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Overview
Assessment of Doctoral Programs
The Graduate School
The Ohio State University

I. General Premises

- High quality doctoral programs are required for Ohio State to reach the top ranks of public research universities.

- Admitting and producing students of the highest quality is the most important priority for Ph.D. programs.

- The Ph.D. is a distinctive degree. Its purpose is to prepare students to carry out independent research or scholarship in academic or other positions that require such skills and abilities.

II. Background

The doctoral program assessment process follows upon the recommendations of the Beck and Freeman Committees and the findings of the "Funding Models for Doctoral Education Based upon Quality" report (Srinivasan et. al, March 1, 2007). In her July 2006 charge to the Srinivasan Committee, former Provost Barbara R. Snyder wrote that "this committee will present several possible models for distributing funding to high quality doctoral programs, that takes into consideration the opportunities to ‘seed’ doctoral programs that with increased stature, will contribute to enhancing the reputation of this university. Inevitably, this focusing of our resources will mean dis-investment in weak, non-core, graduate programs that do not enhance the reputation of the university."

Vice Provost of Graduate Studies and Dean of the Graduate School Patrick S. Osmer developed an implementation plan for following through on the recommendations of the Srinivasan report in light of Provost Snyder’s charge. The goal was to develop a process that was fair, recognized differences among the doctoral programs, rigorous, effective in selecting Ohio State’s highest quality programs, and defensible (July 2007). In the autumn quarter 2007, Provost Joseph A. Alutto indicated that assessments of current program quality would be accompanied by differential allocations of support from the Office of Academic Affairs.

III. Timeline and Process

Summer Quarter 2007
- Graduate School dean prepares and publicizes the implementation plan for assessing Ohio State’s doctoral programs.
- The Graduate School and the Office of Institutional Research and Planning compile data for each graduate program. These data build upon efforts already undertaken for the National Research Council (NRC) survey.
- Data are distributed to the colleges.

Summer and Autumn Quarters 2007
- Colleges work with their doctoral degree programs to review data and develop college-level assessments.
- Graduate School dean meets individually with each college dean and, as requested, with representatives of doctoral programs to discuss the doctoral program assessment process.
Winter Quarter 2008

- Assessment documents from each college are submitted to the Graduate School by January 4, 2008.

- The doctoral program assessment committee is named in January 2008. The 13-member faculty committee was formed by the dean of the Graduate School with input from the executive and college deans:

  **Arts and Sciences:**
  Barbara Hanawalt, King George III Chair of British History, Department of History
  Kathleen McGraw, Professor, Department of Political Science
  Karin Musier-Forsyth, Ohio Eminent Scholar, Departments of Chemistry and Biochemistry

  **Health Sciences**
  James King, Interim Chair, Department of Neuroscience
  Michael Racke, Chair, Department of Neurology
  John Sheridan, Professor, College of Dentistry, Oral Biology

  **Professional Colleges**
  David Bloome, Professor, School of Teaching and Learning
  Craig Davis, Professor, School of Environment and Natural Resources
  Gerald Frankel, Professor, Department of Materials Science and Engineering

  **Graduate School**
  Brian Joseph, Distinguished University Professor, Department of Linguistics
  Julian Thayer, Ohio Eminent Scholar, Department of Psychology
  William Russel, Dean of the Graduate School, Princeton University (Arthur W. Marks ‘19 Professor of Chemical Engineering and Chair, Board of Directors, Council of Graduate Schools)
  Richard Wheeler, Dean of the Graduate School, University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign (Professor of English; Past Chair, Board of Directors, Council of Graduate Schools)

- The doctoral program assessment committee meets for an all-day meeting in Columbus on February 8, 2008. Committee members had been previously assigned to be primary and secondary reviewers for the college reports. Committee members were not primary or secondary reviewers for colleges in which they have their primary academic appointment.

- The Graduate School reviews college documents, the committee’s assessment, and available data, and prepares a draft report for the provost in mid-March.

Spring Quarter 2008

- Findings are released.
- Responses are due from colleges by May 15, 2008.

Summer Quarter 2008

- Action plans for doctoral programs finalized and incorporated into college strategic plans by September 1, 2008.

IV. Summary and Main Findings

The Graduate School has carried out an assessment of all doctoral programs at Ohio State making use of data compiled by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning and the Graduate School; reports submitted by the colleges; and a review of the reports by a committee of distinguished faculty at Ohio State and two highly respected graduate deans from Illinois and Princeton. Graduate programs are
embedded in the overall research, teaching, and service activities of departments and colleges, and the doctoral assessment process also provided valuable information on those activities.

The Graduate School assessment has resulted in several important outcomes: 1) the in-depth assessment of the doctoral programs by the colleges; 2) the Graduate School’s candid assessment of and classification of Ohio State’s doctoral programs by indicators of quality; and 3) the identification of university-wide issues, challenges, and opportunities. This global doctoral program assessment process was essential to uncovering these systemic issues, and addressing these university-wide findings is critical to Ohio State’s ability to move forward.

The results of the assessment show that Ohio State’s doctoral programs can be classified into one of six groups:

- **High Quality**: Doctoral programs that stand out in terms of overall quality, planning, focus, and potential to enhance the standing of the university (12 doctoral programs).

