File Edit	Wew Favorites Tools Help				22
G Back		Search 🌠 Favortes 🥰	Mada 🔕 🔗 👹 🗷	• 🔵 🗇 🔏 🐮	
Address	http://www.oged.temu.edu/debh/Plo	und3_1a.esp?ID=52		8 •	Links *
Google -	5	search web 🔹 👩 🗗 40	kocked 📷 AutoHill 🛃 Options	A REPORT OF A R	
tra De at	bund 3 Question 1 his question, we will examit cks or into the core curricul added or was not adequab	ne the goals identified, um. A text box for comr ely covered.	tracks identified to meet the nents is provided as the last	ise goals, and skills that should be designated into t part of this question if you think something should	٢.
a Tiv Bir D	estion 1.1 Program Goal ound 2.1, you were asked t d business. Those object the goals emerged from thos reement that it is appropriate	s to identify 5 objectives f ves were then sorted in se groups of objectives the for this program.	or a professional science to groups based on similari and are listed below. For e	masters program combining biotechnology ty and these groups were summarized into goals. ach goal identified, indicate your level of	E
8	als				
₩.E	Students will demonstrate of scientific formats, oral pr terpersonal and supervisory	mastery of written and esentations supported / situations] Agree strongly © Agre	by visual aids for technical (it by visual aids for technical (it e O Undecided O Disagre	erature review, writing in a variety of business and nontechnical audiences, communication for ee O.Disagree strongly	
е и	Students will participate in ast one internship in an indi	experiential learning of ustry setting. Agree strongly © Agre	portunities that focus on we	orking in the industry environment, including at e ODIsagree strongly	
ల్ క్	Students will demonstrate olecular biology, biochemi:	mastery in the theories stry, cell biology). Agree strongly O Agre	and techniques of a scienti e Undecided Disagre 	fic discipline basic to the biotechnology industry as ODIsagree strongly	
4	Students will have a functio	anal understanding of b	asic biotechnology business	s principles.	
	Marketing Finance Accounting Management				2
Dorre				S Internet	-
🐮 start	🗿 Web based Dephi	😂 Hound S	酸 Part Ship Inc	5 27 B ~	0133.FM

6	11 09 🛃 📈		Students will their success in		Internet	A BASE A
th-based Delphi - Microsoft Internet Exploren Edit Vew Favortes Tods Heb Back + 💽 - 💌 🛃 🙆 🖉 Search 🌟 Favortes 🤯 Heda 🔕 🔗 👹 國 + 🧾 🚯 🚴 🔕 🚳	s 🛃 http://www.aged.tamu.edu/de/ph/fRound)_1a.esp?ID=52 gle - 🔰 🤟 Searth Web 🔹 🚮 🔁 ao biochad 🕤 Aurolf 📲 options 🥒	 4. Students will have a functional understanding of basic biotechnology business principles. Marketing Finance Accounting Project management 	 Agree strongly O Agree O Undecided O Disagree strongly Many people emphasized specific industry knowledge and skills for goals. However, no one topic or discipline p Because of that, we decided to classify them under a goal that emphasized a broad range of industry topics Goalt have knowledge of the current issues and trends that are important to the biotechnology industry and important to the industry Agree strongly O Agree O Undecided O Disagree O Disagree strongly 	In the text box below, please feel free to provide any comments that you might have about any part of Question 1A.		dart al webbeed hetde . 📚 Hourd 3 👘 Part Stoo Pro- Cata

	22		Go Linis *		¢			5								>		
		0 A 4			and the advancedity events are as "tread?"	end to classify each one as a pack, emerged, having been identified by a echnology and business. Those four tracks ent. There was some concern that science	scinc tracks (below), we are not attempting insidered as part of the model.	mponent of the program and what minimun e combining biotechnology and business, ave combined all those questions in this	minimum amount of laboratory experience aduate or graduate career.								Internet	
		· 🛛 🖏		Options	Valuation of	st, four tracks of combining biot biot biot biot	at should be co	should be a constens' degre treason, we h	e if you think a in their underg ory experienc experience, th	a track	Disagree Strongly	0	0	0		0		
		ė		NutoHill	, poi tos o	om that li degree o	racks th	perience g with a r c. For tha	1. Indicat ne point boratory ave.	hould be		0	0	0		۲		
		teda 📀		oted 1	i loo li oo	nasters	for you to	atory exp raduatin by track 4 things	identified m at sor od to hav d have la should h	f these s		0	0	۲		0		No. of the local division of the local divis
				13 Q (1)	the local sector	Action of the prog	ortunity study, bi	on labor tudent g ermined ou to do	ch track e progra s require student	t each o		0	۲	0		0		
10		A Favor	66p71D=52	· 9	the first of the	priate for t priate trac ical/clinic	m in this	er hands- ted of a s lid be det asking y	It with eac lents in the should be bicular trac ience the	ement that	Agree strongly	۲	0	0		0		
d Explore		Search	ound)_lb.	Search We	an airea	t approl n approl preclin	provide currriculu	y wheth e expec his shou	VLL stud VLL stud V experin v exper	of agree			pment					1
ed Delphi - Microsoft Interne	Wew Favorites Tools Help	S S S S . O .	http://www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/Ro	*	estion 1.2 Tracks	re previous round, you we ursework in a track or 'no' jority of respondents as ar re manufacturing, science	s too general, so we have dentify specific details of (also discussed previous) juired experience would be rry respondents beli eved the nd. In the questions below	 Indicate your level of ag should be required of A indicate if students in th if you think all students i semesters of laborato 	Please indicate your level	iggested Track	anufacturing	eclinical/Clinical Develo	usiness Development	Science tracks:	olecular biology		A underend factor.
Web-bas	File Edg	G Back .	Address 🌒	Google -	9	CO TO	to	Ma Ma Tou	- 00	1.1	0	W	ę.	ä		M	Done	to start

Web-base	d Delphi - Microsoft Internet	Explorer						
File Edit /	New Favorites Tools Help							ł.
G Back.		Search St Favor	100 Set	teda 📀	8.	0 · N	\$ \$	
Address	tp://www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/Hou	und)_1b.esp?ID=52					8	Links *
Google -	5 40 ·	iearch Web -	B 40 by	ocked 📔	AutoHill	Options 🥒		
	Science tracks:							3
Mo	lecular biology	0	0	0	۲	0		
Bio	hchemistry	0	0	0	0	۲		
ů	I biology	۲	0	0	0	0		
Are a se	there other scientific disciparate track for a program	plines that are s n focusing on bi	so signifi	cantly di ogy and	flerent fro business	n the three listed at	oove that they should be considered for	
							53	
H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H	previous rounds, we start were, when analyzed from eriential component with a only point of disagreemen ds-on laboratory experienc ds-that you indicate your	ed with the que: the viewpoint o written product it seemed to be ce as a compon level of agreem	f experie that emp whether ent of the ient belov	hesis vs mital ed hasizec or not A eir gradu	nonthesi ucation, it i critical th LL studer uate progr	, which evolved to c was found that all re inking, organizing ir fts in the masters' p am. Given that infor	cognitive vs. psychomotor vs. tracks, spondents agreed there should be an information, presenting information, etc. rogram should be required to have mation, we have restated the question	
Alls	tudents in the program, re er as an undergraduate be	gardless of trac sfore entering th	k, should e progra	t be req m or dur	uired to he	we hands-on wet lat raduate program.	o experience, which could be acquired	>
Done S							S Internet	-
🐮 start	🗿 Web-based Delphi	C panel 😋		and 🕷	Shap Pro - 13		2020	0136-610

students in the program	the Canach We	F . 1	Patrobaded 1 Autors 1 Oct	
I students in the program	Can property in	2		ors 🤌
mer as an undergraduate), regardle e before e	ss of track ntering the	 should be required to have I program or during their grad 	hands-on wet lab experience, which could be acquired uate program.
Indree strongly Agree Un	decided	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	
0	۲	0	0	
you agree, how many ser In this question, please i	mesters st Indicate if	a hands-o	equired at a minimum?	id be required for all students in this track and if so,
suggested Track	Should for all s	laborato tudents i	ry experience be required in this track?	If YES, what is the minimum number of semesters that should be required.
Aanufacturing	OYes	0N®		
Science	 Yes 	ONO		
Preclinical/Clinical Development	OYes	0N®		
Susiness Development	© Yes	ONO		
the text box below, pleas	se feel free	> to provid	e any comments that you mig	ht have about any part of Question 1B.
the text box below, pleas	se feel free	to provid	e any comments that you mig	ht have about any part of Question 1E
		Ľ	Data and Castina	

3 Web-based Delphi - Microsoft Internet Explorer File Edit New Favortes Tools Heb							
🚱 Back • 🐑 - 🗶 🕰 🐔 🔎 Saardt 🤺 Favortes 💞 Meda 🚱 🔗 👌	• 🗷	83 100	37				
Address 🛃 http://www.aged.temu.edu/delphi/Round)_tc.esp?tD=52						8	Links *
Google - 💌 👹 Search Web 🔹 👹 🛃 40 bloched 🕤 Autoriti 🧧	Coptions						
Question 1.3 Skills identified for core curriculum and tracks.							<
In the previous round, you sorted a list of skills into 'core', 'track' or 'not a a majority of respondents as appropriate for core or track are listed. The Table B Track with a scale for each allowing you to indicate your level of provided for each skill.	appropriate t lose skills are if agreement	for the progress organized with that cla	ram'. Or into two ssificati	hy those tables- on. Frec	skills ic Table A quencie	Sentified by Core and s are	
In the table below, please indicate your level of agreement that each skill students.	ill listed shou	ld be includ	ed in the	e core cu	Irriculun	n for ALL	
TABLE A Core Curriculum							
Skill	Frequency	Agree strongly				Disagree strongly	
 Preparing an abstract for a meeting 	10	۲	0	0	0	0	
 Present a business plan for a biotechnology company 	6	0	۲	0	0	0	
a. Present findings with Powerpoint type presentation	17	0	0	۲	0	0	
 Proposal writing 	10	0	0	0	۲	0	
s. Scientific and technical writing	13	0	0	0	0	۲	
 Writing brief trip reports 	13	0	0	0	۲	0	
7.Writing on, speaking about and presenting technical material to a variety of audiences with varying levels of knowledge in the field	16	0	0	۲	0	0	
 Critical thinking skills 	17	0	۲	0	0	0	
 Problem solving skills 	16	۲	0	0	0	0	
I iterature review skills	11	с	0	с	С	с	>
Done						S Internet	14
🐮 Start 🔰 Webtozed Depti 🔂 Round 3 🛛 💐 Part Step Pro						0490	141 841

Interference to do holo Interference to do holo Interference to do holo Interference	odt. New Favorites	tools Help			and the second		8				24
Interference Interference Interference Interference Interference Interference Interference Interference Interference Interference Interference <	0				1	1	2				
Image: Section of the state of the sta	× · · · ·	3	Search 🏹 Favorbes 🤩	Meda 🛃 🔀	27		2			-	
• Problem solving stolls • Problem solving stolls • Interpretation of scientific literature 11 0 0 0 0 • Trouble shorting stolls 11 0	A http://www.sged.	terru eduldelphi Pio	und)_tc.esp?ID=52	0						8	Links
a Problem solving skills 16 60 0 0 0 0 u Literature review skills 11 0 6 0		8		DOCKED IN PAIDAR	about a						
o. Literature review skills 11 0 0 0 0 0 o. Interpretation of scientific literature 10 <	e. Problem solv	ing skills			16	۲	0	0	0	0	0
Interpretation of scientific literature 10 0 0 0 0 0 Trouble shooting Trouble shooting 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Trouble shooting Trouble shooting 12 0 <td>10. Literature re</td> <td>wiew skills</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>11</td> <td>0</td> <td>۲</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td></td>	10. Literature re	wiew skills			11	0	۲	0	0	0	
a: Trouble shooting a 0 0 0 0 0 0 b: Understanding orher people's research 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 i. Toudherstanding orher people's research 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 i. Tearnwork in scientific investigation 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 i. Work both as an individual and as a productive member of productive productive productive productive member of productive pr	++. Interpretation	n of scientific h	terature		10	0	0	۲	0	0	
a. Understanding other people's research 12 0 0 0 0 0 4. Tearnwork in scientific investigation 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 a. Working on teams with professionals who are not trained in biology or biotechnology. 14 0	12. Trouble shot	oting			6	0	0	0	۲	0	
•• Tearmwork in scientific investigation 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 •• Working on tearms with professionals who are not brained in biology or biotectmology 14 0 <td< td=""><td>13. Understandi</td><td>ng other peopl</td><td>le's research</td><td></td><td>12</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>۲</td><td></td></td<>	13. Understandi	ng other peopl	le's research		12	0	0	0	0	۲	
e. Working on teams with professionals who are not trained in biology or biotechnology. 14 0 0 0 0 0 biology or biotechnology. e. Work both as an individual and as a productive member of a research beam. 12 0	14. Teamwork It	n scientific inve	estigation		14	0	0	0	۲	0	
•• Work both as an individual and as a productive member of a research team 12 0 0 0 0 •• Interpersonal skills-ability to work with diverse cross-section of people 16 0 0 0 0 0 0 •• Interpersonal skills-ability to work with diverse cross-section of the Resume writing 13 0 <td>16. Working on biology or biote</td> <td>teams with pro echnology</td> <td>viessionals who are not</td> <td>t trained in</td> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>۲</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td></td>	16. Working on biology or biote	teams with pro echnology	viessionals who are not	t trained in	4	0	0	۲	0	0	
tri Interpersonal skills abolity to work with diverse cross-section of people 16 0 0 0 0 is. Resume writing 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 is. Resume writing 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 is. Resume writing 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 is. Interviewing skills 12 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 s. Ethics of research and business 11 0 <	16. Work both a research team	is an individual	and as a productive m	tember of a	12	0	۲	0	0	0	
Is. Resume writing: Is. Resum writing: </td <td>47. Interpersone people</td> <td>al skills-ability t</td> <td>o work with diverse cro</td> <td>ss-section of</td> <td>16</td> <td>۲</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td></td>	47. Interpersone people	al skills-ability t	o work with diverse cro	ss-section of	16	۲	0	0	0	0	
•• Interviewing skills 12 0 0 0 0 0 •• Ethrics of research and business 16 0 0 0 0 0 •• Ethrics of research and business 11 0 0 0 0 0 •• Ethrics of research and business 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 •• Ethrics of research and business to adapt to new directions 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 •• Ethrics of research and business to fistory, current state and direction of the field 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 •• How biotechnology is used in different fields-agricuture, environmental, human health, etc. 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 •• How to read a profit and loss statement 10 0	18. Resume writ	ting			13	0	۲	0	0	0	
as: Ethics of research and business 16 0 0 0 0 0 21. Eagements to adapt to new directions 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 21. Eagements to adapt to new directions 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 22. Awareness of history, current state and direction of the field 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 23. Time management 17 0 <td>18. Interviewing</td> <td>skills</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>12</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>۲</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td></td>	18. Interviewing	skills			12	0	0	۲	0	0	
a: Eagemess to adapt to new directions 11 0 0 0 0 z: Awareness of history, current state and direction of the field 11 0 0 0 0 0 z: Awareness of history, current state and direction of the field 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 z: Time management 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 a: Time management 13 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 a: How biotechnology is used in different fields-agriculture, environmental, human health, etc. 13 0 <td>20. Ethics of res</td> <td>search and bus</td> <td>siness</td> <td></td> <td>16</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>۲</td> <td>0</td> <td></td>	20. Ethics of res	search and bus	siness		16	0	0	0	۲	0	
2: Awareness of fistory, current state and direction of the field 11 0 0 0 0 0 2: Time management 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 2: Time management 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2: Time management 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 2: How biotechnology is used in different fields-agriculture, environmental, human heath, etc. 13 0 0 0 0 0 2: How to read a profit and loss statement 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3: Reading a balance statement 10 0	21. Eagemess t	to adapt to nev	v directions		11	0	0	0	0	۲	
as Time management 17 0 0 0 0 as How biotechnology is used in different fields-agriculture, environmental, human health, etc. 13 0 0 0 0 as How to read a profit and loss statement 9 0 0 0 0 0 as Reading a balance statement 10 0 0 0 0 0	22. Awareness	of history, curre	ent state and direction	of the field	11	0	0	0	۲	0	
as How biotechnology is used in different fields-agriculture, environmental, human health, etc. 13 0 0 0 0 as. How to read a profit and loss statement 9 0 0 0 0 as. Reading a balance statement 10 0 0 0 0 0	23. Time manag	pement			17	0	0	۲	0	0	
as. How to read a profit and loss statement 9 0 0 0 0 as. Reading a balance statement 10 0 0 0 0	24. How biotech environmental,	nology is used human health,	d in different fields-agni etc.	culture,	13	0	۲	0	0	0	
26. Reading a balance statement 10 0 0 0 0 0	26. How to read	a profit and lo	ss statement		6	۲	0	0	0	0	
	26. Reading a b	valance statem	ent		10	0	۲	0	0	0	
										D Internet	
and 🖓 we breed bebri 🛜 Heard 3 💦 Heart Street Fronchion - Chail 😵 Saint Fronchion - Chail 😵 241 M	art A unit	based Delphi -	🙆 Roud 3	No Part Shar Pro - r	Safe						3-41 601

