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The Universities

- **University of Rhode Island 1992-1996**
  - ~250 undergrad, 11 NR faculty (3 wlf)
  - Wlf Club 5 in 1992

- **Texas Tech University 1998-2002**
  - ~250 undergrad, 13 NR faculty (5 wlf)
  - RWF Club 6 in 1998
URI Success and activities

- Club grew to over 60 regular active members
- Competed and hosted wildlife Quiz Bowls
- Project Wild, Beach cleanup, Plover management, wood duck monitoring, biodiversity monitoring, woodlot management, woodcock surveys,
- Developed their own consulting firm $15k/yr
- Regularly staffed DEM deer check-stations, assisted Audubon refuges, city planners
- Only 2-3 worked with grad stds/year
- Usually > 10 interns with state or feds/year
TTU success and activities

- Club remained < 20 regular active members
- Competed and hosted regional wildlife Quiz Bowls
- Small mammal trapping, horned lizard capture, rangeland cleanup
- Did not engage in fundraising
- Many did work with local wildlife rehabilitators
- Only 2-3 worked with grad stds/year
- 1-3 interns with state or feds/year
# How rated experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>URI n=15</th>
<th>TTU n=18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How important</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class exercise</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field lab</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field trip</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w faculty</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intern</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summer</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlating years worked in Natural Resources with ratings for kinds of experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>importance</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Lab</th>
<th>Trip</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Intern</th>
<th>summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URI</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTU</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparing educational outcomes

**1st Job**

URI: n=15

TTU: n=18

**Current Job**

URI: n=15

TTU: n=18
Reasons for differences

- Must discount time periods –
- Differences in Faculty/Departmental support
- Differences in students
  - Composition
  - Motivation
- Some conjectures
Faculty/Departmental Support

URI
- 1 faculty member
  - Focused on teaching and motivating students
  - 100% of his research dependent upon undergrads
  - Limited institutional support, no vehicles, limited graduate program
  - Many local opportunities

TTU
- 1 faculty member
  - Focused on tenure
  - <10% of his research dependent upon TTU undergrads
  - Significant institutional support for graduate research, 37 trucks, ~50 grad stds
  - Few local opportunities ‘cotton desert’, private lands
Delayed adulthood
- five milestones: completing school, leaving home, becoming financially independent, marrying and having a child.
  - In 1960, 77%F; 65%M by 30
  - In 2000, <50%F;<33%M by 30. (U. S. Census Bureau)
- need for more education to survive in an information-based economy; fewer entry-level jobs even after all that schooling; young people feeling less rush to marry because of the general acceptance of premarital sex, cohabitation and birth control

Ambivalence
- more self-focused than at any other time of life, less certain about the future and yet also more optimistic, no matter what their economic background.
- dread, frustration, uncertainty, a sense of not quite understanding the rules of the game.
Generational differences

- Veterans 1922-1943
  - “job well done”

- Baby boomers 1943-1960
  - “success & family”

- Dedication, sacrifice, hard work, respect for authority. In-person, phone, letter/memo. “Your experience is valued”

- Optimistic, team player, personal growth, authority +/-, workaholic. Staff meeting, phone (fax/email). “We need you”
Generational differences

- Xers’ 1960-1980
  - “Time off (my time is valuable)”

- Gen Y 1980 – 2000
  - “meaningful work”

- Think globally, balance work-play, techno-literate, self-reliance, informal. Email, internet, text message. “Do it your way”

- Civic duty, sociability, morality, diversity, collective effort. Text message, social media, skype. “You are bright & creative”
Summary

- Very different experiences
- Good programs demand faculty support
- Students coming from them had different levels and kinds of success
- Students valued different kinds of experiences
- Students today have different expectations, may be less focused as 20-somethings, respond to different communication and rewards.
Questions?