- **Strong**: Doctoral programs that are noted for their strength and potential to enhance the reputation of the university. However, each needs to address aspects of program focus or structure (17 doctoral programs).

- **Good**: Doctoral programs that are doing reasonably well and appear to have viable plans for moving ahead (16 doctoral programs).

- **New and/or Developing**: Doctoral programs that are in a state of transition or are too new for full assessment at this time (11 doctoral programs).

- **Reassess and/or Restructure**: Doctoral programs with significant problems in terms of their current structure or mission or connection with other programs (29 doctoral programs).

- **Disinvestment or Elimination**: Doctoral programs or specialization tracks within a doctoral program that have significant problems and are candidates for disinvestment or elimination unless solid plans for addressing their problems are developed (5 doctoral programs or specialization tracks).

These categorizations are detailed in the classification table and in the Graduate School’s report for each college.

*University-Wide Findings*

- The highest priority finding for Ohio State to emerge from the assessment of doctoral programs is that there are critical issues about the organization and administration of the multiple doctoral and research efforts in the biological and life sciences across the university. These must be addressed for the university as a whole to achieve the enormous potential it has to be a world leader in these fields, which include some of the most important scientific and health challenges of the 21st century. More than 500 faculty members from 12 colleges and schools are involved just in the six interdisciplinary graduate programs in the life sciences. In addition, there are five doctoral programs in the biological sciences and 11 in the health sciences. Ohio State has made a large investment in building new facilities and recruiting top-ranked researchers for these programs. By optimizing the organizational and administrative arrangements to enable the faculty and their students to work at their full potential, Ohio State has the opportunity to develop unique and cutting edge research and graduate programs and achieve world-wide prominence.

- The assessment process also illuminated a tremendous opportunity for Ohio State to excel in the environmental and earth sciences. The organization and coordination of these efforts are currently suboptimal. Ohio State already has demonstrated strengths and faculty with
international reputations in these important areas but the individual efforts are widely distributed across eight colleges on campus.

- Some programs need to assess their degree offerings at the doctoral level, reserving the Ph.D. for students preparing to carry out independent research and offering a professional degree for those students who require graduate education for advanced practice or career development.

- Few colleges responded to the Graduate School’s request that they identify new or emerging opportunities for their doctoral programs and how they might gain a competitive edge. This type of thinking appears to be foreign to many disciplines and within college cultures. Its absence is a significant hindrance to their overall strategic planning.

- There were very few suggestions about disinvestment or discussion about balancing the size of programs against quality and areas of focus. Thus, initiative in this area was taken through the review process.

- Recruiting plans and comments were generally formulaic and not sufficiently focused to improve recruiting. Plans to rely on professional recruiters are not generally sound yet seemed to be a default alternative for some programs. Graduate students commit to doctoral programs because their faculty have national reputations and are known to be excellent. For Ohio State to improve recruitment of graduate students, faculty must commit to and actively participate in recruiting high quality doctoral students. Otherwise the hiring of recruiters alone will not be successful. These observations also apply to the recruitment and retention of underrepresented minority doctoral students. The Graduate School can provide expertise and guidance in these efforts.

- To increase the quality of doctoral students, the Graduate School notes that successful doctoral programs must consciously address the number of students admitted to the program, the quality of those students, and the level of financial support (including multi-year packages) offered.

- Stipends are too low in many programs. They must be raised to more competitive levels if we are to recruit the most highly qualified students. In addition, more multi-year funding packages are needed. In many cases, this may well result in smaller doctoral student cohorts, and this is a strategy that has been successfully implemented by a number of our strongest doctoral programs.

- Norms for time to candidacy and time to degree need to be established by all doctoral programs. Multiple cases were identified of students taking too long both to reach candidacy and to complete their degrees.

- The teaching and research needs of some programs are coming into conflict with doctoral students making timely progress toward their degrees or with the program being sufficiently selective in the quality of admitted students. This needs to be addressed at the department and college level.

V. Enhanced support

All colleges are expected to support their doctoral programs through focused allocations of internal college and department resources. Except as noted below and through standard competitive processes, programs cannot assume that incremental central strategic resources will be made available to enhance doctoral programs.

Enhanced fellowship support will be provided to programs classified as high quality or strong by the Graduate School. This enhancement responds to the findings that to compete with the very best doctoral programs, stipends at Ohio State need to be increased. Furthermore, it is clear that competitive pressures require that Ohio State offer multi-year funding packages for outstanding doctoral students.
The general contours of the enhanced support will consist of the following: Students from the high quality or strong programs who are awarded Graduate School fellowships will also receive an annual $3000 increase over and above standard graduate school support levels. The commitment will be for four years, and funding will come from Graduate School resources. This will be done with the understanding that the student’s doctoral program will continue to provide normal support in intervening years when the student is not on a Graduate School fellowship. Details of this plan and expectations for the individual units will be worked out between the Graduate School and each participating doctoral program, but it is expected that programs receiving such commitments will use the enhanced support levels as part of their student recruitment activities.