Image: Solution of the log Image: Solution of the log Image: Solution of the log	Web-based D	Delphi - Microsoft Internet	Explorer								
Obsolved Image: Source of the source of th	the Edit New	Favorities Tools Help									22
All the information and it the information of the inf	G Back •	0 . 2 2 2	Search 🌟 Favorites 🥰	Nuda 🙆 🙆 🕌	•	00	3				
Algo	ddress Shttp:/	(/www.aged.tamu.edu/delph(Plou	nd)_Ic.esp?ID=52							8	Links N
a. Reading a balance statement 10 0 0 0 0 zr. Knowledge of gene expression 10 0 0 0 0 0 a. Chemical safety 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 a. Laboratory safety 112 0 0 0 0 0 0 a. Laboratory Practice (GLP) 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 a. Laboratory Practice (GLP) 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 b. Good Laboratory Practice (GLP) 9 0 0 0 0 0 b. Federal regulatory process 112 0 0 0 0 0 b. Moderstanding dug discovery & development 13 0 0 0 0 0 b. Understanding dug discovery & development 13 0 0 0 0 0 a. Understanding dug discovery & development 13 0 0 0 0 0 b. Understanding dug discovery & development 13 0 0 0 0 0 a. Understanding dug listored value 9 0 0 0 0 0 <	ooge -	540 .	sarch web - 🐖 🗗 40	blocked 🔂 Automi 🛃 O	ptions 🤌						
Trichowieddge of gene expression 10 0 0 0 0 0 ax Chemical sefety 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 ax Laboratory safety 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 ax Laboratory safety 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 ax Eadiation safety 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 ax Eadiation safety 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 ax Eadiation safety 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 ax Eadiation safety 11 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 ax Heelectual property issues 12 12 0 0 0 0 0 ax Understand value and for thore of coporate cubrer 12 0 0 0 0 0 ax Understand value and for thore of coporate cubrer 12 0 0 0 0 0 ax Understand value and for thore of coporate cubrer 12 0 0 0 0 ax Understand value and for thore of copo	26. Rei	ading a balance statem	ent		10	0	۲	0	0	0	<
a: Chemical safety 11 0	zz. Kno	owledge of gene expres	sion		10	0	0	۲	0	0	
a: Laboratory safely 12 0 0 0 0 b: Radiation safely 11 0 0 0 0 0 b: Cood Laboratory Practice (GLP) 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 b: Cood Laboratory Practice (GLP) 2 9 0 0 0 0 0 b: Cood Laboratory Practice (GLP) 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 b: Federal regulatory process 12 12 0 0 0 0 b: Inderstanding drug discovery & development 13 0 0 0 0 b: Understand value and role of corporate cuture 12 0 0 0 0 b: Understand value and role of corporate cuture 13 0 0 0 0 b: Survey of biotechnology industry a: Basic Information Technology (IT) and MS needs for biotech 9 0 0 0 0 b: Monodge of clinical trids process . . 0 0 0 0 0 companies . . . 0 0 0 0 0 0 companies . . . 0 0 0 </td <td>28. Ch</td> <td>emical safety</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>11</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>۲</td> <td>0</td> <td></td>	28. Ch	emical safety			11	0	0	0	۲	0	
 Rediation safety	ze. Lat	ooratory safety			12	0	0	0	0	۲	
s: Good Laboratory Practice (GLP) 9 0 0 0 0 0 2: Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP) 2: 0 0 0 0 0 0 3: Federal regulatory process 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4: Keeping lab notebooks 4: Keeping lab notebooks 12 0 0 0 0 0 5: Inderstanding dug discovery & development 13 0 0 0 0 0 5: Survey of biotechnology industry 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 6: Survey of biotechnology industry 8 13 0 0 0 0 0 6: Nowedge of clinical triefs process 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 6: Nowedge of clinical triefs process 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 6: Nowedge of clinical triefs process 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 7: Nowedge of clinical triefs process 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7: Nowedge of clinical triefs process 9 0 0 0 0 0 0	20. Rat	diation safety			11	0	0	0	۲	0	
2: Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP) 9 0 0 0 0 0 3: Federal regulatory process 10 0 0 0 0 0 3: Federal regulatory process * Keeping lab notebooks 12 0 0 0 0 0 4: Meelectual property issues 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 5: Understand value and role of corporate cuture 12 0 0 0 0 0 5: Survey of biotechnology industry 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 6: Survey of biotechnology industry * Survey of biotechnology industry 13 0 0 0 0 0 6: Survey of biotechnology industry * Nowledge of chinical triads process 9 0 0 0 0 0 • Knowledge of chinical triads process 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 • Knowledge of students in thet track. Inthe table below, please indicate your level of agreement that each stull listed should be part of a specialized track and only Inthe table below, please indicate your level of agreement that each stull listed should be part of a specialized track and only	st. Goi	od Laboratory Practice	(GLP)		6	0	0	۲	0	0	
S: Federal regulatory process 10 0 0 0 0 S: Keeping lab motebooks 12 0 0 0 0 0 S: Keeping lab motebooks Altelectual property issues 13 0 0 0 0 0 S: Understanding drug discovery & development 13 0 0 0 0 0 S: Understand value and role of corporate culture 12 0 0 0 0 0 S: Survey of biotechnology industry 3 8 0 0 0 0 0 S: Survey of biotechnology industry 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 S: Survey of biotechnology industry 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 Vinowledge of clinical triate process 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 In the table below, please indicate your level of agreement that each skill listed should be part of a specialized track and only 0 0 0 0 0 In that track. Intertrack Intertrack Intertrack Intertrack 0 0 0 0	32. GOI	od Manufacturing Practi	ce (GMP)		6	0	۲	0	0	0	
•• Keeping lab notebooks 12 0<	33. Fe(deral regulatory process			10	۲	0	0	0	0	
** Intellectual property issues 13 0	SA KO	eping lab notebooks			12	0	۲	0	0	0	
a. Understanding dug discovery & development 13 0 0 0 0 0 a. Understand value and role of corporate cuture 12 0 0 0 0 0 a. Survey of biotechnology industry as Basic Information Technology (IT) and MIS needs for biotech 9 0 0 0 0 0 a. Survey of biotechnology (IT) and MIS needs for biotech 9 0 0 0 0 0 a. Knowledge of clinical trials process 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 a. Knowledge of clinical trials process 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 a. Knowledge of students in that track. Ither table below, please indicate your level of agreement that each skill listed should be part of a specialized track and only required of students in that track. 0 0 0 0 0	zs. Inte	electual property issues			13	0	0		0	0	1
27. Understand value and role of corporate culture 12 0 0 0 0 36. Survey of biotechnology industry 313 0 0 0 0 0 36. Survey of biotechnology industry 38. Survey of biotechnology (IT) and MIS needs for biotech 9 0 0 0 0 0 36. Survey of biotechnology (IT) and MIS needs for biotech 9 0 0 0 0 0 36. Knowledge of clinical trials process 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 40. Knowledge of clinical trials process 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 10. In table below, please indicate your level of agreement that each skill listed should be part of a specialized track and only required of students in that track. 0 0 0 0 0 Interst match in table below, please indicate your level of agreement that each skill listed should be part of a specialized track and only required of students in that track. 0 0 0 0 0 0 Interst match in the table below, please indicate your level of agreement that each skill listed should be part of a specialized track and only interst.	39. Unc	derstanding drug discov	ery & development		13	0	0	0	۲	0	
set Survey of biotechnology industry set Survey of biotechnology industry set Survey of biotechnology (IT) and MIS needs for biotech set Survey of biotechnology (IT) and MIS needs for biotech set Survey of biotechnology (IT) and MIS needs for biotech set Survey of biotechnology (IT) and MIS needs for biotech set Survey of biotechnology (IT) and MIS needs for biotech set Survey of biotechnology (IT) and MIS needs for biotech set Survey of biotechnology (IT) and MIS needs for biotech set Survey of biotechnology (IT) and MIS needs for biotech set Survey of set Survey of the set Survey of Survey of Survey set Survey of set Survey of a set Survey of Survey of Survey set Survey of Survey of Survey set Survey of Survey of Survey set Survey of Survey set Survey of Survey set Survey set Survey of Survey set Survey	ar. Unc	derstand value and role	of corporate culture		12	0	0	0	0	۲	
** Basic Information Technology (IT) and MIS needs for biotech 9 0 0 0 0 ••. Knowledge of clinical trials process 9 0 0 0 0 0 ••. Knowledge of clinical trials process 9 0 0 0 0 0 ••. Knowledge of clinical trials process 9 0 0 0 0 0 ••. Knowledge of clinical trials process 9 0 0 0 0 0 ••. Knowledge of clinical trials process 9 0 0 0 0 0 ••. Knowledge of clinical trials process 9 0 0 0 0 0 ••. Knowledge of clinical trials process 9 0 0 0 0 0 ••. Knowledge of clinical trials process 9 0 0 0 0 0 ••. Rule trials ••. Rootest 0 0 0 0 0 0 ••. Rule trials ••. Rootest ••. Rootest 0 0 0 0 0 ••. Rule trials ••. Rootest ••. Rootest 0 0 0 0 0 ••. Rule trials ••. Rootest ••. Rootest 0	38, Sur	vey of biotechnology inc	tustry		13	0	0	0	۲	0	
 Knowledge of clinical trials process 	28, Ber comp	sic Information Technolo anies	gy (IT) and MIS needs	for biotech	6	0	0	۲	0	0	
In the table below, please indicate your level of agreement that each skill listed should be part of a specialized track and only required of students in that track. TABLE B Tracks Dow Start Sta	40. Kn(owledge of clinical trials	process		6	0	۲	0	0	0	
TABLE B Tracks Annae Disannee Dome	In the tr require	able below, please indic ed of students in that trac	ate your level of agree .k	ment that each skill lic	sted should	d be part o	of a spec	alized fr	ack and	Nuo	
Dore Antree Antree Diterree V D	TABLI	E B Tracks									
1 Johns 1 J. Web-based Depti 📩 Rand 3 🕷, Part Sny Pro - rink 1 🖉 🖉 💰 🍸 🔇 342 Mi	-		M 0.111	-		Arree				Disarree	>
🖌 Start 🔰 Webbased Depris 😓 Hand 3 🐚 Paint Strup Pro- 12419 🔪 🖓 Art Strup Pro- 12419	Done									Internet	12
	start	🛃 Web-based Dephi	🖨 Hound 3	🐞 Paint Shap Pro - rSalg					~	日本での	0:42 BM

Web-based	Delphi - Microsoft Internet	t Explorer							•	
File Edit No	w Favorites Tools Help									2
- Hadt -	2 2 2 2 2	Search Stavetes	S Hada 🔕 🙆 🖉	. 2	83 100	27				
Address 🐴 http	r.//www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/Ho	und]_tc.asp?ID=52							8	Links »
Google -	*	Search Web 🔹 👩 🗗	40 blocked 👔 AutoHi N	Options 🤌						
TABL	.E B Tracks	2								<
		Skill	Ē	requency	Agree strongly				Disagree	
1.Eq	perimental design			10	۲	0	0	0	0	
2. Pro	oject management			10	0	۲	0	0	0	
a. Pro	oduct development			15	0	0	۲	0	0	
4. Ma	rketing			13	0	0	0	۲	0	
6. HO	w to write a business pla	u		10	0	0	0	0	۲	
e.De	veloping partnerships			13	0	0	0	۲	0	
7. SB	les skills			15	0	0	۲	0	0	
e. Ba	sic accounting principles	υΩ.		10	0	۲	0	0	0	-
e. Un	derstanding venture cap	ital process		11	۲	0	0	0	0	
to. RI	sk management			6	0	۲	0	0	0	
11.0	onducting market resear	ch		13	0	0	۲	0	0	1,
t2. M	icroeconomics of a firm			11	0	0	0	۲	0	
43 O	ontract law			12	0	0	0	0	۲	
14 Bi	oinformatics			6	0	0	0	۲	0	
16. Bi	ostatistics			10	0	0	۲	0	0	
16. CL	ONA library construction			6	0	۲	0	0	0	
12. C	ell therapies			10	۲	0	0	0	0	
ta. In	situ hybridization			10	0	۲	0	0	0	>
E) Done									D Internet	-
start	🗿 web-based Delphi	😂 Rourd 3	👹 Paint Shap Pro - r3q1	4				*	1 4 4 C	0:43.8M

Web-b	ased Detahi - Microsoft Intern	et Explorer								
Fiel Eq.	Wew Favortes Tools Help								1	2
G Back	· • • • • •	Search Stavortes	💕 Hada 🔕 🙆 - 🌉	•	0	*				
Address	http://www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/F	lound)_tc.esp?ID=52							8 •	Links *
Google.	8	Search Web - 👹 🗗	Coblocked Taratoria National Opt	ions 🤌						
-	re. In situ hybridization			10	0	۲	0	0	0	6
-	re. In vitro translation			11	0	0	۲	0	0	
R	to. In-vitro transcription			11	0	0	0	۲	0	
ni.	21. Microbial screening			10	0	0	0	0	۲	
64	22. Non-isotopic labeling tec	hniques		10	0	0	0	۲	0	
14	23. Poly(A) RNA isolation			12	0	0	۲	0	0	
- 14	M PCR-Real time			6	0	۲	0	0	0	
14	a. Proteomics			10	۲	0	0	0	0	
(1	a. Reverse transcription			6	0	۲	0	0	0	
.04	zr. RNA amplification			10	0	0	۲	0	0	
м	as. RNA isolation			10	0	0	0	۲	0	
04	M. SDS-PAGE			6	0	0	0	0	۲	
n	w. Site directed mutagenes	is techniques		345	0	0	0	۲	0	.8
n	M. Tissue and organ replace	ement		11	0	0	۲	0	0	1
	22. Transfection			12	0	۲	0	0	0	
n	xs. Transformation			10	۲	0	0	0	0	1
0	M Use of bacteria			10	0	۲	0	0	0	
	». Viral and non-viral gene t	herapy		6	0	0	•	0	0	
	m. Good Clinical Practice ((3CP)		12	0	0	0	۲	0	
-00	w. Good Tissue Practice (G	(di		12	0	0	0	0	۲	>
Done								-	D Internet	-
star	🕇 🔰 Web based Delphi	e bauel 3	🐞 Part Shop Pro-rögli					~	0496	01435910

	ors 🌒						
ar. Good Tissue Practice (GTP) 12	12	0	0	0	0	۲	<
a. 21CFRx00 10	10	0	0	0	۲	0	
34. Points to Consider documents	11	0	0	۲	0	0	
e. Guidance documents 9	6	0	۲	0	0	0	
4. Know about current drugs under development 12	12	۲	0	0	0	0	
42. Know about medical devices under development 12	12	0	۲	0	0	0	
48. Acquiring funding for biotech companies 13	13	0	0	۲	0	0	
44 ISO 9000	11	0	0	0	۲	0	
46. Biotechnology market knowledge 10	10	0	0	0	0	۲	
 Facility design and engineering ("Basic understanding of HVAC, water systems, facility layout and design) 	12	0	0	0	۲	0	
ar. Quality Assurance 11	11	0	0	۲	0	0	
4. National and International Scope of Interest	10	0	۲	0	0	0	
as. Preclinical testing 13	13	۲	0	0	0	0	
so. Human Factors testing 13	13	0	۲	0	0	0	
st. Clinical testing 13	13	0	0	۲	0	0	
es Madical writion	13	0	0	0	۲	0	

	22		Go Links *		< بن					yi	¥				2		1 10 1 10 1 10 1 10 1
			>		ember esters ough 3					ember	cy Ra	0	N	-		Interne	
					by panel m ed on semi oices 1 thr					by panel m desirable	Frequent	12	4	-			
		3• 😓 🖬 • 🛄 🗇 🔉 🕉		🔰 🛃 Options 🥒	ng how many times that length was chosen t d semesters, we grouped the answers basi we are asking that you rank the different ch tole choice.	Rank				mes that level of responsibility was chosen I t choices 1 through 3 with 1 being the most		at the student would be hired for)	e with intern's personality and abilities and				
		Neda 📀 👔		locked 1 AutoH	ncies indicati mships aroun under "Rank",	Frequency F	6	9	9	g how many ti		le position the	commensurat				State Charter
Explorer		Search 🔆 Favortes 🥶	d3_2.esp?30=52	arch web 🔹 👩 🗗 40 t	nship internship, with freque its will be planning inte d below. In the column choice and 3 being th				emester up to 1 year)	insibility are provided indicatin are asking that you rai choice.		out a half step below th	d move to higher level				S Bound 3
Delphi - Microsoft Internet I	Favorites Tools Help	0 2 2 2 0	U/www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/roun	· ·	d 3 d 3 tion 2.1 Length of Inten table below, the length of ovided. Given that studer ovided. Given that studer at information is provided being the most desirable	th of Internship	nonths (1 semester)	nonths (2 semesters)	months (1 summer + 1 se	tion 2.2 Level of Respo table below, frequencies column under "Rank", we being the least desirable	I of responsibility	evel of responsibility (ab	low (apprentice level) an any's policies	srate level			a web-based Debhi
Web-based	File Edit View	G Back •	Address Shttp:	Google -	Roun Quest In the t are pro and th with 1	Leng	0-3 m	4-6 m	7-121	Quest In the 1 In the c and 3	Leve	Hight	Start comp	Mode		E LUTIE	a start

	22		a Links *		K			1					>	
		27		The second s	1 was chosen by panel members. eing the most desirable choice	ne kind. An evaluation instrument uation form asking supervisors to I skills or communication skills by	ar from the supervisor, and verbal					fferences could be based on g east coast to west coast. We g, etc. For each level of ng adjustments for your area, and our rank the different choices 1 -ull Time Equivalent)		S Internet
		8 (D)		d 📆 Autoriti 🛛 🌌 Options 🥒	w many times that method of evaluation of different choices 1 through 3 with 1 b	report, thesis and/or end product of som initiative. An example would be an evaluation med on measures such as interpersonal ompletely unsatisfactory.	rmance as performance reviews, a lette	Rank		52	E	Instition, it appeared that some of the di al are in several different states spannin, due to geographic location, cost of livin, 3 on your area of the country, cost of livin . In the table below, we are asking that y eing the least desirable choice. (FTE=F		
		workes 🥑 Med		B B +0 blocke	d indicating ho that you rank t	cation, written onsidered que em has perforn ellent to 5 for c	isures of perfo s.	Frequency	7	9	4	In evel of compe- ers of this pan- or differences out the base thoice and 5 b	Dank	
(Explorer		Search the	und3_2.asp?10=52	Search Web *	Intern s are provide e are asking i le choice.	ults in a public ould also be c t which an into isistently exce	des such mea similar mean				nd quantitative	n for an inte es related to l se the membe se the membe tit to account fi tider what it woul students woul st desirable o		
elphi - Microsoft Interne	Favorites Tools Help	2 0 0 0 0 0	www.aged.tamu.edu/dephi/roi	*	on 2.3 Evaluation of able below, frequencle olumn under "Rank", w eing the least desirab	tative evaluation res a numerical score we be the perceived level a ng a score of 1 for cor	ative evaluation inclu- ion from supervisor or	ation method	tative	ative	ination of qualitative at	on 2.4 Compensatio examined the respons nees in location becau the table in an attemp nation provided, cont of positions in which 5 with 1 being the mo	of Companestion	
Web-based Dr	File Edit View	G Back -	address 🗿 http://	Google -	Question In the ta In the cc and 3 b	Quantity that has indicate indicate	Qualita evaluati	Evalua	Quantit	Qualita	Combi	Questix As we 6 differen remeet comper the kind through	I aval	Dorree

	a.		Links *		K						1		T.			>	M4 Shi C
			8		ould be based on it to west coast. We each level of ints for your area, and different choices 1	uivalent)							d above.			and the second	> ≤ ≤ ≤
		III · 💟 🚯 🐍		ptions 🤌	ed that some of the differences co ifferent states spanning east coas c location, cost of living, etc. For e he country, cost of living adjustme w we are asking that you rank the	sirable choice. (FTE=Full Time Eq							we will consider only the four lister				
		Nuda 🙆 🔗 🕹		ocked 🚡 AutoHi 🛃 0	ipensation, it appear anel are in several d es due to geographi sed on your area of t ind in the table belor	5 being the least des							o consider. y of respondents, so	or each question was			🐞 Pairt Shap Pro-right
		orbes 🧐		B 50 40 k	vel of com s of this p uld be ba	oice and	Rank		2		Ţ		emship t	Round 2 fe			
Explorer		Search of Fan	d3_2.asp?10=52	sarch Web 🔹 🕡	for an interr s related to le e the member to account for der what it wo tudents would	t desirable ch		ja de la compañía de	y level FTE	y level FTE	y level FTE	ry level FTE	ons of an into e identified by	o consider. vere given in f	ary, and		🖨 Found 3
l Delphi - Microsoft Internet	tw Favorites Tools Help	0 0 0 0	pultimen aged terru eduldelphitrour	5	stion 2.4 Compensation e examined the response ences in location becausi ed the table in an attempt bensation provided, consi- ind of nocitions in which s	gh 5 with 1 being the mos	el of Compensation	emships should not be pa	should be equal to ¼ entr	should be equal to ½ entr	should be equal to % entr	should be equal to an ent	ttion 2.5 Other dimension dditional dimensions were	stion 2.6 Other factors to s question, the scale you v	Not Important, Important but not necess Important and necessary		🗿 web-based Dephi
Meh-hase	File Edit We	G Back •	Address 🛃 Htt	Google -	Que: As w differ rewis comp	throu	Lev	0-lm	Pay	Pay	Pay	Pay	Que No a	Que: In this	<i>⊢.</i> α.α,	and the	start

	4	Contraction 18	an Line	K.		±0		ৰ জ	10 18	() () () () () () () () () () () () () (R (8)	>	*	and the second se
	\$	9				ile range (IQR). The IQR is that I have the option of changing it i side the IQR and you choose N	Comments						6 Interne	
	d ₩	S	Options 🥒	SB		ied, as is the interquart is outside the IQR, you ange it, but if it falls out	Choice this round					Save and Exit		
	0	a	toHi 1	estionw		is provid ir answei red to ch	ß	2.00	3.00	2.00-3.00	2.5-			
	0	P mai	blocked 1	for each qu		m Round 2 ound, if you e not requi	Your Choice	ю	m	m	ю	d Continue		-
splurer	the second second		arch Web • 🚮 🗗 40	o consider. Nere given in Round 2	sry, and	or each statement fro esponses fell, In this r I the list above. You at comment explaining y		s familiar with the nd goals ?	the company.	riences should be	ould evaluate the t should be	Save ar		
elphi - Microsoft Internet E	Favorites Tods Help		www.eged.tamu.eduloephilinum	on 2.6 Other factors to prestion, the scale you w	lot Important, nportant but not necessa nportant and necessary.	the below, your choice f within which 50% of the n sire, using a choice from ge it, please provide a c	Factors to Consider	ng with a company that it e master's curriculum ar	supervision provided by	idividual and team expe e during the internship.	udent and the school sho in each time to be sure i jed within the program.			Contraction of the local data
Web-based D	File Edit View	Address (Address (Add	Google -	Question In this q	1000 245	In the ta range w you des to chane	Other	Workin	Goods	Both in provide	The stup positio		Dores	A DECK OF A

Control of the transmission of the considered in professional science masters program. As you can set the question addressed what focus should be taken when planning a professional science masters program. As you can set trequencies are not that working anywhene. Autional-only national workforce needs and issues should be considered in program planning because graduates of the program could and up working anywhene. Autional with tracks based on student interests- a national focus is taken in planning and an overview provided for stude but with individual pracking anywhene. Autional with tracks based on student interests- a national focus is taken in planning and an overview provided for students but areas of specialization and does and issues are considered and an overview provided for students, but areas of specialization are developed based on workforce needs, industry transfs and issues when planning the provident is tracks but areas of specialization are developed based on workforce needs, industry transfs and issues when planning the provident is the institution should look only at the workforce needs, industry transfs and issues when planning the provident institution should consider to hold to student goals Local emphasis-the institution should look only the local workforce needs, industry transfs and issues when planning the provident industry transfs and issues when planning the provident industry transfs and issues when planning the provident industry the colloce. Autional volue on the actional work the different choices 1 through 5 with 1 being the most desirable choice and 5 beil with needs. Instronal specialization are developed based on workforce needs. Industry transfs to meet student goals autional onerview with regional specializations additional overview with regional specializations additi	
Round 3 Round 3 National, regional or local focus for program development. This question addressed what focus should be taken when planning a professional science masters program. As you can set requencies are not that widely dispersed. The choices are: 1. National-only national workforce needs and issues should be considered in program planning because graduates of th program found with reacks based on student interests and goals 2. National with reacks based on student interests and goals 3. National with reacks based on student interests and goals 4. Regional emphasis-the institution should boxe needs and issues are considered and an overview provided for student interests and goals 5. Local emphasis-the institution should consider only the local workforce needs, trends and issues of the region that the institution serves 6. Local emphasis-the institution should consider only the local workforce needs, trends and issues of the region these provided for student fractions are stated indicating how many times that focus was chosen by panel members. In the coll undic 'Rank', we are asking that you rank the local workforce needs, trends and issues of the region these the institution should consider only the local workforce needs, trends and issues of the region these institution should consider only the local workforce needs, then are such a very provided for stude the institution stores are stated and an overview provided for stude the institution stores are stated and an overview provided for stude the institution stores are students. 6. Local emphasis-the institution should consider only the local workforce neeeds, intherest and issues of the region itsect ences ar	
This question addressed what focus should be taken when planning a professional science masters program. As you can se frequencies are not that widely dispersed. The choices are: 1 National-only national workforce needs and issues should be considered in program planning because graduates of th program could end up working anywhere 2 National with tracks based on student interests- a national focus is taken in planning and an overview provided for stude but with individual tracks developed based on student interests and goals 3 National with regional specialization-national workforce needs, and an overview provided for students, but areas of specialization are developed based on workforce needs, industry trands and issues when planning the prostudents, but areas of specialization and elveloped reased on workforce needs, industry trands and issues of the region it set. 6 Local emphasis-the institution should look only at the workforce needs, industry trands and issues of the region it set. 7 Local emphasis-the institution should consider only the local workforce needs, trends and issues of the region it set. 8 Local emphasis-the institution should consider only the local workforce needs, trends and issues when planning the provident fractional emphasis-the institution should local to consider only the local workforce needs. Industry trands and issues when planning the provident fractions are assing that you rank the different choices 1 through 5 with 1 being the most desirable choice. In the table below, frequency A In the table below, frequenci planning the most desirable choice. In the ta	
 National-only national workforce needs and issues should be considered in program planning because graduates of th program could end up working anywhere National with tracks based on student interests- a national focus is taken in planning and an overview provided for stude twith individual tracks developed based on student interests and goals National with regional specialization-national worldorce needs and issues are considered and an overview provided for stude students, but areas of specialization-national worldorce needs and issues are considered and an overview provided for stude students, but areas of specialization-national look only at the worldorce needs, industry trends and issues of the region tast. Local emphasis-the institution should consider only the local worldorce needs, industry trends and issues of the region it set. Local emphasis-the institution should consider only the local worldorce needs, industry trends and issues of the region tast to the table below, frequencies are provided indicating how many times that focus was chosen by panel members. In the colu under 'Rank', we are asking that you rank the different choices 1 through 5 with 1 being the most desirable choice. Program Focus National overview with tracks to meet student goals Alational overview with regional specializations A 	n. As you can see,
 Program from any individual tracks based on student interests- anational focus is taken in planning and an overview provided for student with tracks but with tracks besed on student interests and goals National with regional specialization-national workforce needs and issues are considered and an overview provided for stude the institution should consider only the local workforce needs, industry trands and issues of the region that the institution serves Local emphasis-the institution should consider only the local workforce needs, industry trands and issues when planning the product "Rank", we are asking that you rank the different choices 1 through 5 with 1 being the most desirable choice. In the table below, frequencies are provided indicating how many times that focus was chosen by panel members. In the columer "Rank", we are asking that you rank the different choices 1 through 5 with 1 being the most desirable choice and 5 being that you rank the different choices 1 through 5 with 1 being the most desirable choice and 5 being that you rank the different choices 1 through 5 with 1 being the most desirable choice and 5 being that you rank the different choices 1 through 5 with 1 being the most desirable choice and 5 being that you rank the different choices 1 through 5 with 1 being the most desirable choice and 5 being that you rank the different choices 1 through 5 with 1 being the most desirable choice and 5 being that you rank the different choices 1 through 5 with 1 being the most desirable choice and 5 being that you rank the different choices 1 through 5 with 1 being the most desirable choice and 5 being that your sections is a set of the regional specializations is a s) graduates of the
3. National with regional specialization are developed based on workforce needs and issues are considered and an overview provided for students, but areas of specialization are developed based on workforce needs, industry trends and issues of the region that the institution serves 5. Local emphasis-the institution should consider only the local workforce needs, trends and issues when planning the prunder 'Rank', we are asking that you rank the different choices 1 through 5 with 1 being the most desirable choice and 5 beil watomal focus with regional specializations and inclusing the provided for the different choices 1 through 5 with 1 being the most desirable choice and 5 beil values with regional specializations and inclusing the provided for the different choices 1 through 5 with 1 being the most desirable choice and 5 beil values with regional specializations and the specializations and 5 beil value and 5 beil value and specializations and 5 beil value and 5 beil value and specializations and specializations and 5 beil value and	rovided for students,
 Regional emphasis-the institution should consider only at the workforce needs, industry trends and issues of the region it is 5. Local emphasis-the institution should consider only the local workforce needs, trends and issues when planning the prounder 'Rank', we are asking that you rank the different choices 1 through 5 with 1 being the most desirable choice and 5 beiled to be been with regional special s	view provided for stitution serves
In the table below, frequencies are provided indicating how many times that focus was chosen by panel members. In the colu under 'Rank', we are asking that you rank the different choices 1 through 5 with 1 being the most desirable choice and 5 beinest desirable choice. Program Focus Frequency Rank National focus 4 1 National overview with regional specializations 3 1	of the region it serves planning the program
National focus 4 4 National overwiew with tracks to meet student goals 4 4 National overwiew with regional specializations 3 3	thers. In the column hoice and 5 being the
National overview with tracks to meet student goals 4 National overview with regional specializations 3	
National overview with regional specializations 3	
Regional emphasis	
Local emphasis	

2	Links #		¢	T			1										1	>	44	0.00 EM
	8		force for ast 50% or more ition that a recent																S Internet	
33			tts into the work chosen by at le	Disgree strongly	0	0	0	0	۲	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	۲	c		
ers O			ntry poir e been e couldi		0	0	0	۲	0	۲	0	0	0	0	0	۲	0	¢		
			ble as er that hav h job titl		0	0	۲	0	0	0	۲	0	0	0	۲	0	0	¢		
X		Options	be suital ositions that eac		0	۲	0	0	0	0	0	۲	0	۲	0	0	0	¢		
0 8.8		AutoHi N	that would iss. Those p agreement mber of res	Agree strongly	۲	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	۲	0	0	0	0			
S Neda		pa to blocked	w graduates ose positions y and busine your level of stion, total nu	requencies	13	44	12	10	12	12	11	6	11	11	6	14	16			
2 🖒 🔎 Search 🤺 Favortes	u.edu/delphi/round3_4-asp?30=52	🔸 👘 Search Web 👻 🛃	/ points into industry for nev e have attempted to identify the isters program in biotechnolog e listed below. Please indicate pect to qualify for. For this quee	Position Title F	ssociate	relopment associate	ng associate	ssociate		ological	ntation specialist	Iwhiter	ntation coordinator	i associate	ion assistant	velopment research analyst	isearch analyst			
. 0	p://www.eged.tem		nd 3 stion 4-Entry s question, we uates of a ma spondents are uate could exp		Research as	Process dev	Manufacturin	Aseptic fill as	QC analyst	QC microbio	QA documer	QS technical	QA documer	Clinical data	Documentati	Business der	Marketing re	To shall all as		
G Back -	iddress 🖨 http	Google -	Rour Gues grad	No.	-	3	3	4	ø	9	1	8	თ	10	1	12	13		Done	

() + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	www.sped.tamu.edu/delphi/round3_4.asp?30=52			and a second				-	
								-	Links
	- C Search Web - C	1 40 blocked	utore N	Options a					
13 M	larketing research analyst	16	0	0	0	0	۲		
14 Te	echnical service rep	11	0	0	0	۲	0		
15 P	roduct management associate	6	0	0	۲	0	0		
16 JL	unior position in licensing/tech transfer	11	0	۲	0	0	0		
No.	Additional Titles	Appropriate :	as entry or NO	pointls	fundam	ientally e	equivalent		
17 AS	sociate product manager	© Yes	ONO	t					
18 Cli	nical research associate I	OYes	©N0	1					
19 Bio	otechnology patent writer	 Yes 	ONO						
20 Re	gulatory analyst	O Yes	©N0						
21 Do	cument analyst	 Yes 	ONO						
22 Ph	armaceutical technical writer	OYes	0N©						
23 Ap	plication scientist	© Yes	ONO						
24 Da	ta management coordinator	OYes	0N0						
25 An	alytical scientist, knowledge management	© Yes	ONO						
26 Sr.	knowledge analyst	OYes	0N0	-					
27 Lio	ensing associate	© Yes	ONO						
28 Pla	ant quality compliance manager	OYes	0N0						
29 Cli	nical manager, scientific communications	 Yes 	ONO						
30 Bio	ological database administrator	OYes	0N()						

	*		Units *		¢	1						2	122	NH SSID
_	1	5 IS	8		that range within which 50% of we are asking you to consider your de the IQR and you choose not to hoice.		at a more acourate response	Comments	K 3	(1)	x 3		O Internet	2 1 2 2 A 2 2 A 2 A 2 A 2 A 2 A 2 A 2 A
		· N		options 🥒	d interquartile range (s given. In this round, or response falls outsi son supporting your o		es into two parts to o	Response this round						
		•ds 🕙 🔂 •		ched S Autors	an response an previous round warranted. If you you give the rea	20	e strongly acarated the rol	Your response in Round 2	-	7	3	m		😽 Pant Shap Pro
		5		ED 40 blo	ard he med rom the nink are ask that		Disagre	IQR	2.00	1.00-	1.00	90,0		
ar		T Parote	p710=52	10 . 9	risory bos Round 2, the response f nges you the Me only d	4	Disagree	Median	1.5	1.00	1.50	2.00		c pun
rnet Explore		Search	hi/round3_5.as	Search We	ilustry adv id rated in and your acceptable	0	o opinion 1		riculum		.E	fustry ties		
rosoft Inte	Tools Hel	3	mu edujdelp	•	es for inc mitified ar () is giver and mak berfectly a	2	Agree N	tole	ient & cur	opment	s & trend	versity/inc		eed Delphi -
Delphi - Mic	Favorites		//www.sged.ta		d 3 dion 5 Role tich role ide rs falls-IQF e it that is p used on pr	1	e strongly J		s assessm	ship develo	fying issue	din guid		A web-be
Web-based	File Edit Ven	- ypeq	Address Shttp.	Google -	Roun Quest answe chang chang		Agree In the c		Need	Intern	Identi	Estab	Done	🐮 start