VI. Next Steps

College deans will:

1. Review the Graduate School’s response with chairpersons, graduate studies committee chairs, and faculty.

2. Prepare a response from the college that focuses on the doctoral programs, is forward-looking, and coordinates with the college’s overall strategic plan (5 pages, maximum). This response is due to the Graduate School by May 15, 2008.

3. Meet with the Graduate School dean and the provost to begin reconciliation of the assessment process. Each college will develop an action plan for its doctoral programs and that action plan should be an integral part of the college’s strategic plan, which is due to the provost by September 1.

In addition:

- Deans will report annually on the progress of their college doctoral programs.

- The entire review process will be repeated on a regular (four to five year) cycle to assess the progress made by doctoral programs.
DOCTORAL PROGRAM REVIEW & COLLEGE STRATEGIC PLAN INTEGRATION

Autumn 2007
Meetings with deans regarding strategic planning/plans

January 2008
Deans submit analysis and recommendations related to doctoral program quality

February
University committee and external review team review college analyses of doctoral program quality
Dean of the Graduate School considers the deans’ submissions and committee analyses and recommendations and develops preliminary analyses of doctoral program quality

March
Dean of the Graduate School and Provost along with the Vice Provosts review and revise preliminary Graduate School recommendations
Preliminary reviews and feedback of draft college strategic plans

April
Dean of the Graduate School interacts with the Dean of each college to review Graduate School recommendations
Each dean interacts with faculty regarding Graduate School doctoral program quality assessment

May
Dean of the Graduate School considers comments/responses to recommendations from the Dean of each college
Each dean begins integration of doctoral program quality action steps into college strategic plans

June
Provost and Dean of the Graduate school meet with each college dean to reconcile final decisions
Each dean continues integration of doctoral program quality action steps into college strategic plans

July
Dean of each college submits a doctoral program enhancement implementation plan for feedback
Each dean finalizes integration of doctoral program quality action steps into college strategic plans

by Sept 1
Dean of each college submits college strategic plan that incorporates the doctoral program quality enhancement plan
Doctoral Program Assessment
Classifications

High Quality Doctoral Programs
These programs stand out in terms of overall quality, planning, focus, and potential to enhance the standing of the university.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts &amp; Sciences</th>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Veterinary Biosciences</td>
<td>Fisher College Ph.D. programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Accounting and Management Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Labor and Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Materials Science and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strong Doctoral Programs
These programs are noted for their strength and potential to enhance the reputation of the university. However, each needs to address aspects of program focus or structure as noted in the Graduate School's response to the college assessment document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts &amp; Sciences</th>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric Sciences</td>
<td>Integrated Biomedical Science Graduate Program</td>
<td>Agricultural, Environmental, and Development Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Oral Biology</td>
<td>Electrical and Computer Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Vision Science</td>
<td>Food Science and Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek and Latin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish and Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good Doctoral Programs
These are programs that are doing reasonably well and appear to have viable plans for moving ahead.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts &amp; Sciences</th>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biostatistics</td>
<td>Computer Science and Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Physics</td>
<td>Food, Agricultural, and Biological Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Horticulture and Crop Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian Languages and Literatures</td>
<td>Human Ecology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological Sciences</td>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Art</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New and/or Developing Doctoral Programs
These programs are in a state of transition or are too new for full assessment at this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts &amp; Sciences</th>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Health and Rehabilitation Sciences</td>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Studies</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td>OSU Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Eastern Languages and Cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Policy and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(John Glenn School of Public Affairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Doctoral Programs that Must Reassess and/or Restructure

These are programs with significant problems in terms of their current structure or mission or connection with other programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts &amp; Sciences</th>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>Anatomy</td>
<td>Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Biological Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. programs</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Agricultural and Extension Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Entomology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evolution, Ecology,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Organismal Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Microbiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Molecular Genetics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plant Cellular and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecular Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French and Italian</td>
<td>Veterinary Clinical Sciences</td>
<td>Animal Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanic Languages and</td>
<td>Veterinary Preventive Medicine</td>
<td>City and Regional Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literatures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Neuroscience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ohio State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Biophysics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Molecular, Cellular,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Developmental Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic and East European</td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages and Literatures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech and Hearing Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geodetic Science and Surveying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial and Systems Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nuclear Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Sociology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Candidates for Disinvestment or Elimination
These are programs that have significant problems and are candidates for disinvestment or elimination unless solid plans for addressing their problems are developed. The doctoral program in Comprehensive Vocational Education is inactive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts &amp; Sciences</th>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive Vocational Education (Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitation Services (specialty track in Education: Physical Activity and Educational Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soil Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology Education (specialty track in Education: Teaching and Learning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Welding Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Main Findings

- The emerging initiative in "Theory and Practice in the Contemporary Arts" shows considerable promise and should be further developed.

- The doctoral program in Dance, as a new doctoral program in a discipline where it is already regarded as an elite program, has much promise to bring great distinction and recognition to the college and university.

- Low stipend levels for doctoral students in the Arts are a major impediment to the ability of these doctoral programs to achieve and sustain levels of excellence.

- There is some concern with the quality of the students in the Music and Theatre programs as gauged by their standardized test scores. Music, in particular, needs to place more focus on monitoring professional placement and employment outcomes for its students, especially in the context of seemingly high unemployment. Theatre is a small program producing approximately two Ph.D.s per year.

- Theatre and History of Art are in critical transition periods with regard to faculty retirements and departures and new hiring opportunities. Both programs will be challenged to make strategically planned, targeted, and focused hires if they are to embark on a trajectory towards excellence.

- History of Art must address the seeming disconnect between the relatively high caliber of the students enrolling in the program, the relatively few degrees produced, and the inordinate length of time to degree for those who complete the program.

- While ranked extremely highly on disciplinary measures, there is a disconnect between the seeming quality of Art Education’s students and the program’s seeming prominence. We raise the question of whether the program’s high output of doctoral students includes some number who would be better served by the pursuit of an alternative degree. This would seem to be indicated by both student quality metrics as well as the K-12 career path of many present Art Education doctoral students.

Taxonomy

High Quality:
Strong:
Good: History of Art, Music, Theatre
New and/or Developing Doctoral Programs: Dance
Programs that Must Reassess and/or Restructure: Art Education
Candidates for Disinvestment or Elimination:

Narrative

The College of the Arts has five doctoral programs in Art Education, Dance, History of Art, Music, and Theatre. In the college’s report, the importance of the arts to the success of a major comprehensive research university as well as the diversity of mission, audience, and objective that exists in doctoral programs in the arts was underscored. The college highlighted the ongoing and critical problem of low stipends in its doctoral programs, not only when viewed comparatively with programs in other disciplines.
well beyond the arts domain but, considerably more troubling, when viewed relative to the arts programs in peer and benchmark institutions. These points are consistent with the Graduate School’s own view and assessment of the college. Addressing the stipend issue is of critical importance for the College of the Arts to address in its strategic plan.

Also discussed in the college’s report is an emerging initiative to join with the Wexner Center in developing a new curriculum program offering in “Theory and Practice in the Contemporary Arts” that will draw on and enhance the resources of the Departments of Dance, History of Art, and Theatre. The Graduate School sees much promise in this planned initiative while recognizing that considerable work needs to be done to develop the proposal and give it structure and substance.

As a new doctoral program, Dance is in the early stages of its development and too new for assessment. The Graduate School recognizes the historical strength of the Dance program’s MFA graduate students (as documented by fellowship competition performance, professional placement, etc.) as well as its national ranking for graduate Dance programs generally. The doctorate in Dance is currently offered at a very small number of institutions, and Ohio State’s Dance program promises to be a niche program that brings much distinction to the college and the university.

Three programs in the college, History of Art, Music, and Theatre, have been categorized by the Graduate School as good. The Graduate School does note the relatively low GRE scores among Music students as well as the lack of sufficient monitoring of student placement and some evidence of relatively high unemployment (which may simply be endemic to the field). The Theatre program does well in producing Ph.D.s with a relatively small faculty (eight members) and a relatively low percentage of graduate course offerings. Ph.D. production remains low (approximately two per year), and we note that key faculty members have or are retiring. The Theatre program is facing a critical juncture for mapping out its future trajectory. Concerns were raised about a seeming disconnect between the relatively high quality of students in the History of Art doctoral program and the relatively few number of degrees produced and the inordinate time to degree, which approaches a full decade. There is some evidence that, in the wake of recent program restructuring, improvement is occurring in this area. The History of Art program is facing several hiring opportunities due to recent faculty retirements. The program will be challenged to succeed in making targeted and focused faculty hires to embark on a trajectory to achieve excellence.

The Graduate School categorizes the Art Education doctoral program as one that must reassess and/or restructure. The Graduate School notes the seeming disconnect between the program’s high ranking and market share of Art Education Ph.D.s as contrasted with students who present relatively low GRE scores and undergraduate records for the pursuit of doctoral study. The program attracts many students who work in a K-12 setting and many who will continue in that career path after the attainment of the Ph.D. Given Ohio State’s unusually large market share of doctorates in this area (50 percent of the doctorates awarded in the CIC and over 25 percent of those awarded nationally), the Graduate School asks if the program is enrolling doctoral students who, in other institutional settings, are obtaining an alternative degree. Specifically, the Graduate School asks the college to address whether the Art Education program and the university would be better served by an alternative degree track. For instance, an Ed.D. or alternative professional doctorate is focused on education for advanced practice rather than independent research, which is the hallmark of the Ph.D. degree. Such an alternative degree may be appropriate for many of the students in the K-12 pool currently pursuing the Ph.D., and the college could continue to offer a smaller, more selective doctoral program targeting applicants preparing for careers in the academy.

None of the doctoral programs in the College of the Arts have been categorized in the Graduate School’s taxonomy as a candidate for disinvestment.
Main Findings

- The widely used phrase “The 21st century is the century of biology” encapsulates the great importance of biological sciences, not only to the university but to the state and the nation as well. The doctoral programs at Ohio State in biological sciences have many strengths but have not yet achieved the high quality and recognition that are critical to the university’s drive to enhance its overall stature as a leading research university. Biological Sciences are ranked 42nd overall in the nation by U.S. News & World Report, and no Ohio State programs made the rankings of the sub disciplines.