	22		Go Links *		ৰ জ	S	10 12	3	3 3	রা হা	x x	3	>		1 (1 3157 BM
			>											S Intern	202
		0 B 3													
		- IZ		🛃 Options 🥒									Save and Exit		rotea
		40 🙆 🙆		Ned 1 Autorit	2	m	÷	-	F	÷	4	m	Ortinue		🍘 Paint Shap Pro -
		1 S 10		Bo to the	1.00-	100- 200-	100-	2.00-	2.00-	2.00-	2.00-	3.00-	Seve and C		
		Favorb	10-62		1.50	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00			e 12
Explorer		Search	rd3_5.esp?	earch web		ry ties	, team					ns and			0
Delphi - Microsoft Internet	Favorites Tools Help	0.00000000	Ummu aged, temu eduldebhlihou	5	fying issues & trends in try	olishing universityindust	est or provide seminars cts, case studies, etc. to ement faculty teaching	art job placement	ing on private sources o	ding private sources of 1g	esent a cross-section of try through diverse bership	am evaluation through back on success of inten lates hired.			🛃 Web-based Dephi
Web-based	File Edit Ven	G Back -	Address S http:	Google -	Identi indus	Estat	Sugg projer suppl	Stude	Advis	Provi fundir	Reprindus	Progr		Done Done	🐮 start
	📌 Favortes 💞 Meda 🕗 🙆 🙆 👹 🛛 🛄 ᠿ	6 8 %													
-----------------	--	---													
Search 1	estimations. 🛃 to blocked 🕤 Autoriti 🛃 Options 🥒														
hat sh	build be considered in this study.	mortant to include in this stuck for													
d was any in	u user were serected by a majority of respondents as in vas explored further in Round 2.1 and is summarized in hat of possible innovations in curriculum and teaching ovations that you think could be successfully implement	noncent to include in this round. In Question 1 of this round. for professional science masters ited in professional science masters													
	Save and Exit														
		S Internet													
0	sound 3 😻 Paint Shap Pro	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2													

APPENDIX G

ROUND 4 INSTRUMENT

-	*		Links *		¢						3	4	N8 6510 (
		0 B 3	· ·	The second se	ı Professional biotechnology.	nairing questions and summarize those that ing this one. For this round, "consensus" is tree (5)".	is round or encounter any technical	ch item. You are given one last opportunity to ents. Part of #2 Tracks will require one more		portunity to see the results, make any d in Round 3 and a summary is provided for	portunity to see the results, make any	Dirternet	2007
		💞 huda 🙆 🙆 🔮 📓 - 🛄		1 40 blocked 🕤 Autoriti 🛃 Options 🥒	shi study to develop a model for a ogram combining business and	s round will complete most of the ren puire an additional, brief round follow iT receive a rating of "Strongly Disag	 If you have any questions about th ir call 979-862-4935. 	 from Round 3 are provided for ear our answer and provide final commet 		aach item. You are given one last op nal comments. Part 6 was completed	each item. You are given one last op		💘 part Stop Sto
		Search of Favorites	nd4.asp	earch web 🔹 👩 🗗	Round 4 of a Delp cience Masters pi	ce in this study. Thi ons 1 and 4 will rec rif an item does NC	/7 from 11/19 to 12 jeant/othernu.edu o	quartile ranges (IQ) nges you desire to		3 are provided for swer and provide fi	3 are provided for . swer and provide fi		😂 Hound 3
	Favorites Tools Help	0 0 0 0 0 0	(www.sged.tamu.edu/delphi/rour	× 10	ō	you for your perseveran mpleted. Parts of questi d as being reached only	und will be available 24 ms, please email me at	on 1 ents, medians and inter results, make any char ollowing this one.	rogram Goals racks kulls	on 2 is and IQR from Round is you desire to your an inventence.	on 3 is and IQR from Round is you desire to your an		🛃 Web-based Delphi
	File Edit New	G Back • 🗧	Address Shttp://	Google -		Thank) are con defined	This rol problen	Questi Comme see the round fu	÷.ciei	Questi Meciar change your co	Questi Mediar change	Done -	🐮 start

Web-based	Delphi - Microsoft Internet	Explorer			
File Edit View	w Favorites Tools Help				22
G Back -	 <!--</td--><td>Search 🌟 Favorbes 🥐 b</td><td>ata 😵 🙆 🔮 📓 🛛 🚺 🕼</td><td>\$ B &</td><td></td>	Search 🌟 Favorbes 🥐 b	ata 😵 🙆 🔮 📓 🛛 🚺 🕼	\$ B &	
Address 🖨 http:	U/www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/rour	d4.asp		8	units *
Google -	×	sarch Web 👻 🛃 🚯 40 bk	ded 🗐 Autoriti 🛃 Options 🥒		
round	following this one.	instances of each			<
+ N m	Program Goals Tracks Skills				
Ques Media shang	tion 2 Ins and IQR from Round. Les you desire to your any onvenience.	3 are provided for each swer and provide final c	tem. You are given one last opport	unity to see the results, make any Round 3 and a summary is provided for	
Ques Media chang	tion 3 Ins and IOR from Round. es you desire to your an:	3 are provided for each swer and provide final c	tem. You are given one last opport	unity to see the results, make any	
Ques Media any ch indica	tion 4 Ins and IQR from Round, tenges you desire to you te your level of agreeme	3 are provided for each r answer and provide fin nt. This part of question	tem in Table 1. You are given one al comments. In Table 2. frequenci 4 will require one more round to co	ast opportunity to see the results, make as are provided and you are asked to mplete.	
Ques No fur provid	tion 5 ther action is necessary. led for your convenience.	Analysis of this questio	Lis completed. A summary of Rour	d 3 comments, medians and IQR is	
Ques Sumn be sur desire	tion 6 paries of responses from mmanzed and provided. id.	Round 3 are provided . merely as a starting poir	No further analysis will be done on	his question in this study. The results will comments may be made in this round if	
Ģ				Dirteernet	>
🐮 start	🗿 Web-based Delphi	e baurd 4	🍓 Pairt Shap Pro - ritet	20.67	144 00

×	k,	Links »		٢.	-1) 				>	4	W8 1016
		3		entified in an earlier round.	r each item,	ed on the feedback given. If only ask that you please give The scale used in the previous		Comments from Round 3		Internet	20676
	\$ Y @) objectives id	responses fo	ecessary basi ceptable. We inal analysis. 7	strongly 5	2			
			Options 🥒	t on the five (5	falls-IQR) of all	ges you think n is perfectly ac ecision in the f	4	Commen			
	8		Autore 2	el of agreemen	of responses	nake any chan; o change it that erstand your d	ю	Your response his round			Paint Shap Pro
	orbes 💕 Media		B B + 10 blocked	icate your lew	item. in which 50% 1 Aous round.	answer and n choose not to to better und	2	Your response in Round			*
	Faw	71D=52		ind o	e with round	ious liyou elp us	. ≥	ß			-
et Explorer	Search S	ound4_1a.esp	Search Web	als reasked	onses for (that rang previous mi from th	r your prev he IQR and hoice to h	strong	Median			0
ed Delphi - Microsoft Interm	Wew Favorites Tools Help · 💽 - 💌 🔊 🐔 🏑	http://www.sged.tsmu.edu/delphi/R	\$ ·	und 4 estion 1.1 Program Goa he previous round, you we own below are	 The median for all resp The interquartile range Your response from the Comments for each ite 	his round, please conside ir response falls outside th reason supporting your c nd was:		Goals	Students will demonstrate istery of written and oral mmunication skills litterature		🗿 Web based Delphi
Web-ba	Back -	Address 🐴	Google-	8 9 5 5 8	104520.01434	t ni vy viti etta			A mi mi	Done	🐮 start

	ł.		this #		<			2		144 2
ä		1	v 2 60 11		Comments from Round 3			In regards to #5, we have students that come in without an undergraduate degree in a biological discipline, yet do well in the graduate level science courses. I would not say that they demonstrated "mastery" of a basic discipline, yet centarily have mastered the basic concepts underlying the discipline. Some go into positions where they never have to do hands on work, so do not "master" the bench techniques. Since we pervised to an anonament acreate of the	Internet	2020
		R 🕒 🚺 🖉		Options 🤌	Comments	< <u>></u>	3. 2	< <u>></u>		
		a @ @·&		M Statette M	Your response this round					Point Shap Pro - ridgi
		orbes 💕 Med		B Brettode	Your response in Round 3	-	8	m		-
		E Faw	21D=52	13	IQR	280	218	289		5
t Explorer		Search S	und4_1a.esp	Search Web	Median	81	1.00	00.1		0
based Delphi - Microsoft Interne	% New Favorites Tools Help	5 (🔊 🖻 🖻 · 🔘 • 4	http://www.sped.temu.edu/delphi/Ro	1	Goals	A. Students will demonstrate mastery of written and oral communication skills [literature review, writing in a variety of pusiness and scientific formats, oral presentations supported by visual aids for technical and nonechnical audiences, communication for interpersonal and supervisory situations.]	B. Students will participate in experiential learning opportuncties that focus on working in the industry environment, including at least one infermship in an industry setting.	C. Students will demonstrate mastery in the theories and techniques of a scientific discipline basic to the biotechnology industry imolecular biology.		17 🔹 🗿 Web-based Delphi
Web-	File Ed	BMG	Address	Google					Dorree	射 sta

do hands on work, so do not the bench techniques. Since we
"marter" the bencl emphasize the ma program, we do no
]
8
gy industry biology, v celt biology1

Web-based	1 Delphi - Microsoft Interne	i Explorer		
File Edit Vie	the Favorites Tools Help			2
G Back •	S - S S S	Search 🔆 Favortes 💞 Media 🚱 💈	3- 😓 🖬 - 🛄 🗇 🔉 🕉	
Address 🗃 Htta	pulliwere aged tame eduldelphing	and+_jb.esp?tD=52	8	nie *
Google -	*	Search Web • 🚳 🗗 to blocked 🚡 Autom	🛃 Options 🤌	
Rour	nd 4 stion 1.2			٢.
A. St In the	uggested Tracks previous round, we ask	ad you to:		
	Indicate your level of ag Indicate the minimum a Indicate lab experience	reement with the tracks that had been mount of hands-on laboratory experier that should be required of students in	identified. The that should be required of every student in the program. different tracks.	L
Items	s in the table below are n	inked first by median and then by IQR	. For each item you are given:	
	The median for all resp The interquartile range Your response from the Comments from the pre	onses. (that range within which 50% of respo previous round. vious round.	nses falls-IQR) of all responses.	
		General Comment	s from Round 3	
The sciel requ	experiential component ritific enterprises and sh irre less hands-on expen is to have current, hands	of each track will of course be differen build have a lot of experience. The bus ence. However, I strongly agree that a -on experience with the science in orc	It based on the focus of the track. However, the first 3 are iness development track is less science oriented and would myone doing business development for the biotech industry der to understand, argue, and negotiate for the industry.	
I wou	uld expect all students ar	imitted would meet the lab requirement	nt as result of their undergraduate education.	
Whe	are is Quality?			
Note	sure how to do lab for so	me of these and assume lab is not int	emship.	>
*				*
Dorree			S Internet	340
🐮 start	🛃 web-based Dephi	📩 Bound 4 🛛 🛛 😻 Paint Shop P	vo-riele 🔰 🖉 💰 🕹 🧃	13.6M

in	(eb-based Delphi - Microsoft Interne	d Explorer						
橙	Edit New Favorites Tools Help							22
•) Back - 🕥 - 💌 🕰 🏠 🖌	Search SFan	rtes 💞 Media	@ B. B		3 B 3		
Addiv	ess 🗃 http://www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/ro	ound4_1b.esp?tD=52					8	Links *
3	gle-	Search Web 🔹 🚳	B Bh 40 blocked	Autoria 2	Options 🥒			
			General Co	omments fror	n Round 3			3
	The experiential component scientific enterprises and sh require less hands-on exper needs to have current, hand	t of each track w ould have a lot ience. However s-on experience	ill of course bu of experience. . I strongly agr	e different bas The business ee that anyone hoe in order to	ed on the focu development e doing busine understand, e	is of the track. How track is less scient ess development f irgue, and negotia	wever, the first 3 are find or oriented and would for the biotech industry ate for the industry.	
	I would expect all students a	dmitted would n	neet the lab re	quirement as r	esult of their I	Indergraduate edi	ucation.	
	Where is Quality?							71
	Not sure how to do lab for sk	ome of these an	d assume lab	is not internsh	ip.			
	"Preclinical/Clinical"should i	nclude some ex	posure to pro-	duct developm	ent in ag biot	echnology.		1
		Agree strongly 1	2	ю	4	Disagree strongly 5		
		U	omments fro	m Round 3 fo	or this sectio	Ę		
	These very good.						No. 101 100 10	
	Mol Bio, Biochem and cell E into a single track that is call represented here, Quality A;	Bio are importar led research. Th ssurance could	It science disc the need for a s be included in	ciplines however science based this track.	er I would not technical trac	grant them separs It for Quality Contr	ate tracks. Combine them rol is also great and is not	>
1	80						Internet	
2	start 🔰 🗿 web based Dephi	e proced 😜	*	Paint Shap Pro - r4g	td -		 A 2 4 5 	4:04.6%

	22		Links *		3						K S	8 5	<u> </u>	6 5	8 5	~	4:05 PM
			8				ics. Combine them so great and is not	d and matched to		Comments						Internet	2 10 X 10 X
		1 · 🗌 🗇 🔒 🐇		1	s section		vuid not grant them separate tract ical track for Quality Control is al	hese disciplines should be mixer		Your response this round							
		💞 Hada 🕗 🙆 🚰 🛃		🗗 40 blocked 👔 Autoriti 🛃 Options	ments from Round 3 for this		ience disciplines however I wo eed for a science based techn ncluded in this track.	ot industry based. Courses in t		Your response in Round 3	2	4	÷	ę	9	144	🍓 Paint Shap Pro-Hajle
		Favortes	1D=52	4 .	Com		ch. The n ch. The n	cipline, n		IQR	1.00-2.00	00-2.25	00.2.25	00-3.00	00-3.00		44
t Explorer		Search 5	und4_1b.asp?	Search Web			io are imp ed resear surance o	ed are dis		Median	8	8	8	1.50	200		Const O
d Delphi - Microsoft Interne	ten Favorites Tools Help	S S S S S	tp://www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/ro	\$6 •		se very good.	Bio, Biochern and cell B a single track that is call resented here, Quality As	nk the science tracks liste industry requirements.	nt Physiology	Suggested Tracks	Inical/Clinical Development	scular biology	ufacturing	ness Development	hemistry		🛃 web-based Delphi
Web-base	File Edit V	G Back •	Address	Google -		The	Mol	the the	Pla		Prec	Mole	Man	Bus	Bioc	< E) Done	start

	22		Links *		<	(max - max)				3	*	-	1105 811
			3			5 3	o have hands-on wet lab ering the program or h experience the student		the feedback given. If sisk that you please give ale used in the previous			S Internet	20426
		0 B &					should be required to graduate before enti semester, how much	I responses.	recessary based on cceptable. We only a final analysis. The sc	Disagree strongly 5			
				tions 🤌			ill students as an under ndicate. by	s-IQR) of a	you think r perfectly ac sion in the f	4			
		.0 0.2		1 🗐 Autoria 🔤 🔤 Op	ø	÷	i agreement that a e acquired either a so asked you to ir	o of responses fails	nake any changes o change it that is erstand your deci	m			Paint Shap Pro - right
		es 💕 Nedi		ED 40 blocks			/our level of ce could be o that, we a	which 50%	swer and n oose not to better und	8			*
		Favor	p?tD=52		1.00-3.00	1.00-3.00	udents indicate y experien agreed to iven:	ge within s round. ound.	evious an nd you ch help us to	ee. NDu			t pan
of Explore		O Search	ound4_1b.æ	Search Web	200	2.00	or All St dyou to sck. This m. If you you are g	onses. (that ran e previou evious ro	r your pr he IQR at hoice to	Agr Stroi			Ō
telahi - Microsoft Intern	Favorites Tools Help	0 - 2 2 4	Nwww.eged.temu.edu/delphi/r	\$	mistry	Acid.	nds-on Experience 1 avious round, we aske ence, regardless of the their graduate progra have. For each item y	The median for all rest the interquartile range (our response from the Comments from the pr	round, please conside sponse falls outside t son supporting your c was:				🛃 Web-based Dephi
Web-based I	File Edit Vew	G Back •	Address Shttp:/	Google -	Blocher	Cell bio	B. Har In a pre experi- during should		In this r your re the rea round v		*	Done Done	🐮 start

		Links #		C			E B		n		dy be	~
		8			Comments			ents in each track.	semesters is /-N).	ve the sgram or during	Strong	Internet
	\$ 33 (D			Disagree strongly 5	Your response this round			iould be required for all stud easured by semesters.	e number of recommended ifference between Y and N ()	ck should be required to har suste when they enter the pro	Strongly Agree	
	• 🗷 👘		Coptions	4	ponse in nd 3			component sh should be, me	he mean of th inked by the di	te in each tra an undergrad table.		
	0		Natorii I	m	Your res Rou	10		n laboratory f experience	o" answers. T encies are ra	tho participa nce either as ts below the I	cies	191
	S Heda		5 40 blocked	5	ß	1.00-	100- 2,00	hands-o amount o	and No	udents v experie	requen	
	Search St Favorbes	d4_1b.asp?tD=52	arch web 🔹 🛐 🗗	Agree strongly 1	Median	s 1,50	81	Track you to indicate if a that the minimum 6	are given for "Yes' fio answered "Yes	preement that all st ands-on laboratory ce is provided for (
t New Favorites Tools Help	- O - S S V	http://www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/roura	S 10 .		Question	Hands on experience for all students regardless of track?	How many semesters? (n=12)	C. Hands-on Experience By n a previous round, we asked y f so, we asked that you state w	In the table below, frequencies a cased on those respondents w	Please indicate your level of ag ecommended semesters of his fielr graduate program. A spac		
File Edit	Back	Address	Google					0 E E	20	0.58	_	< Dome