- The College of Biological Sciences report chose not to identify doctoral programs for enhancement or for disinvestment and not to make any comparative assessment of the existing five doctoral programs. This decision was made on the grounds that the college was in the middle of its overall strategic planning process and that the data were not adequate to make distinctions among the programs. The college report focuses instead on strengthening the quality of its doctoral students. The Graduate School’s assessment, however, found that data do show significant differences among the doctoral programs and that Entomology appears to stand out as the weakest of the college’s doctoral programs.

- The college must consider the organizational issues that it has already identified together with the observations noted below. The college appears to be trying to support too many doctoral programs for its size. It must identify research and graduate areas in which it can excel and formulate a plan to reorganize programs and/or reallocate resources to strengthen its doctoral programs. Two suggestions to consider are offering one doctoral degree program in Biology with several specializations or reducing the number of doctoral programs to two or three via mergers.

- This effort should be carried out in the context of and on the same time scale as the college’s current overall strategic planning effort underway for the Provost. Furthermore, the college’s strategic planning should be done in the context of all the life and biological science programs at Ohio State, including the interdisciplinary graduate programs, so that the college and the university as a whole can develop areas of focus that will stand out at the national level.

- The present college report is a first step toward identifying the issues and needs for strengthening doctoral education in the biological sciences, which is critically important for the college and for the university.

Taxonomy

Final classification of the college’s doctoral programs awaits the completion of the college’s strategic plan and its response to the findings of this report. In the meantime, the Graduate School has categorized the College of Biological Sciences’ doctoral programs as programs that must reassess and/or restructure.

Narrative

The College of Biological Sciences comprises approximately 100 full-time faculty in six departments: Biochemistry; Entomology; Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology (EEOB); Microbiology; Molecular Genetics; and Plant Cellular and Molecular Biology (PCMB). Each department has a Ph.D. program, except for the doctoral program in Biochemistry which is housed in the interdisciplinary Ohio State Biochemistry Program (OSBP). The Biochemistry department is a major participant in this interdisciplinary program. Faculty in the College of Biological Sciences also advise students in three other interdisciplinary graduate programs: Biophysics, Environmental Science, and Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology (MCDB). The college is involved in three Targeted Investments in Excellence programs -
Translational Plant Sciences, Mathematical Biosciences, and Public Health Preparedness, which provide important focal points for its research and graduate programs. The college is in many ways the nexus for the multiple efforts in biological and life sciences at Ohio State.

Since September 2007, the college reports that it has been engaged in a strategic planning process focusing on evaluation of the administrative structure of the college and assessment of its doctoral programs. Its strategic planning committee believes that decisions regarding their doctoral programs should not be made until the college decides how it will be organized administratively in the future. The committee gave three reasons for this position: 1) that the data were not adequate and did not have enough statistical significance to distinguish among the different programs, 2) should any enhancements or disinvestments be made, the interconnectedness across departmental and program boundaries would produce “ripple effects throughout the college,” and 3) “the Strategic Planning Committee is only now taking up the closely-related issue of administrative structures and possible reorganization, with the prospect of our graduate programs changing name and possibly focus over the coming years.” Thus, their recommendations “are offered on the assumption that departmental boundaries may shift over the coming years.” Therefore, the college report does not distinguish between strong and weak doctoral programs as requested by the Graduate School. The report focuses instead on investments “in the best students, those with entering credentials that exceed historical norms and those who are progressing well in their programs.”

The college report identified important current issues in its doctoral programs, such as time to candidacy and time to degree and the steps the college is taking to remedy them, all of which are important to strengthening its doctoral programs. As described below, the report also identified important steps to be taken to strengthen the recruiting and retention efforts of the college.

The college report was carefully considered and analyzed during the review process, and the following comments summarize the outcome of the Graduate School’s reviews.

The Graduate School does not agree with the college’s statements about the data not being able to distinguish among the current programs. The Graduate School notes that Entomology has students with rather weak verbal and quantitative GREs, very low research funding per faculty member, and low stipends, which, not surprisingly, translates into few students per faculty member. A high yield on offers in an otherwise competitive college looks a bit conspicuous. The Graduate School also notes that Microbiology stands out for low numbers advancing to candidacy and a long time to degree. Those numbers suggest problems either at admissions or with mentoring and advising of students. Also, the median time for students in EEOB to complete their degrees is more than seven years. The college is aware of the time-to-degree issues.

The college also expressed concern about the quality of incoming students, retention rates, and time to degree, as well as the number of international students. In this context, the high yields in most of the doctoral programs suggest that they are not competing against highly ranked schools, where yields can be below 40 percent. Times-to-degree beyond six years could be addressed by recruiting students of better quality and advising better those admitted.

The college recognizes that its doctoral programs need to reduce the number of weak students being admitted to the program. A consequence is that they must develop other ways to meet their instructional needs at the undergraduate level and the research needs of their faculty. The Graduate School agrees with this assessment and stresses its importance for the College of Biological Sciences and for other colleges facing similar situations. Using the research and instructional demands to determine the size of doctoral programs can yield detrimental results for all three efforts.

It appears that the college is trying to support too many doctoral programs for its size. The departments in the College of Biological Sciences differ in number of faculty, ranging from 10 in PCMB to 32 in EEOB. The college report points out that its faculty are currently training 237 students from nine different doctoral programs – the five within the college plus four interdisciplinary graduate programs. A suggestion would be for the college to offer one doctoral program in Biology with several areas of specialization.
Alternatively, the college could reduce the number of its doctoral programs to three, perhaps by merging Entomology with EEOB and Molecular Genetics with Plant Cellular and Molecular Biology. In both cases, the areas of specialization could be noted on transcripts.

Another observation from the review process was on the report’s comments about the frequent and ongoing restructuring in the biological sciences that has been occurring. However, no principles were articulated for moving the current departmental boundaries. Perhaps the goal should be to provide all graduate students with as broad and adaptable an education as possible, while still assuring a solid disciplinary base. According to this line of reasoning, the range of biology covered by the college could fit into two or, at most, three departments.

As mentioned above, the Graduate School expresses serious concern about the strength of the Entomology doctoral program and suggests either merging it, as just described, or disinvesting in it.

Better recruiting is clearly important though simply hiring a staff member to visit campuses, conferences, and fairs that attract large numbers of minority students will not solve the quality problem by itself. Direct faculty involvement is critically important. Web pages that convey the academic and research programs in a compelling way and highlight successful student and alumni are also essential. Most successful recruiting efforts also involve visits to campus by prospective or admitted students, but this is only convincing if the current students are thriving. A new staff member might work with departments and students to improve that situation. Additional suggestions include improving networking by providing support for faculty and students to attend, present papers and network at professional meetings and by possibly sponsoring regional, national, or international workshops or convocations in areas of research strength. These steps also apply to strengthening the diversity efforts in the college.

The Graduate School notes that the doctoral programs already are supplementing stipends to generally competitive levels for their disciplines. They propose to create new fellowships using college resources. The trade off between enhanced stipends and new fellowships is not yet decided and will likely depend on available resources.
Main Findings

• The College of Education and Human Ecology’s education doctorate is granted in three different schools and, within each school, is further subdivided into numerous specialties, subspecialties, and licensure tracks. The Graduate School finds that these subdivisions create a maze of decentralized programs with a limited core, with small faculties exercising considerable local control. In addition, the Graduate School finds governance and oversight to be problematic. While there have been recent efforts to address this overall situation, the education doctoral programs in the College of Education and Human Ecology require reassessment and a possible restructuring. Establishing appropriate internal and external review mechanisms for this reassessment is a high priority for the university in its doctoral program review.

• The Graduate School review has identified four recommendations to start addressing the difficult problems faced by the Education doctoral program:
  1. Aggressively pursue alternative curriculum options to the Ph.D. such as the Ed.D. or Ed.S., as appropriate, for students in non-research career paths.
  2. Downsize the Ph.D. program dramatically, focusing on students seeking a research oriented degree and a career in a higher education or similar setting.
  3. Focus on improving the quality of entering Ph.D. students.
  4. Reassess the structure of the Education doctoral degree program.

• The college report did not address the Human Ecology doctoral program. The Graduate School requests that the college submit such a report in three weeks as an addendum to its initial documents. The Graduate School reviewed the central data available for the doctoral program in Human Ecology and makes the initial assessment that while it is not central to the core mission or reputation of a major research university, it is a small successful niche program. The Graduate School classifies it as good but notes that the college needs to investigate mechanisms for raising student stipends and attracting greater numbers of domestic students.

Taxonomy

High Quality:
Strong:
Good: Human Ecology
New and/or Developing Doctoral Programs: Ohio State University Nutrition
Programs that Must Reassess and/or Restructure: Ph.D. in Education (College of Education and Human Ecology)
Candidates for Disinvestment or Elimination: Rehabilitation Services (specialty track in Education: Physical Activity and Educational Services), Technology Education (specialty track in Education: Teaching and Learning)

Narrative

The College of Education and Human Ecology is a recently merged college created out of the former College of Education and the former College of Human Ecology. There are two doctoral programs subsumed in the college, one in Education and one in Human Ecology. However, the authorized Education degree is granted in three different schools: Physical Activity and Educational Services
Based largely on problems associated with the college’s Education doctoral program, where most of the college’s doctoral students are enrolled, the Graduate School has categorized the college’s doctoral programs as in need of reassessment and/or restructuring to achieve excellence. If the Graduate School were to view these programs in isolation, that categorization would apply solely to the doctoral program in Education. The college did not address the Human Ecology doctoral program in its document, and the Graduate School requests such a report. Based on its review of central data, the Graduate School has an initial assessment of the Human Ecology doctoral program and would classify it as good. While not necessarily central to the development and/or reputation of a great university, it appears to be a sound niche program. Areas of concern center on the need to offer higher student stipend rates and to attract a greater percentage of domestic students. OSUN, established in 1996, is not discussed extensively in the college report nor is it the focus of study in the report that was produced for the interdisciplinary graduate programs. This report focuses exclusively on the life sciences. Based on the limited information available and judged standing alone, OSUN would be categorized as a program that is not ready for full assessment at this time.