×	4	42 54		<									2	14	H
Ë		3				rongly Sagree	ø	0	0	0	۲				(a) + 10
				<u>.u</u>	guin	8 B	4	0	0	0	0			Internet	1.7
				ésters.	le m or d		m	0	0	۲	0				
				vd sem	have th progra	4	5	0	۲	0	0	(8)			
				Y and h	ired to I	Strong	2	۲	0	0	0			-	
	8 S (1)		6 ×	an of the number of recon y the difference between	ach track should be required to the section of the		Recommended Semesters		2	2	ŝ.		ve and Exit		
	-		Coption	s. The me	pate in e: as an und he table.		N-Y	14	10	7	2	ants	ŝ		na - réalh
	0		d 🗐 Autori	o" answen encies are	who partic ince either ts below t	Icles	Ŷ	0	5	m	9	Comme	Intimue		Pant Shop P
	ortes 😵 Med		Bato biodos	Yes" and "N "Yes", Frequ	all students v atory experie I for commen	Frequer	Yes	14	12	10	8		Save and Co		*
Coplarer	Search 🌟 Favo	df_lb-asp710=52	arch Web - 🧃	are given for '	preement that ands-on labor ce is provided										e Bound 4
Delphi - Microsoft Internet I	w Favortes Tools Heb D - 💌 🛃 🐔 💋	(//www.aped.tamu.edu/deph//roun	45 50	table below, frequencies t on those respondents w	e indicate your level of ag mended semesters of he traduate program. A spar		Suggested Track	6	nical/Clinical Development	acturing	ess Development				🛃 Web-based Deb/v
Web-based	File Edit Vien	Address Ath	Google -	In the based	Pleas recorr their g			Science	Preclin	Manuf	Busin			Done	🐮 start

🛓 Web-based Delphi - Microsoft Internet	Explorer		
File Edit View Favorites Tools Help			22
🔾 Back + 😒 - 💌 🛃 🏷	Search 🌟 Favorbes 😻 Medi	· 📀 🙆 · 🜄 · 💟 🚯 🚴 🕉	
Address 🗿 http://www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/rour	nd4_)c.asp/30=52		Go Links 🏘
Google -	earch Web 🔹 👩 🗗 40 blocke	a 🗐 Alartii 🛃 Options 🔌	
Round 4 Question 1.3	6		<
Skills identified for core cur In the previous round, you indic more appropriate for students	riculum and tracks. cated your level of agreeme in a particular track. We an	In that certain skills should be required in core curriculum or would a not attempting to separate skills into specific tracks in this study.	8
Our goal for this question is to:			
 Identify those skills that s Separate them from those 	should be core for all studer se skills that should be only	ts and in tracks.	
TABLE A Core Curriculum In Table A, you indicated your I every student, regardless of tra	level of agreement that eac	h skill listed should be part of part of the core curriculum and requir	d of
For each item you are given:			
 The median for all respondence of the interquartile range (the Your response from the prevence of the prevence of	nses that range within which 50% previous round. Aous round.	of responses fails-IQR) of all responses.	
In this round, please consider your response falls outside the the the reason supporting your cho round was:	your previous answer and n IQR and you choose not b orce to help us to better und	take any changes you think necessary based on the feedback give o change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you pleas erstand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the pr	give wous
🖨 Dane		6 Jit	met F
🐮 start 🔰 🗿 web taxed Defrit	😸 Round 4	Paiet Broo Pro-reigti 🖉 🖉 🧳	a (4) 407.84

257

Meda (A)	Mada Image: Solution Solutin Solutinge Solutinge Solution Solutinge Solution Solution Soluti
oded A MART Options A Ind make any changes you think necessary based on the feedback given. If of to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous 3 4 5 0 1 3 4 5 5 6 1 2 <tr< td=""><th>Model Anotation Options Image and make any changes you think necessary based on the feedback given. If Image Image of to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give Image Image of to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give Image Image of to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give Image Image out of change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give Image Image all Comments from Round 3 Image Image Image vould be based on which track a student was on. Hopefully, there is exposure Image Image other get into your program. Image Image Image ck(s) you are referring to. Each of these skills may be essential for a specific offer an opinion on the value of the skill. Image Image</th></tr<>	Model Anotation Options Image and make any changes you think necessary based on the feedback given. If Image Image of to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give Image Image of to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give Image Image of to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give Image Image out of change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give Image Image all Comments from Round 3 Image Image Image vould be based on which track a student was on. Hopefully, there is exposure Image Image other get into your program. Image Image Image ck(s) you are referring to. Each of these skills may be essential for a specific offer an opinion on the value of the skill. Image Image
Ind make any changes you think necessary based on the feedback given. If of to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous 3 4 5 3 4 5 4 5 4 5 5 4 5 5 6 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	and make any changes you think necessary based on the feedback given. If the tis perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give runderstand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous at understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous at understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous at understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous at understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous at understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous at understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous final analysis analysis analysis at a student was on. Hopefully, there is exposure they get into your program.
3 4 Disagree strongly 5 and 6 bisagree strongly 5 bisagree strongl	3 4 Disagree strongly strongly strongly strongly strongly strongly strongly strongly strongly there is exposure vould be based on which track a student was on. Hopefully, there is exposure they get into your program.
al Comments from Round 3 ould be based on which track a student was on. Hopefully, there is exposure they get into your program.	ral Comments from Round 3 vould be based on which track a student was on. Hopefully, there is exposure e they get into your program. ck(s) you are referring to. Each of these skills may be essential for a specific offer an opinion on the value of the skill.
ould be based on which track a student was on. Hopefully, there is exposure they get into your program.	vould be based on which track a student was on. Hopefully, there is exposure e they get into your program. ck(s) you are referring to. Each of these skills may be essential for a specific offer an opinion on the value of the skill.
	ck(s) you are referring to. Each of these skills may be essential for a specific offer an opinion on the value of the skill.
k(s) you are referring to. Each of these skills may be essential for a specific offer an opinion on the value of the skill.	
Median IQR Your response Your response Median IQR Your response Your response	Median IQR Your response Your response Comments in Round 3 this round
Median IQR Your response in Round 3 Your response this round Comments 1.00 1.00 3 3 1	Median IQR Your response Comments 1.00 1.00 3 1
Median IQR Your response in Round 3 Your response this round Comments 1.00 1.00 3 1 0 1.00 1.00 3 0 0	MedianIQRYour responseComments1.001.003111.001.00211
Median IQR Your response in Round 3 Your response this round Comments 1.00 1.00 3 1 0 1.00 1.00 3 0 0 1.00 1.00 2 0 0	MedianIQRYour responseComments1.001.0031.0031.001.002111.001.0021

	2		the t		K	(CARD)							>	~	MR 60
ā			3		<u> (</u>)	C 3	1	¥ 5	3	X B	S 3	3. 5.	x]	 Internet 	20470
	2 2 2	. co .													
	9 . B			options 🤌	2			5		4	50	•	m		4uth
	0	a		NatoHi E	8	8.1	1.00- 2.00-	100-	280 280	1.00 2.00	1.00-	1.00-	1.00-		Papero - r
	C and			Nocked	1.00	1.00	1.00	1,00	1.00	1.00	1.50	1.50	1.50		Start St
d Delphi - Microsoft Internet Explorer	em Favortes Tools Help		<pre>cp://www.sged.tamu.edu/delphi/round4_lic.asp?ID=52</pre>	🔸 💏 Search Web 👻 🛃 🗗 40 t	ntical thinking skills	roblem solving skills	resent findings with Powerpoint type presentation	cientific and technical writing	nterpersonal skills-ability to work with diverse cross- ion of people	Ethics of research and business	repaing an abstract for a meeting	hitling brief trip reports	nterpretation of scientific literature		🔒 🚽 web-based Dephi 🔂 Round 4
Web-base	File Edit V		Address A H	Google -	8	б. 6	б. M	ưi vi	17. I sect	20.1	1. P	6. 4	1.11	< Dome	🐮 start

		to Links to		< <u> </u> <u> </u>	10 3	R 2	(C) (S)	10 2	(c)	<u>र</u> 5	10 17	8	•
		~											Internet
	D A 4												
			Options 🥒	m	F	-	m	4	e	2	m	-	
	i		NatoHi N	1.00-	1.00-2.00	289	1.00-	1.00 2.25	2.56 2.56	389	3.86	100- 100-	
	Mada 👧		ocked 1	1.60	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	
Explorer	Search Travertes	d4_lc.asp?I0=52	sarch web 🔹 👩 🗗 40 b	en				tion			onals who are not trained	atement	
helphi - Microsoft Internet Favotes Tools Help	0 . 2 2 4	(www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/rour	5	rpretation of scientific literati	od Laboratory Practice (GLP	ieral regulatory process	flectual property issues	mmark in scientific investiga	e management	rature review skills.	rking on teams with professi gy or biotechnology	v to read a profit and loss sti	
Web-based I	- ind	Address 🙆 http:/	Google -	11 Inte	31. Gat	33. Fed	35. Inte	14. Tea	23. Tim	10. Lite	15. Wa in biolo	25. How	c Dome

	2		Links *		K	(m m)			100.00	100.00		(m) (m)		~	111.80
			3		51	54_31		(s) (s)		51	el a	4.3		 Internet 	A BARA
		2 C 2													
		· N		Options 🥒		m	+	ş	4	4	e	2	2		-
		i		NatoHil E	3.00	8 8 8 8	1.00-	1.00- 3.00-	3.00-	00 10 10 10 10 10	3.50	1.50	1.50		Prop Pro - 14
		Heda		40 blocked	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00		S Parts
net Explorer		D Search The Favories	fround4_1c.asp?30=52	🖈 Search Web 👻 🛃	s statement	ion				ry & development		process	E		🖨 Round 4
l Delphi - Microsoft Inter	en Favorites Tools Help	2 2 . 0	p.//www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi	•	ow to read a profit and los	howledge of gene express	hemical safety	aboratory safety	adiation safety	inderstanding drug discover	tterviewing skills	howledge of clinical trials p	ceding a balance statemer		- Mathematic Depti
Web-based	File EQ. W	G Back -	Address 🛃 Hut	Google -	25 H	27. K	28 C	29. L	30. R	38	19. In	40. X	26. R	< Dome	start

	ke i	this #		<.								>	~	2.611
ö				<u> (1</u>	3 5	<u>s</u>	3	<u>x</u>] [2]	1	0.3	3	S	S Internet	20476
	\$ F													
	· 3		options 🥒	2	2	4	2	5		2	5	ŝ		tato
	Ó		NutoFill	1.50	1.75 2.25	1.75- 3.00	1.75- 3.00	1.75 3.00	1.75- 3.00	1.75- 3.00	2.00-	3.00-		Presidente - P
	Media 📀		ocked 🔝	2.00	2.00	2,00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00		100 March 100
Explorer	Search 🔆 Favortes 🥩	d4_1c.asp?I0=52	with Web 🔹 👩 🗗 40 b		(dwb)			ctions	iate and direction of the	fiterent fields-agriculture,	search	porate culture		🙆 Round 4
Delphi - Microsoft Internet	Fevortes Tods Heb I evortes Tods Heb I evortes Tods Heb	U/www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/houn	3 36	ading a balance statement	od Manufacturing Practice (G	puble shooting	ssume writing	ogemess to adapt to new direc	vareness of history, current st	w biotechnology is used in di mental, human health, etc.	iderstanding other people's rei	iderstand value and role of cor		🗿 web based Dephi
Web-based	File Edit Vie Back •	Address 🛃 http	Google -	28. R	32.6	12. Tr	18. Ro	21. Es	22 Av field	24. Hk environ	13 Ur	37. Ur	Done	a start

		Links *		ৰ যা হয় ক	য় যি হ	13 5	1		E E	121 231	2	•	and the second se
		8									nly required of	 Internet 	
	0 A &										pecialized track and o		
	- N		Options 🥒	5	e	-	2	2	2		ould be pert of a s		
	i.		NatoHill	2.00-	200-	3.00	1.00- 3.00-	2.00-	1.75- 3.00	3.00	listed sh		
	ada 🔕		ched TA	2.00	2.00	2.60	2.50	2.50	3.00	3.00	ach skill		We can all
t Explorer	Search 🌟 Favortes 🥐)	und4_1c.asp?80=52	Search web 🔹 🦪 🗗 40 bk	orporate culture	(T) and information		1 as a productive member of		iotechnology company	J.	E A level of agreement that e		A total i
I Delphi - Microsoft Interne ter Favortes Tools Heb	3 (V) 2 2 . ()	p://www.aged.tamu.edu/delph/hou	-	inderstand value and role of c	asic Information Technology I gement for biotech companie	oposal weiting	Vork both as an individual and earch team	seping lab notebooks	esent a business plan for a bi	arrvey of biotechnology indust	IS THE END OF TABLE LE B Tracks ble B you indicated your		Table Production
B Web-based	 Back. 	Address A http	Google -	U.VE	39. B	4. Pr	16. V a res	34 K	2. Ph	ĝ	TABI	Done	to start

	A Favorates A Mata A Mata </th <th>AFF Anotases Anoonotases</th> <th>0. The model of the second of the second</th> <th>a2 04</th>	AFF Anotases Anoonotases	0. The model of the second	a2 04
Arring Control Arring Contro Arring Contro Arring Contro </td <td>By The Detected A rest of the part of a specialized track and only required of a greenent that each skill isted should be part of a specialized track and only required of nge within which 50% of responses fals-IOR) of all responses. Inge within which 50% of responses fals-IOR) of all responses. Inge within which 50% of responses fals-IOR) of all responses. Us round. Cound. Index any changes you think necessary based on the feedback given. If an analysis. The scale used in the previous of the pus to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous of 000 2 2 3 4 5 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td> <td>An interface </td> <td>Action Contract Contrac</td> <td></td>	By The Detected A rest of the part of a specialized track and only required of a greenent that each skill isted should be part of a specialized track and only required of nge within which 50% of responses fals-IOR) of all responses. Inge within which 50% of responses fals-IOR) of all responses. Inge within which 50% of responses fals-IOR) of all responses. Us round. Cound. Index any changes you think necessary based on the feedback given. If an analysis. The scale used in the previous of the pus to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous of 000 2 2 3 4 5 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	An interface 	Action Contract Contrac	
 	Image: Section in the section is section in the section in the section in the section is section in the section in the section is section in the section in the section in the section is section in the section in the section in the section in the section is section in the section in the section in the section is section in the section in the section in the section is section in the section in the section in the section in the section is section in the section in the section in the section is section. Image: To the section in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous is set on the section in the section in the section in the section is set on the section in the section in the section is set on the section in the section in the section is set on the section in the section in the section is set on the section in the section in the section is set on the section in the section is set on the section in the section is set on the secton section in the secton secton secton set on the secton s	Image: Section in the section is a section in the section in the section in the section is a section in the section in the section in the section is a section in the section in the section in the section is a section in the section in the section is a section in the section in the section is a section in the section in the section is a section in the section in the section is a section in the section in the section is a section in the section in the section in the section is a section in the section in the section in the section is a section in the section in the section in the section is a section in the section in the section in the section is a section in the section in the section in the section is a section in the section in the section is a section in the section is a section in the section in the section is a section in the section in the section is a section in the section in the section in the section is a section in the section in the section in the section is a section in the section in the section in the section in the section is a section in the section in the section in the section in the section is a section in the section in the section in the section in the section is a section in the section in the section in the section in the section is a section in the second in the section in the section in the section in the s	Image:	15
f agreement that each skill listed should be part of a specialized track and only required of the within which 50% of responses falls-IOR) of all responses. Us round. Ound. Ound the section answer and make any changes you think necessary based on the feedback given. If and you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give the you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give the you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give the you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give the you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give the you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give the you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give the you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give the you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give the you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give the you choose it is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give the you choose it is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give the you choose it is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give the you choose it is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give the you choose it is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give the yo	of agreement that each skill listed should be part of a specialized track and only required of mige within which 50% of responses fals-IOR) of all responses. The sponses fals-IOR of all responses target in the sponses of the sponses fals-IOR of all responses in the sponses of	If agreement that each skill listed should be part of a specialized track and only required of magreement that each skill listed should be part of a specialized track and only required of us not the 50% of responses fals-IOR) of all responses. The scale used in the previous cound.	of agreement that each stall isted should be part of a specialized track and only required of markee within which 50% of responses fals-IOR) of all responses. A responses tals-IOR) of all responses tals-IOR of a specialized track and only required of us round. The scale and marke any changes you think necessary based on the feedback given. If and you choose not to change that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give on the location in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous of the previous of the scale used in the previous of the scale and the scale used in the previous of the scale used of the scale us	5
ge within which 50% of responses fals-IQR) of all responses. Is round. Seround. evious answer and make any changes you think necessary based on the feedback given. If and you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous the pust to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous the pust to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous the pust to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous the pust to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous the pust to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous the pust to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous the pust to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous the pust to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous the pust to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous the pust the previous to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous to better the previous to better the previous to better understand your decision in the final analysis of the previous to better to better the previous to better	ge within which 50% of responses fals-IQR) of all responses. Is round. aund. evious answer and make any changes you think necessary based on the feedback given. If evious answer and make any changes you think necessary based on the feedback given. If and you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous the us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous the used in the final analysis is the scale used in the previous the number of the transmission of the final analysis is the scale used in the previous the number of the number of the time of the number of the previous the number of the number of t	ge within which 50% of responses fals-IQR) of all responses. Is round. ound. We only ask that you please give help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous for you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous the previous the transfer that the transfer the transfer to better understand you decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous the previous the transfer transfer to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous	ge within which 50% of responses fals-IQR) of all responses. is round. bund. and you choose not bo change you think necessary based on the feedback given. If ad you choose not bo change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous read you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous read you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous read in the previous read in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous read in the read	el of
ge within which 50% of responses falls-IQR) of all responses. is round. is round. bund. evolues answer and make any changes you think necessary based on the feedback given. If not you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous. ready out better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous. ready out to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous. ready out to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous. ready out to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous. ready of the previous of the final analysis. The scale used in the previous of the standard of this round of this r	ge within which 50% of responses falls-IQR) of all responses. Is round. Be round. Be not the feedback given. If not you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous field 2 3 4 5 100 200 5 5 5 5 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	ge within which 50% of responses fals-IQR) of all responses. Is round. Seround. aund. Wous answer and make any changes you think necessary based on the feedback given. If nd you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous field 2 3 4 5 ng/y 2 3 4 5 no 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0	ge within which 50% of responses falls-IQR) of all responses. is round. und. evious answer and make any changes you think necessary based on the feedback given. If analysis. The scale used in the previous help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous not you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous not you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give help us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous not you choose not to change it is a difference of the scale used in the previous of the scale used in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous of the scale used in the previous of the scale used in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous of the scale used in th	
Mous answer and make any changes you think necessary based on the feedback given. If d you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give elp us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous of the prev	A ous answer and make any changes you think necessary based on the feedback given. If d you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give elp us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous elp us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous elp us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous elp us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous elp us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous elp us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous elp us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous elp us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous elp us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous file used in tother in the final analysis of the scale used in the previous file used in tother in tother in the final analysis of the scale used in the transit	Alous answer and make any changes you think necessary based on the feedback given. If d you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give elp us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous Bit d you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give elp us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous Bit d you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give elp us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous Bit d you choose not to change it that is not to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous Bit d you choose not to change it that is round I wo in the grant of the resonse in the resonse in this round I wo in the grant of this round	Alous answer and make any changes you think necessary based on the feedback given. If d you choose not to change it that is perfectly acceptable. We only ask that you please give elp us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous elp us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous elp us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous elp us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous elp us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous elp us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous elp us to better understand your decision in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous elp us to better understand your response in the final analysis. The scale used in the previous elp used in tot 1.00 1.00 2.20 1.00 2.20 1.00 2.20 1.00 2.20 1.00 2.20 1.00 2.20 1.00 2.20 1.00 2.20 1.00 2.20 1.00 2.20 1.00 2.20 1.00 2.20 1.00 2.20 1.00 2.20	es. It rang avious us rou
Tee 3 4 Disagree strongly strongly 1 2 3 4 5 Median IQR Your response in this round This round 1.00 1.00 5 5	Tree 3 4 Disagree Ingly 2 3 4 5 Median IQR Your response in this round Comments 1.00 1.00 1.00 5 1	Tree 3 4 Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 1 000V 2.50 5 100 1 100 100 5 100 1 100 2.50 5 100	Tree 3 4 Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 00 100 100 100 1 10 100 100 100 1 10 250 5 1	a He
MedianIQRYour response in Round 3Your response1.002.5051	Median IQR Your response in Your response Comments 1.00 1.00- 5 5	Median IQR Your response in Your response Comments 1.00 1.00 2.50 5 1	Median IQR Your response in Round 3 Your response 1.00 1.00 250 5 1.00 250 5 5	Stro
Median IQR Your response in Round 3 Your response 1.00 2.50 5 I	Median IQR Your response in Round 3 Your response 1.00 1.00 2.50 5	Median IQR Your response in Round 3 Your response 1.00 1.00- 5 5	Median IQR Your response in Round 3 Your response 1.00 1.00 250 5 1.00 250 5 1	
1.00 1.00- 2.50 5 5	100 100 250 5 D	1.00 1.00 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	1.00 1.00 2.50 5 1.01 2.50 1.02 2.50 1.03 1.04 1.04 1.04	
		Internet	ard 4 🐂 Part Sno Pro-14(1) 🖉 🖉 🔊 7 🌖 413	