To its credit, the college’s report recognizes the substantial problems faced by the Education doctoral degree and underscores some of the initiatives that are being or will be pursued to address them. Disinvestment has already occurred in the Rehabilitation Services doctoral specialization track in PAES and the Technology Education doctoral track in Ed T&L is currently under review. The Graduate School notes, however, that problems in the doctoral program are more institutionalized and college-wide in scope. As noted in the college’s report, 21 new faculty members were hired in the past year, and there is a goal of 40 hires in place for the next year or two. While a great opportunity for the college, such unusually high numbers underscore a faculty in transition, which will place much stress on existing college structures and operations. The Graduate School notes that absorbing the new faculty into the college’s existing doctoral program will create new and difficult challenges and recommends a thorough review to identify ways in which the college’s doctoral program can be better structured and managed to the benefit of graduate students, faculty, and mission.

The Graduate School has four recommendations for how fundamental problems in the education doctoral program can be addressed:

1. Aggressively pursue alternative degree options as a primary component and mechanism for pursuing appropriate graduate education options for some constituents.

   The Graduate School recognizes the college’s beginning efforts in this regard. The Graduate School notes a tension in the college’s graduate ranks between students who seek to be higher education academicians and research scholars and those who work in K-12 school settings and are pursuing graduate work for professional development and career advancement. At present, these alternative foci are serviced at the doctoral level with one program, the Ph.D. The Graduate School believes that there are scores of students enrolled in the current Ph.D. program who are neither qualified for the pursuit of the research doctorate nor do they really need it.

   The college is to be applauded for its current focus on developing an Ed.D. alternative to the Ph.D. and, perhaps, an Ed. Specialist credential for those for whom the Ph.D. and Ed.D. are not indicated. Such options are focused on education for advanced practice rather than independent
research, which is the hallmark of the Ph.D. degree. If such degree options are available, there should be a natural gravitation of students out of the Ph.D. program. This should allow the college to focus on developing a leaner, more highly articulated and coherent Ph.D. program with appropriate oversight, a considerably stronger student body, and considerably better monitoring of student progress and success. The bottom line is that the college needs to examine the goals of its students and the purposes of its degree programs as a basis for creating a rational degree structure that meets both college goals and student needs.

2. **Downsize the Education Ph.D. program dramatically.**

Currently, there are over 2,000 Education graduate students across the program’s three schools. Of the 772 doctoral students enrolled autumn quarter 2007, 499 were in Education: Teaching and Learning. These numbers are absolutely too high and represent extremely poor doctoral student/faculty ratios. The Graduate School finds that it handles a disproportionate number of complaints and concerns by Education doctoral students about the quality and availability of the advising that they receive and the general oversight of their graduate educations. The Graduate School finds that the size of the Education doctoral cohort, coupled with the problematic quality of a great number of its students, creates serious concerns about the quality of student life in the program.

3. **Focus on improving the quality metrics for entering Ph.D. students.**

The GRE scores presented across the college’s three schools and the undergraduate grade point averages suggest a student body that, in the aggregate, is not of doctoral study caliber. The Graduate School recognizes differing views about the utility of GREs and knows that all doctoral programs can readily provide individual examples of students who do excellent work and succeed despite not having requisite numbers. However, the Graduate School finds that when the aggregate metrics are as low as they are for this doctoral program, there is a clear problem. In addition, a disproportionate number of Education doctoral students are petitioned to the Graduate School for admission because they do not meet threshold acceptance criteria. There is a high attrition rate, approximately 20 percent of the students, who leave the program at a relatively early stage. Approximately 50 percent of the program’s students are part-time, another metric that is problematic.

4. **Reassess the structure of the Education doctoral degree program.**

If there are truly numerous doctoral programs being run under the guise of one degree authorization, that reality should be addressed. Specifically, are the doctoral programs in Physical Activity and Educational Services, Policy and Leadership, and Teaching and Learning fundamentally different doctoral degrees? If so, should they be spun off and recognized as such? Can the multitude of subprograms within each of these three schools be reigned in so that, at a minimum, their governance can be rationalized and strengthened at the school level? Can these subprograms be recognized as tracks in a school-wide doctoral program? Structural and administrative issues such as these are fundamental to the definition and success of the doctoral program in Education, and they simply cannot be handled by ignoring them and continuing with the status quo.
Main Findings

- Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering and Materials Science and Engineering are categorized as high quality doctoral programs, and Electrical and Computer Engineering and Mechanical Engineering are categorized as strong.

- The Graduate School is concerned that significant effort will be needed to bring the graduate programs in Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering, Civil Engineering, and Nuclear Engineering up to levels of excellence commensurate with the goals of the college.

- The doctoral program in Welding Engineering at present is not strong enough to be viable on its own and is categorized as a candidate for disinvestment or elimination.

- This college has several departments that most major engineering schools have not sustained. The organizational arrangements and future of the related doctoral programs need to be assessed in the context of the overall strategic plan for the college.

- The overall concern for the college is that it does not have enough resources to support all its existing doctoral programs at the high level needed to attain or maintain national prominence. The Graduate School recognizes that the doctoral program issues will need to be considered in the context of Engineering’s overall strategic plan, which also involves connections with industrial activity and economic development in Ohio.