	k,	Links *		<		1000 mm		1		1000	1 mm	12	~	
				Q 35	0_0	si_3	81. 21	S 3	S 8	SI., Di	31 01	K 3	Internet	
	0 A 4	1 3 1												
		1	Coptions 🥒	5	-	2	5		2	E	5	•	-	
	0		AutoHill	1.80 2.60	289	288 288	1.8 288	1.8 289	1.8 289	1.8 2 8 8	1.00- 2.60	1.00-		
	rites 💞 Media	,	B entioded	1.8	150	2.00	2.00	200	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	-	
Explorer	Search Trav	ind4 1c.aso/10m52	Search Web 🔹 🕷											1
l Delphi - Microsoft Interne	ew Favortes Tods Help	tr://www.aped.terru.edu/delphi/no.	*	ontract law	MA isolation	DNA library construction	and Tissue Practice (GTP)	heclinical testing	leverse transcription	NA amplification	linical testing	fedical writing		The second particular
Web-based	File Edit W	Address Chut	Google -	13. C	28. 8	16. 0	37. G	đ.	28	27. R	5.6	52. N	< Come	at start

	22	1	Links	₹		Transfer	Louis	Laurente			Low	>	~	IS PM
			8	K 2	4 7	<u>x</u> <u></u>	×	31_34	SI_30	<u>s</u> , s	8 18	0.3	 Internet 	20476
	2 A	:33												
		1	Coptions 🥒	-	E	2	E	,	2	-	E	5		right
	0	0	AutoH.	250	1.00-2.75	1.00 275	1.00-	389	988 188	389	9.8 198	8.8		H Shapfro
	A nucle		+0 blocked	2.00	2:00	2.00	2:00	2.00	2.8	2.8	2:00	2.00		*
ased Delphi - Microsoft Internet Explorer	View Favorites Tools Help • 🖱 - 💽 🔊 📣 🗖 Sauch 🕁 Exemised		http://www.aged.tamu.edu/dep/i/round+_ic.asp70=52	2 Medical writing	3. In vitro translation	4. PCR-Real time	5. Viral and non-viral gene therapy	8 21CFRs00	. Basic accounting principles	4 Bioinformatics	5. Biostatistics	5. Biotechnology market knowledge		🚺 🗿 web tased Dephi 😧 Round 4
Web-b	File Edit		Google -	40	÷	19	m	m		-	-	4	< Done	🐮 star

Web-based I	Delphi - Microsoft Internet	Explorer						
File Edit View	# Favorites Tools Help				3			22
G Back -	0 0 0 0 0	Search 🔆 Favortes 🥹	Media	0	·	D B &		
Address 🛃 http:	U/www.aged.tamu.edu/delph/hou	rd4_1c.45p?ID=52					× 5 60	Links #
Google-	5	iearch web 🔹 👘 🗗 🐿	blocked	Autorit	🛃 Options 🥒			
45. Bio	otechnology market knowled	əb	2.00	3.8 3.8	ŝ		51 2	<
1. Exp	xerimental design		2.00	38.0	-			(Permitted)
36. Ge	od Clinical Practice (GCP)		2.00	38.0 38.0	•			[
5. How	v to write a business plan		2.00	309- 300-	5		51_34	
50. Hu	rman Factors testing		2.00	388	2		N_0	100000000000
44. IS(0006 0		58	9.0 38.0	•			P.07
4. Mar	keting		2.00	38.8 38.8	•			
21. Ma	crobial screening		2.00	3.8	'n			
23 Po	Ny(A) RNA isolation		2.00	1.00 300-	1			>
< Done							Internet	~
🐮 start	🗿 Web-based Delphi	😸 Rourd 4	*	et Prophro-	rigis		2042	115.84

		Links *		<	1	8 3	C X	(C) (S)	E F	T 5	3	8	*	
		8	- International										Internet	
	\$ \$ \$ D													
	·		🛃 Options 🥒	B	5	5	•	•	2	•	2			
	0		AutoHit .	38.8	3.00 3.00	98 88	389	88	88	1.8 38	3.60	1.00- 3.75	2	
	Meda -		0 40 blocked	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	200	200		
seid Delphi - Microsoft Internet Explorer New Fevortes Tools Help	- 🕥 - 🗶 🌊 🐔 🖉 Search 🤺 Favories	http://www.aged.tamu.edu/debhi/round+_1c.asp?80=52	+ 🤁 Search Web - 💋 🗗	L Poly(A) RNA isolation	Sales skills	I SDS-PAGE	L Site directed mutagenesis techniques	Understanding venture capital process	. Use of bacteria	Developing partnerships	l. Fisk management	. Cell therapies		
Web-bas	G Back.	Address	Google -	23.	7.1	8	R	oi	34	ú	ĝ	17.	< Dome	

	4	Links *		र रा (२)	5 7	R P	E 2	5 3	E D	10 2	K 2	(K) (K)	~	
		8											C Internet	
	\$ \$ @	**												
			options 🥒	1	2	-	,	4	-	1	3	2		
	0		AutoH.	1.00- 3.75	1.00- 3.75	1.00-	8 ¹ 88	48	28 28	1.25- 2.75	38 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	48 8		
	Media		Oblocked	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.8	2.00	2.00	2:00		1
Explorer	Search Troutes	nd+_lc.asp?ID=52	earch web 🔹 👩 🗗				("Basic understanding yout and design)				ompanies			4
elphi - Microsoft Internet	Favorites Tools Help	Wwww.aged.tamu.adu/delphi/row	5 45	therapies	nsfection	nsformation	lifty design and engineering C, water systems, facility la	resconomics of a firm	leomics	tro transcription	quiring funding for biotech co	itu hybrioizstion		
Web-based D	File Edit View	Address 🛃 http://	Google -	17. Cell	32. Trar	33. Tran	46. Fac of HVA(12 Mc	25. Prot	20. In-vi	43. Acq	18. In si	< B) Done	at at a t

	**		Go Links N		< 9	3 3	3 3	3 8	31.51	1	N 3	E B	3	X X	10 (C) 410 PM
				A REAL PROPERTY OF										2	202
	d	- 20 C												-	
		1 1 1 1 1 1		Cottons	2		E	2	2	e	•	2	2	2	Pro-r4g1v
	6	2		thed T Auto	300	00 125	00 300 300	00 1.50 3.50	50 1.00	50 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	50 1.25 2.50	50 200	90 200	-	👸 Part Stop
Explorer		Search X Favorities	nd4_1c.ssp?ID=52	iearch Web * 👘 🛃 40 bloc	2	3	2	2	2	3	se 2	nder development 2	a of interest	-	🖨 Roud 4
d Delphi - Microsoft Internet	tew Favortes Tools Help		tp://www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/rou	540	In situ hybridization	roduct development	Quality Assurance	roject management	Guidance documents	lissue and organ replacement	Non-isotopic labeling technique	Know about medical devices ur	National and International Scop		🛃 Web-based Debiti
Web-base	Fle Edt	- Hack	Address 🛃 H	Google -	18.	e ei	47.	2 P	40	31	8	42	48.	< Done	1 start

	4		🗙 🛃 60 Links 🍋			8 8	141 151	K 2	8 5	((() ())	<u>s</u>	>	S Internet	2 1 4 2 6 anom
		27 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12													
	I	· •		Cptions 🥒	2	E	4	2	2	E	e	-	Save and Exit		right
		i Ø		AutoHi	300	1.00	1.25	2.00- 3.00-	2.00- 3.75	84 88	498 198	300	9		rt Shapfro-
		Anda .		Sh eo blocked	2.50	2.60	2.60	2.50	2.50	3.0	3.0	3.8	we and Confin		2
Explorer		Search Search Searches	nd4_1c.asp?30=52	earch Web - 🐖			2	nder development	e of interest			er development	ŭ		😁 Round 4
Delphi - Microsoft Internet	Fevorites Tools Help		//www.aged.temu.edu/deph/rou	5 10 1	idance documents	sue and organ replacement	n-isotopic labeling technique	ow about medical devices un	tional and International Scop	nducting market research	ints to Consider documents	ow about current drugs unde			🛃 web-based Delphi
Web-based I	File Edit View	- Hadt	Address 🛃 http:/	Google -	40. Gu	31. Tis	22. Nor	42. Kn	48. Nat	11. Cor	39. Poi	41. Km		Dorre	🐮 start

	1	tinks #		<	X	1				>		4:19 8%
•		3			mpensation. In the		eedback given. If hat you please give used in the previous		1'3' being the least	Comments	O Internet	2040
		@ A &			sibility, evaluation, and co u are given:	Iresponses.	hecessary based on the f cceptable. We only ask th final analysis. The scale	Disagree strongly 5	tost desirable choice and	our response this round		
			ptions 🤌		el of respons ach item you	ls-IQR) of a	s you think r s perfectly a ision in the	4	being the m	e in X		
		8 B·	AutoHi No		Iship-length, leve ous round. For ev	of responses fa	vake any change o change it that is erstand your dec	m	choices with '1'	Your respons Round 3		Paint Shap Pro
		s 💞 Heda	ED 40 blocked		of an interr	Mich 50%	wer and m ose not to better und	7	e different	ß		*
xplarer		earch of Favorite	ech web -	Internship	our dimensions an of results from	ses. at range within evious round. ous round.	Our previous and QR and you cho ce to help us to	Agree strongly	asked to rank th	Median		e panad e
Delphi - Microsoft Internet E	 Favorites Tools Help 	🖸 - 💌 🛋 🏠 🔑 s	ees 40 .	d 4 tion 2 Dimensions of an	question, we discussed fi below, a summary is give	The median for all respon The interquartile range (th Your response from the pr Comments from the previo	round, please consider yr ssponse falls outside the l sson supporting your choi was:		ngth of Internship previous round, you ware ble choice.	Length of Internship		🗿 webbased Debhi
Web-based I	File Edit View	Address all httm:	Google -	Roun	In this tables		In this your re the rea		2.1 Le In the p desira		Done D	🐮 start

	22		inks *		<		ka i					0	~	144.02
			8		1'3' being the least	Comments	R. 19	(1)	x x	1.3' being the least	Comments	<u>(</u>)	Internet	20670
		\$ B &			t desirable choice and	r response this round				t desirable choice and	Your response this round			
		- N (📢 Options 🥒	1' being the mos	nse in You				.1' being the mos	Your response in Round 3	9		142.0
	-	ė		atoff.	es with	Round	-	2	ņ	es with	ß	289		hap Pro - r
		4		NEI Day	ant choic	You				ant choic	fedian	8		🕷 Part S
		**		Sh to blod	e differe	ß	1.00-	1.00-	3.00	e differe	2			
		Favorbes	p/10=52	1 1 . 9	d to rank th	Median	100	200	2.00	d to rank th	A.	p below the		and 4
t Explore		Search	und4_2.45	Search We	e aske				ster up	e aske	onsibil	a half ste hired for		٥
d Delphi - Microsoft Interne	ew Favorites Tools Help	3 (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1	p.//www.eged.temu.edu/delphi/ro	·	ength of Internship s previous round, you wer rable choice.	Length of Internship	nonths (1 semester)	nonths (2 semesters)	months (1 summer +1 seme ear)	.evel of Responsibility previous round, you wer rable choice.	Level of Resp	level of responsibility (about a ion that the student would be		🛃 web-based Delphi
Meb-base	File Edit M	G Back -	Address A htt	Google -	2.1 L In the desir		0-3 u	4-6 n	7-12 to1 y	2.2 L In the desir		High	<	🐮 start

	22		Links »		¢		R 12	3 3	2 5		×		
			8		1'3' being the least	Comments				An evaluation aluation form where of 1 for e supervisor, and		Internet	
		0 2 3			desirable choice and	Your response this round				oduct of some kind / smple would be an ev by indicating a score views, a letter from th			
				Cottons 🥒	1'1' being the most	Your response in Round 3	ю	2	۰	thesis and/or end pr quantitative. An exe ommunication skills ommunication skills ommunication skills			
		à		utoFit	fliw Sec	IQR	1.00-	300- 300-	386	eport, I idered lls or o mance			
		Heda		blocked T	erent choic	Median	8	200	90 E	ilence: n, written r so be cons ersonal ski sfactory. ss of perfor ans.			-
xplorer		Search 🤆 Favortes 🤮	d4_2.05p7ID=52	arch Web • 🥡 🛃 401	asked to rank the diff	nsibility	nalf step below the red for)	a to higher level lity and abilities and		ovided for your conver results in a publicatio iencel score would als asures such as interpi- for completely unsature notudes such measure pervisor or similar me			
elphi - Microsoft Internet E	Favorites Tools Help	2 - N 2 2 2 - C	www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/round	• 68 Sea	rel of Responsibility revious round, you were vie choice.	Level of Respor	el of responsibility (about a h that the student would be hir	w (apprentice level) and move neurate with intern's personal y's policies	e level	aluation of intern ons of each term are pro uantitative evaluation istrument that has a num terms are ranked on mea noistently excelent to 5 ualitative evaluation in stbal evaluation from sup			
Web-based D	File Edit New	🖓 Back - 🕃	Address 🛃 http://	Google -	2.2 Lev In the pr desirab		High leve position	Start Iov commer compan	Moderat	2.3 9.6 9.6 1.1 2.2 2.3 2.3 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5	4	Done	

	22	unies 🗱		¢						_	>	1	22 PM
G		3		he supervisor, and d '3' being the least	Comments	8		<u>(</u>)))	choice and 5 being position.)	Comments	स	S Internet	2040
	• 📑 🍈 🔒 📽	3		mance reviews, a letter from the most desirable choice an	Your response this round				th 1 being the most desirable person working full time in this	Your response this round	[
	Neda 🙆 🔗 🚵 🗷	1	ocked 🛐 Autoriti N options	s of performance as perfor ins. rent choices with '1' being	Your response in Round 3	ю	2	-	rent choices 1 through 5 wi	Your response in Round 3	ţ		👹 Paint Shap Aro - right
	rtes 😜	'	1000	milar mea	IQR	100-200	3.00-	3.00-	the differ Equivaler	ß	ę.		
orer	dh the Favo	Lesp/10=52	web -	visor or sin ked to rank	Median	8	200	300	at you rank Full Time	Median			Found 4
ed Delphi - Microsoft Internet Expl	View Favorites Tools Help • 🙆 - 💌 🛃 🐔 💋 Sean	http://www.aped.tamu.edu/delphi/round4_2	- Chi Search	 Qualitative evaluation inclu- verbal evaluation from super he previous round, you were as 	Brable choice. Evaluation method	mbination of qualitative and antifative	alitative	artitative	I Compensation for an intern he previous round, we asked th least desirable choice. (FTE is	Level of Compensation	in shrudid he eraced to % entry level		🔰 🗿 Web-based Delphi 🔝
Web-bas	File Edit -	Address 2h	Google -	1 1	88	Cor	ö	Qu	1.14 The the		^w d	Done	🐮 start

	22		inis *		4							2	-12	1412
			· · ·		choice and 5 being (position.)	Comments	1	8 2	<u>x</u> (x)	<u> (</u>	Q 3	si sesuodseu	Internet	2047
		• 🔲 🗘 🔏 🐁			th 1 being the most desirable berson working full time in this	Your response this round						nds 2 and 3. The summary of		
		Meda 🚱 🙆 🍓 🕱		boled 🗑 Autorit 🔤 Options 🤞	rent choices 1 through 5 wi	Your response in Round 3	S	4	3	و		id not change between Rou		🍓 Paint Shop Pro - 14ptd
		rhas 🤤		B 40 P	the diffe Equivale	ß	3.00	300	275-4.00	500	4.00-	nedian d		
Abrer		rdh St Favo	2.450/10=52	n Web -	n at you rank s Full Time	Median	2.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	ete as the n nce.		Proved 4
Delphi - Microsoft Internet Exp	w Favortes Tools Help	10 · N 2 4 10	r//www.aged.tamu.edu/deph/round4_	• the search	ompensation for an interr previous round, we asked th ast desirable choice. (FTE it	evel of Compensation	thould be equal to ½ entry level	thould be equal to 14 entry level	mould be equal to 14 entry level	chould be equal to an entry level	mships should not be paid	ther factors to consider. sis of this question is compli- ded below for your convenier		🗿 Web-based Delphi 💽
Web-based	File Edit We	- Abdd -	Address Address	Google -	2.4 C In the the le		Pay s FTE	Pay 8 FTE	Pay 8	Pay s FTE	0-inte	2.6 0 Analy provi	Dore D	🐮 start

• Chher factors to consider.	0=52	8
Other factors to consider. alysis of this question is complete as	· @ B.	tbioded 🗐 Antoria 🛃 options 🥒
Mada betan ta yau wanamena. bis gustion the scale warmen gus	the median	did not change between Rounds 2 and 3. The summary of responses is
 Not Important, Important but not necessary, and Important and necessary. 		
ther Factors to Consider Round	3 Round	Comments from Round 3
ood supervision provided by the 3.00 mpany.	88	
e student and the school should aluate the position each time to sure it should be continued thin the program.	2.00-3.00	See comments to factor 1. We don't want the students to be subjected to a poor experience, so the intermship should be evaluated for the experience level provided to the student by the company.
orking with a company that is 2.00 milliar with the science master's rriculum and goals.	200	I'm not sure this would ever happen as the intemships are usually set up by the program. However, I wonder if I thought this question meant that the student did not have to do an internship within the realm of their own future goals. Anyway, the important focus is that the student get some "in company" experience no matter what the company does, and no matter what their familiarity is with the MS program.
th individual and team periences should be provide 2.00 ring the internship.	2.00-2.75	
	Seves	nd Continue Serve and Exit

3	given. If asse give e previous		ments	3	<u> </u>	3.3	K. 8	3						
	sed on the feedback e only ask that you ple The scale used in the		e this Com	-										
	nk necessary ba ly acceptable. W	Disagree strongly 5	Your respons round						Exit					
Contraction of the second seco	ake any changes you thi change it that is perfect erstand your decision in	6	Your response in Round 3						Save and					
Contraction of Contraction	ver and m see not to other und	3	ß	1.00-	3.00	3.00	4.00	6.00	ve and Con					
S.acp71D-S2	ur previous ans DR and you choo	Agree strongly	Median	1.50	2.50	3.00	4.00	6.00	es es					
100 http://www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/round4	n this round, please consider you our response falls outside the IC he reason supporting your choic ound was:		Program Focus	National overview with tracks to meet student goals	National focus	National overview with regional specializations	Regional emphasis	Local emphasis						
	22		Links *		<	TI.						>	~	M8 621
-------------------------------	----------------------	-----------------	---------------------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------	--	--	--	---	----------------------------------	-------	----------------------------	----------	--------------------
			8			for graduates of a	ints into the below you are given:		leedback given. If hat you please give used in the previous			Comments	Internet	20476
		0 B &				points into the worldorce t	Iff be suitable as entry po or each item in the table t	al responses.	necessary based on the t scoeptable. We only ask t final analysis. The scale	Disagree strongly 5		our response this round		
		• 12		ptons 🤌		e as entry	sitions mig program. F	Is-IQR) of 8	s you think perfectly s ision in the	4		>		
		. 0 8.8		d 🗐 Autorii 🛃 0	uates	t would be suitabl	ent that certain po	o of responses fai	nake any change o change it that is lerstand your dec	m		Your response i Round 3	191	Paint Shap Pro
		es 💕 Hed		En eo blocke	new grad	ositions the ss.	of agreeme	which 509	iswer and r oose not t better und	3		R		*
xplarer		ieach of Favori	H_4-45p/10=52	wich Web -	o industry for	dentify those po ogy and busine	ated your level ng from this pro	ses. lat range within revious round. ous round.	our previous ar IQR and you ch ce to help us to	Agree strongly		Median		🖨 Kourd 4
belphi - Microsoft Internet E	Favorites Tools Help	0 · 🔊 🗟 🔕 🖉	(www.sped.temu.edu/delphi/roune	Pas 20	4 4 ion 4 - Entry points into	question, we attempt to it s program in biotechnold	rrevious round, you indicate for students	he median for all respon he interquartile range (th our response from the pr comments from the previous	ound, please consider y sponse falls outside the l son supporting your choi was:		-	Position		🗿 web-based Delphi
Web-based D	File Edit New	G Back •	Address 🛃 http://	Google -	Round	In this (master	In the p workfol		In this r your rea the rea round v		Table		< Close	🐮 start

		Links *		<					Line	Lesson and	10000000	Line	2	8	144 08
		8			Comments		SI_20	8 21	5 2	81.18	0.2	8 2	KI1	Internet	20436
	· 📦 🖧 🐇				Your response this round										
	teda 🙆 🔗 👹 🛛		octed 🗐 AutoHi 🛃 Options 🖉		Your response in Round 3	-	2	5	2		4	5	•		🍓 Part Ship Ino - Highe
	100 Set		1000		IQR	1.00-	188 200	100- 200-	100-225	100-	8.8	300	100		
xplorer	search Krave	H_4-asp?10=52	wich web •		Median	1.00	1.00	8,1	1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00		🖨 Round 4
i Delphi - Microsofi Internet E w Favortes Tools Help	0 - 2 2 4	out/www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/noune	NOS (10)	1	Position	search associate	poess development associate	nufacturing associate	linical data associate	achinical service rep	eptic fill associate	analyst	: microbiological		🛃 web based Dephi
Web-based File Edit We	G Back •	Address 🐴 http	Google -	Table		1. Rev	2. Pro	3. Ma	10. CI	14. Te	4. Asi	5 00	6. 00	e) Done	🐮 start

	4	niks n	4	1								>		Han I
ā		8			x	1	9			a 3	<u> </u>	3	Internet	2027 6 1
	🔲 💮 Â 🐇	3												
	uta 🙆 🙆 🔏 .		oted 14 Auto-Fill New Options 🥒		m	2	÷			5	n	2		💘 Pairt Shop Pro - rigiti
	dis 🤤		10140	3.00	1.00-	3.00-	1.00-	1.00-	1.00-	1.00-	1.00-	1.00-		
brer	dh the Favo	-sep?ID=52	web •	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2:00		Round 4
based Delphi - Microsoft Internet Expl	t View Favorites Tools Help •• 💽 • 💌 🛃 🐔 💋 Saan	1 http://www.aped.temu.edu/de/ph/ncurd4_4	• 00 Search	6. GC microbiological	7. QA documentation specialist	8. GS technical writer	9. QA documentation coordinator	11. Documentation assistant	12. Business development research analyst	13. Marketing research analyst	15. Product management associate	16. Junior position in licensing/tech transfer		🕇 🔰 Web-based Dephi 📷
a web-t	File Edit	Address	Coogle										e) Done	🐮 stal

when Tools Help									2
s 🔍 🚫 😰 🔹	and the Favor	tes 💕 Hed	0	3	े ⊠ • 🗌 💮 छे के 🐇				2
www.aged.temu.edu/delphi/round4	4_4.esp?ID=52						1	8	Inter to
• 00 Sear	ch web 🔹 👩	B ¹ +0 blocks	N II II	In International	Options 🤌				
or position in licensing/tech.	2.00	1.00-		2				3 2	<
ons added in previous r revious round, you were a aduates with a simple YE erence between Y and N I s an appropriate entry po ss. For example, "Strongh ee" if you think the positio	ound asked to indic S or NO. In th (Y minus N). F int for gradue y Agree" if the in is definitely	ate whethe is round, fre Please indio ates of a pro- ates of a pro- r not approp	rr you thi aquencis cate you ofession ofiate.	nk the p es for Ye al scien r mind, d	ositions in Table 2 were appropriate as sNo are provided and the items are ra agreement that each position listed un ce masters program combining biotech efinitely an appropriate entry-point pos	entry-point ked in occ ber "Positi tology and ion and "S	ts for der by on strong	2	
people believe that one of marized and provided in t uggested for a position ar 2	r more or mer he table belo e provided w	w, but you a th frequenc	s are es are not e cies prov	serrany opected vided in	trie same as positions aireacy listed ar to take action on it. For your informatio parenthesis.	, the equi-	valent	e	
		Fredu	encies			Strongly Agree		Arongly Isagree	
Position Titles	18277	Yes	Ŷ	N-Y	Equivalent to (Frequencies)	1 2	m	9	
tical research associate I		12	2	0	Research associate (2) Clinical data assoc (4) Marketing research analyst (1)	0	0	0	
sociate product manager		1	m		Marketing research analyst (1) Product management associate (5)	0	0	0	>
			2			9	riterret		~
A web tased testin	Sound 4		B Part St	an Pro - rida		10 ×	1		to per
						0	0		

If Deliphit - Microsoft Informet Explored Rew Favoriss: Tota: Mol Image: Second secon		11		🗙 🍑 Go Links 🎀		K		convenience. Items are		1	ound 3			nsive to this issue for the program ys the industry needs so they can	w of the educational institution.		w of the educational institution.	w of the educational institution.	w of the educational institution.
Identifier Alticered Intermet Explorer Revertes: Tools Help Image: Tools He			रू स्ट 😳 🛄 -					provided below for your		Disegree strongly 5	Comments R			leaders should be very respo e students are trained in wa	nsibility for this is the purvier	eshilitu for this is the numb	anna an a an m funan	arrad arr es can ter l'arrest	orranda anti-
Id Delphi - Microsoft Internet Explaner Identify and Explaner New Favores: Tods Heb Description Source: Description Structure Description Itp://www.apdd.term.edu/delph/mound+_S.sep/Dresc Description Match Description Description Itp://www.apdd.term.edu/delph/mound+_S.sep/Dresc Description Match Description Description Match Description <thdescriptin< th=""> Description</thdescriptin<>			2. 🖉 🗷		Deff. M Options			rom Round 3 is I		6 4	8	-	-	I think industry 1 to make sure th be hired.	I feel that respon	1 feel that respon			
Id Delphits - Microsoft Internet Explaner New Favortes Tods MeD Search MeD Image: Search MeD Image: StrondyD Image: Search MeD <td></td> <td></td> <td>Neda 📀</td> <td></td> <td>ocked 1 Aut</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>ij sesuodse</td> <td></td> <td>0.016</td> <td>Round</td> <td>1.00-2.00</td> <td>1.00-2.00</td> <td>1.00-2.00</td> <td>1.00-2.00</td> <td>1.00-2.00</td> <td></td> <td>2:00-3:00</td> <td>2.00-3.00</td>			Neda 📀		ocked 1 Aut			ij sesuodse		0.016	Round	1.00-2.00	1.00-2.00	1.00-2.00	1.00-2.00	1.00-2.00		2:00-3:00	2.00-3.00
Idelphi - Microsoft Internet Explaner New Favortes Tods Neb Favortes Tods Neb New Favortes Tods Neb Search Sep New Spect term scholdshifterundt Search Neb Search Neb Up to Spect term scholdshifterundt Search Neb Search Neb Und 4 Question 5 Search Neb Und 4 Question 6 Search Neb Und 4 Question 6 Search Neb Ind 4 Question 6 Search Neb Ind 4 Question 6 Search Neb Ind 4 Question 7 Search Neb Ind 4 Question 6 Search Neb Ind 4 Question 7 Search Neb Ind 4 Question 6 Search Neb Ind 4 Question 7 Search Neb Ind 4 Question 6 Search Neb Ind 9 used on previous round Agree Ind 9 used on previous round Agree Ind 9 used on previous round Agree Inship development Agree Inship development Agree Inship gesues & trends in industry ties Agree Inship ing universty/industry ties Agree Inship ing universty/industry ties Agree Instinuing universty/industry ties			workes		Book B			mmary of re		2	Median Round 3	1.00	1.50	2.00	2.00	2.00		2.00	2.00
	d Delphi - Microsoft Internet Explorer	New Favorites Tools Help	🖸 - 💌 🎜 🟠 🖉 sauch 🤺 Fa	tp://www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/round4_5.asp?ID=52	• 🐯 Search Web •	ind 4 Question 5	es for industry advisory board	lysis of this question is complete. A sur- ted by median first, then by IQR.	le used on previous round.	Agree strongly	Role	mship development	ablishing university/industry ties	tifying issues & trends in industry	ds assessment & cumiculum review	gest or provide seminars, team projects, e studies, etc. to supplement faculty	ching	hing gram evaluation through feedback on cess of intems and graduates hired	hing gram evaluation through feedback on cess of intems and graduates hired

Back 🔹 💟 🛛 🛋 🎑 🏠 🔎 Saarch 🥳	Favortes	ida 🕲	3. ዿ 🛚 . 🔲 🗇 A 🔹
** Attp://www.aged.tamu.edu/delphi/round4_5.asp?ID=	55		
gle - Search web -	B Broth	ched 1 Autof	🔹 🛃 Options 🥒
Role	Median Round 3	IQR Round 3	Comments Round 3
Internship development	1.00	1.00-2.00	
Establishing university/industry ties	1.50	1.00-2.00	
Identifying issues & trends in industry	2.00	1.00-2.00	I think industry leaders should be very responsive to this issue for the program to make sure the students are trained in ways the industry needs so they can be hired.
Needs assessment & curricultum review	2.00	1.00-2.00	I feel that responsibility for this is the purview of the educational institution.
Suggest or provide seminars, team projects, case studies, etc. to supplement faculty teaching	2.00	1.00-2.00	I feel that responsibility for this is the purview of the educational institution.
Program evaluation through feedback on success of intems and graduates hired.	2:00	2.00-3.00	
Student job placement	28	200-3.00	 The job of the advisory board is to make sure their training is good so they can get jobs. Also, they can help the students network. However, they are not a job placement service. This indicates a level of motivation necessary to success
Program evaluation through feedback on success of intems and graduates hired.	2:00	2.00-3.00	
Providing private sources of funding	2.00	2.00-4.00	Biotech industry is a poor industry. This is not their role.
Advising on private sources of funding	2.60	2.00-4.00	Again, not the purview of the advisory board.
	Seve and	Continue	Save and Exit
2			S Internet
Martin A undersed paths -		Married Married Married	

	*	💉 🔁 Go Links 🍀		41								Dirterret	2
	nda 🔗 🔗 📓 . 🔤 👘 A 📽		ded 🗐 Autoriti 🔤 Options 🥒			er, I feel strongly that whatever methods nation available to meet the industry needs. s pulse of the industry, preferably through	s each of three days. It covers (VERY seed to in any US MBA program. All the from NPVs to valuations to buy vs lease wedge and the practical application of nefit a MS Biotech program.	1000	ents where students work in teams to	ments	Save and Ext		🕷 Pairt Stoo Pro
Internet Explorer	Help Search - Favortes .	idebhihound+_6-asp?ID=52	- 👘 Search web - 🥡 En 40 bk		61	as for me to comment on. Howev ild teach the most relevant inform s of the program should be on the advisory board.	[Company Name] MBA. 2 hours pics you would normally be expo om real [Company Name] data; ne connection between book kmo comething like this would also be	tt	linary course with business stud businesses.	Additional Com			bite 🎃 Roud 4
'eb-based Delphi - Microsoft	Edit View Favorites Tools Back • 💭 • 💌 🛃 🔞	sss 🎒 http://www.aged.tamu.edu	gle -	Round 4 Question 6	Possible Innovation	This is not a good are are utilized, they shou Therefore, the fingers the knowledge of the	I am preparing a min QUICKLY) all MBA to examples used are fr examples. It makes th MBA topics. Maybe s	Outcomes assessme	Develop cross-discip analyze and evaluate			85	start 3 webbased De

APPENDIX H

ROUND 5 INSTRUMENT

	22		Links »		6						2	-	100.000
		1 - 🔽 🖓 🔏	3		Professional Science Masters otechnology.	by. For this round, "consensus" is defined as being	1003. If you have any questions about this round or r call 979-693-6334.	When the data analysis is complete, I will send an s that come from the research later on.				Internet	0 A 9 B 2
		er nata 🙆 🙆 🛃 🗏		40 blocked 🗐 Autoria 🛃 Options	to develop a model for a F ombining business and bi	of "Strongly Disagree (5)".	10, 2003, to December 20, 2 he at <u>Skantz@hotmail.com</u> o	ort questions on one page. V as copies of any publications		Click here to begin.			Rent Shop Pro
Explorer		Search of Favories	dS-asp	sarch web • 🦪 🗗	of a Delphi study program c	ce in this study. This IOT receive a rating	/7 from December ms, please email m	d consists of five st i members, as well	cipation.				Roud 4
telphi - Microsoft Internet	Favorites Tools Help	0 0 0 0 0 0	(www.sged.tamu.edu/delphi/hour	5	Round 5	you for your perseveran d only if an item does N	und will be available 24, tter any technical proble	ial round is very brief an we summary to all panel	you again for your partic				🗿 web-based Delphi
Web-based D	File Edit View	G Back -	Address 🛃 http://	Google -		Thank ₁ , reache	This rol encoun	This fin executi	Thank			Done Done	🕈 start

	2	Links *	<	18								> ^	-	1. 4136 600
		8		ed for all students in each nat range within which previous answer, and is IQR and you choose is to help us better			a is a minefield.	efore, I would recomend elling.	has its own inhouse acturing, business	inding of the sciences and	acturing as these are ssters of experience		Dirterret	
	2 2 C			tt should be requir equantile range (th uto consider your) nes falls outside th conting your choice s	Disagree strongly 5	2000	be more. This are	e it everyday. Ther what they will be so	is its own way and ally go into manula	i minimal understa	opment or manufa lat you get 2 seme			
			btons @	componen n and the inte e asking you ff your respo reason supp us round wa	4	nd 4	nce too, may	ho do not uso reciation of a	ly does thing people actu	re than just a	Volinial devel			
	0 B.	0	Side a	on laboratory with the media is round, we ar edback given at you give the ed in the previo	m	ents from Rou	of tab experier	ally for those wi im a better app	s each compar opics; very few	ted to have mo	ce in preclínica demic setting. 7			and the state
	as 💞 Meda		Page 10 Dioched	a if a hands- wous round, s shown. In th sed on the fe (e only ask th The scale us	3	Comm	3 semesters	eded espect ars to give the	I principles a r all of these t	uid be expec	s of experience an in an acar			
Lxpiorer	Search of Favore	und5_1.asp?t0=52	earch web .	ad you to indicate nee from the pre if all responses i are warranted ba by acceptable. W e final analysis.	Agree strongly		uld have at least	technology is ne ave two semeste	hould be genera tter is enough for pline.	of program sho	get 2 semesters at work rather th ssonable.			
sipin - Microsoft Internet Excelar Tools Mals		www.aged.tamu.edu/delph/Plou	Constant of	revolution for the second of t			students in clinical shor	d understanding of the siness development he	the focus of the study s program. One semes prment is another discil	ve a student in this type ss development.	know where you would ences you typically get an intemship is not rea			
2 Web-based U	- 1948 💽	address Shttp://	- algoon	In the print track. In 50% of make a not to c underst			I thinks	A good	I think t training develo	I believ busine	I don't i experie during		Done	and

2	tinks #	<					3	~
	3 •	Comments	2	S 3	<u> 1</u>	<u>s</u> 31	rts into the from the previous sponses for each ou think are that is perfectly sion in the final	Internet
0 A &	3	Ir response this round					inght be suitable as entry point in this round, your response esponses falls-IQR) of all res er, and make any changes you you choose not to change it you choose not to change it you choose not to change it point to the stronges of the stronges strongly 5	
10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Cottons	ound 4 You	-				in positions m ters program. Tehtch 50% of n revious answ the IQR and tice to help us	
🕐 Huđa 🧑 🔗	Detected Fill anoth	Your response in R	۲	3	ß	ŝ	agreement that certs sestional science mas e (that range within v ou to consider your p esponse falls outside as: 2 3	
Favorbes	- 25-0	IQR	00-3.00	00-3.00	.00-3.75	00-4.00	this profe this profe asking y n. ff your r the reaso the reaso	
Search v	und5_1.asp?	Aedian	2.00	2.60	250 1	2.00	ting from ting from a interque d, we are you give to Agre strong	
Edit View Favorites Tools Help work - 💽 - 💌 🛃 🐔 💋	s 🙆 http://www.sged.tamu.edu/de/phi/Ro. ofe-	Suggested Tracks	Science	Preclinical/Clinical Development	Manufacturing	Business Development	Round 5 Question 4 In the previous round, you indi workforce for students gradua round, with the median and the job title are shown. In this roun warranted based on the feedb acceptable. We only ask that, analysis. The scale used in the	

	2		Unios 🏘		<.						2		20 814
G			8		ints into the from the previous sponses for each ou think are t that is perfectly ision in the final		Comments	S 8	(1) 51	<u></u> ()	R	S Internet	2040
		0 B &			ght be suitable as entry po in this round, your response sponses falls-IQR) of all re c, and make any changes y ou choose not to change i better understand your dec	Disagree strongly 5	Your response this round						
		•		ptions 🤌	sitions mi program. I 50% of re- us answei GR and y OR and y	4	Ē				-		
		h 🙆 🙆 🕌		ed 🗐 Autoria 🔤 O	ent that certain po science masters i ange within which nsider your previo e falls outside the I tting your choice th	69	Your response Round 4	÷	N	m	4		😽 Paint Shap Pro - Hb
		as 😵 Ma		En 40 block	of agreem ofessional nge (that r 1you to co 1you to co r respons ion suppo	3	IQR	1.00-	1.00-	2.00-	2.00 3.m		-
Explorer		Search Search	nd5_1.asp?10=52	with Web -	ated your level - ing from this pro interquartile ran d, we are asking ack given. If you ou give the reas	Agree strongly	Median	2.00	2.00	300	2.00		🖨 Raurd 4
l Delphi - Microsoft Internet I	tw Favorites Tools Help	0 . 3 3 4	pullymme aged terru eduldebhilitiour	- B	nd 5 Question 4 previous round, you indic force for students graduat d, with the median and the the are shown. In this round anted based on the feedbs ptable. We only ask that y ptable. We scale used in the		Additional Titles	al Research	ciate product manager	maceutical technical writer	management coordinator		🗿 Web-based Delphi
Web-based	File Edit W	G Back.	Address Ahtt	Google -	Rou In the work rount job ti warrs acce ansiy		4	Clinit	Asso	Phan	Data	Done	🐮 start

	22		this #		۲.						10			>	-	144 04
			3		21	< 3	(C) 21	E	S 3	1	R	<u>x</u>	< N	<.	S Internet	20476
		23 D														
		ula 🚱 🔗 🦓 📓 ·		ded 🗐 Antoria 🛃 Options 🥒		4	ω	4	m	2	t	2	m			🍓 Paint Shap Pro - rSay
		11 S 11		B 40 bloc		2.00- 3.00	1.75 3.00	1.00-	1.00-	3.00-	1.75 3.25	3.50-	1.00 3.00	2.00-		
splarer		earth St Favor	5_1.asp?10=52	rch Web 🔹 🗃		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.60	2.00	4.00	2.60	5		🖨 Rourd 4
d Delphi - Microsoft Internet E	ten Favortes Tools Help	50 2 2 . 0	tp://www.aged.tamu.edu/delph/Round	Pag 200		a management coordinator	ument analyst	nsing associate	lication scientist	ulafor analyst	lytical scientist, knowledge agement	ogical database administrator	echnology patent writer	é nuslév romelisora msesar		🗿 Web-based Dethi
Tweb-base	File Edit W	- Hack -	Address She	Google -		Deta	Doci	Licer	Appl	Regu	Anal	Biolo	Biote	Disri	Core	🐮 start

	🗙 🛃 🚱 🚺	x	()	1	<u> (</u>)				Internet
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1						(C) (E)	gram?		
· @ 8· 8	of States Science	, , ,	. P	so j	4	based?	signing a new degree pro	process?	
tes 😴 Med	Prestore	-001 -000	2.00- 4.25	2.00-	2.00- 3.00	er a paper-	s was in de	proving the	
ach Mr Fanz	L. asp?ID=52	2.50	4.00	4.00	3.00	ed format ov	alphi proces	u have for im	
i View Favorites Tools Help i • 🐑 - 💌 🌌 🕎 🔊 5ee	 http://www.oged.tamu.edu/dephi/Rounds. Association 	Biotechnology patent writer	Plant quality compliance manager	Sr. knowledge analyst	Clinical manager, scientific communications	1. Why did you choose Web-base	2. How useful do you think this De	3. What recommendations do you	

	22		🗸 🛃 Go Links 🍀		1 2	<u>(</u>									~ ~	Interret	2 1 4 7 6 4 4 M
		\$ \$ \$ D						161	20	ram?	3	90	3				
		ala 🙆 🔗 🌺 🗷 ·		Sed 🗐 AtoHi 🛃 options 🥒	G	π	r-based?			esigning a new degree prog		a bioceast		Serve and Exit			🍓 Paint Shap Pro-rSe
		tes 💕 14		Bh 40 bloc	2.00-	2.00- 3.00	er a pape			s was in d	de service de	in fillword					
xplorer		earch K Favor	d5_1.asp?10=52	wich web • 🧃	4.00	300	sed format ov			Delphi process	and the second second second						🖨 Rourd A
Delphi - Microsoft Internet E	w Favorites Tools Help	0 - N S V	Unwww.aged.tamu.edu/delph(Roun	100 E00	owledge analyst	al manager, scientific unications	v điđ vou choose Web-ba			w useful do you think this [of an another section of the						🗿 web based Dephi
Web-based	File Edit View	G Back •	Address a http:	Google -	S. K	Clinica	1. Wh			2. Hon	-011.0	MA. 0				Done	🐮 start

APPENDIX I

SKILLS IDENTIFIED AS APPROPRIATE FOR CORE CURRICULUM OR SPECIALIZED TRACKS

Suggested Skills	Score R2	Frequency
Product development	Track	15
Sales skills	Track	15
Marketing	Track	13
Developing partnerships	Track	13
Conducting market research	Track	13
Acquiring funding for biotech companies	Track	13
Preclinical testing	Track	13
Human Factors testing	Track	13
Clinical testing	Track	13
Medical writing	Track	13
Contract law	Track	12
Poly(A) RNA isolation	Track	12
Transfection	Track	12
Good Clinical Practice (GCP)	Track	12
Good Tissue Practice (GTP)	Track	12
Know about current drugs under development	Track	12
Know about medical devices under development	Track	12
Facility design and engineering (*Basic understanding of HVAC, water	Track	12
systems, facility layout and design)	Trad	4.4
Understanding venture capital process	Track	11
Microeconomics of a firm	Track	11
In vitro translation	Track	11
In-vitro transcription	I rack	11
Site directed mutagenesis techniques	I rack	11
lissue and organ replacement	Track	11
Points to Consider documents	Irack	11
ISO 9000	Irack	11
Quality Assurance	Irack	11
Experimental design	Irack	10
Project management	Track	10
How to write a business plan	Irack	10
Basic accounting principles	Track	10
Biostatistics	Track	10
Cell therapies	Track	10
In situ hybridization	Track	10
Microbial screening	Track	10
Non-isotopic labeling techniques	Track	10
Proteomics	Track	10
RNA amplification	Track	10
RNA isolation	Track	10
Transformation	Track	10
Use of bacteria	Track	10
21CFRx00	Track	10

Biotechnology market knowledge	Irack	10
National and International Scope of Interest	Irack	10
Risk management	Track	9
Bioinformatics	Track	9
cDNA library construction	Track	9
PCR-Real time	Track	9
Reverse transcription	Track	9
SDS-PAGE	Track	9
Viral and non-viral gene therapy	Track	9
Guidance documents	Track	9
Present findings with Powerpoint type presentation	Core	17
Critical thinking skills	Core	17
Time management	Core	17
Writing on, speaking about and presenting technical material to a variety of audiences with varying levels of knowledge in the field	Core	16
Problem solving skills	Core	16
Internersonal skills-ability to work with diverse cross-section of people	Core	16
Ethics of research and business	Core	16
Toamwork in scientific investigation	Core	14
Working on teams with professionals who are not trained in biology or	0010	17
biotechnology	Core	14
Scientific and technical writing	Core	13
Writing brief trip reports	Core	13
Resume writing	Core	13
How biotechnology is used in different fields-agriculture, environmental, human health, etc.	Core	13
Intellectual property issues	Core	13
Understanding drug discovery & development	Core	13
Survey of biotechnology industry	Core	13
Understanding other people's research	Core	12
Work both as an individual and as a productive member of a research	0	10
team	Core	12
Interviewing skills	Core	12
Laboratory safety	Core	12
Keeping laboratory notebooks	Core	12
Understand value and role of corporate culture	Core	12
Literature review skills	Core	11
Eagerness to adapt to new directions	Core	11
Awareness of history, current state and direction of the field	Core	11
Chemical safety	Core	11
Radiation safety	Core	11
Preparing an abstract for a meeting	Core	10
Proposal writing	Core	10
Interpretation of scientific literature	Core	10
Reading a balance statement	Core	10
Knowledge of gene expression	Core	10
	- 5. 5	

Federal regulatory process	Core	10
Present a business plan for a biotechnology company	Core	9
Trouble shooting	Core	9
How to read a profit and loss statement	Core	9
Good Laboratory Practice (GLP)	Core	9
Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP)	Core	9
Basic Information Technology (IT) and MIS needs for biotech companies	Core	9
Knowledge of clinical trials process	Core	9
Basic finance principles	Tie	
Making posters	No Maj	
Budget preparation	No Maj	
Personnel management	No Maj	
Basic knowledge of stock options	No Maj	
Economics	No Maj	
Agarose Gel Electrophoresis	No Maj	
Apply basic principles to new situations in the use of computers and computer software, including writing algorithms	No Maj	
Automated sequencing	No Maj	
Awareness of differences that can occur with different lots of reagent	No Maj	
Northern blotting	No Maj	
Southern blotting	No Maj	
Western blotting	No Maj	
Cloning a gene	No Maj	
DNA isolation	No Maj	
DNA sequencing	No Maj	
Expression profiling (microarrays)	No Maj	
Making reagents	No Maj	
Polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis	No Maj	
PCR (Polymerase Chain Reaction)	No Maj	
Protein expression, isolation and characterization	No Maj	
Tissue culture	No Maj	
Use of molecular biology software	No Maj	
International Conference on Harmonization Guideline	No Maj	

APPENDIX J

DECISION SCENARIO FROM ROUND 2.1 GOALS QUESTION

Decision scenario

This program is in a Research I university, one of few with federal Land Grant, Sea Grant and Space Grant designation. The Colleges of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Science, Veterinary Medicine, Business and Liberal Arts are willing to support an interdisciplinary professional science master's program combining biotechnology and business. An interdisciplinary Faculty of Biotechnology, with membership representing the five colleges, has been formed to provide academic oversight for the program.

Rationale for the program is that numerous government, and other resources, have indicated a need for a new kind of science degree that prepares science professionals for the increasing opportunities in research and nonresearch positions in industry. The university has identified a need to provide an alternate choice for those students in the life sciences who are well-qualified academically, but who are seeking a career path other than that offered by traditional professional schools or doctoral programs. Some undergraduate majors emphasize undergraduate research experience, some do not, so the experience of the students who might enter the master's program is quite varied, ranging from a few students with several semesters experience to some with no experience beyond the laboratories associated with their biology and chemistry classes. The majority have no experience with independent research as undergraduates.

Resources identified to date:

- An almost endless number of science courses in numerous departments in the three science colleges;
- A certificate in business for non business majors (survey courses in management, marketing, accounting and finance);
- A certificate in entrepreneurship that emphasizes technology commercialization; and
- Experiential learning opportunities for students in a variety of environments-numerous laboratories, centers and institutes; technology licensing office; technology commercialization and market research in the university research park; agriculture communications office; and much more.
- Due to a recent focus on homeland security, opportunities in biosecurity are increasing.

Given this information, what objectives do you think the program should focus on? Please list no more than 5 objectives.

VITA

Student:	Jeannine Wells Kantz
Permanent Mailing Address:	3403 Wildrye College Station, TX
Education:	Bachelor of Science, Biology (1976) Tarleton State University Stephenville, TX
	Texas Teaching Certification (1986) Secondary Composite Science Howard Payne University Brownwood, TX
	Master of Science, Biology (1992) Tarleton State University Stephenville, TX
	Doctor of Philosophy, Agricultural Education (2004) Texas A&M University College Station, TX
Experience:	Assistant Director, Experiential Education Texas A&M University Career Center College Station, TX (January 2004-present)
	Program Coordinator Professional Program in Biotechnology Texas A&M University College Station, TX (August 1997-December 2003)
	Program Coordinator Texas Biotechnology Teacher Enhancement Project Texas A&M University College Station, TX (June 1994-August 1997)