Taxonomy

**High Quality:** Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Materials Science and Engineering  
**Strong:** Electrical and Computer Engineering, Mechanical Engineering  
**Good:** Computer Science and Engineering  
**New and/or Developing Doctoral Programs:** Biomedical Engineering  
**Programs that Must Reassess and/or Restructure:** Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering, City and Regional Planning, Civil Engineering, Geodetic Science and Surveying, Industrial and Systems Engineering, Nuclear Engineering  
**Candidates for Disinvestment or Elimination:** Welding Engineering

Narrative

The College of Engineering has 13 doctoral programs and more than 1200 graduate students, making it one of the largest graduate education providers in the university. The college’s vision is “to be internationally recognized as a primary source of creative education, research, technology, design and planning, and as a vital technical asset for sustaining and growing the Ohio economy.” The college’s assessment of its doctoral program followed the approach of its national accreditation board (ABET) and the results were summarized in categories similar to those used by *U.S. News & World Report* (*USN&WR*). Four doctoral programs were rated by the college report as “Strong” – Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, and Materials Science and Engineering. Computer Science and Engineering was rated as “Good/Strong,” while City and Regional Planning, Geodetic Science and Surveying, and Industrial and Systems Engineering were rated as “Good.” Four programs, Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering, Biomedical Engineering, Civil Engineering, and Nuclear Engineering, were considered to be “Adequate,” and Welding Engineering was classified as “Marginal.”

The College of Engineering is a fundamental component of Ohio State’s educational and research programs and is also closely connected with industrial activity and economic development in the State of Ohio.
Ohio. According to *USN&WR*, the college’s graduate programs are ranked 26th overall in the nation and 16th among public engineering colleges. Individually, two of the programs are in the top 20 and four are in the top 30 nationally.

The Graduate School finds the following: Based on their overall quality and potential to enhance the reputation of the university, Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering and Materials Science and Engineering stand out as programs of high quality, while Electrical and Computer Engineering and Mechanical Engineering are classified as strong programs. Computer Science and Engineering is classified as a good program.

The Graduate School has concerns about the size and strength of the doctoral programs in Civil Engineering, Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering, and Nuclear Engineering and the effort that will be needed to make them strong in the future. City and Regional Planning has the only doctoral program in the Knowlton School of Architecture. The small size of its faculty and its relationship to other programs in the Knowlton School and the College of Engineering need to be examined in the context of considering future directions and priorities for City and Regional Planning. Geodetic Science and Surveying is another small doctoral program whose priority and relationship to other doctoral programs in the college and university need to be examined.

The Welding Engineering doctoral program is in a transition phase owing to faculty retirements and its small size. It is the only such program in the U.S., and there is high industrial demand for its graduates. The college notes that a more appropriate name for the program would be “Materials Joining Science and Engineering.” Nonetheless, its current situation is weak and not tenable.

The college report addressed new or emerging opportunities at the program level. Opportunities were well identified in the document for Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Materials Science and Engineering, and Biomedical Engineering.

The report did not address gaining a competitive edge specifically, except in the context of some of the new opportunities.

Improving diversity is one of the six main goals in the college’s *Performance Plan*. Improving diversity is a national challenge for many fields of engineering and science. The college and its programs have developed a number of focused initiatives to improve their recruiting of under-represented groups, and the Graduate School has been working with them in several targeted activities. The results are to be tracked annually by the college.

To improve the recruiting of graduate students, the college and its programs cite the need to increase stipends to more competitive levels and to improve their recruiting of high-ability students as their highest priority needs.

The Graduate School also notes that the doctoral programs in Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Materials Science and Engineering, and Computer Science and Engineering all have robust enrollments (though ½ - ¾ are international students); a large proportion of students advancing to candidacy; 3.5-4.9 students per faculty member supported by research funding of more than $250k/year/faculty member; and median times-to-degree of six years or less. Furthermore, members of each faculty are noted to hold national distinctions. The Graduate School asks why Mechanical Engineering has such a low yield on offers (due to the admission of many students without funding?) and whether standards for candidacy are insufficiently stiff in Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering and Materials Science and Engineering, where 98 percent advance.

The Graduate School notes that City and Regional Planning, Geodetic Science and Surveying, and Industrial and Systems Engineering are not standard disciplines elsewhere, except perhaps for the last. This makes them more difficult to assess from the outside and less valuable to a college seeking to reach the top tier nationally. The Graduate School classifies these doctoral programs as needing reassessment or restructuring because each has an aspect that looks questionable: minimal research funding for City
and Regional Planning, long times-to-degree for Geodetic Science and Surveying and Industrial and Systems Engineering, and a dismal portion of incoming students advancing to candidacy for Industrial and Systems Engineering. In addition, enrollments of all three are 70-90 percent international students.

The Graduate School classifies the doctoral programs in Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering, Civil Engineering, and Nuclear Engineering as needing reassessment or restructuring. The doctoral program in Biomedical Engineering is classified as a new and/or developing program. These programs have very low rates of advancement to candidacy. Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering and Civil Engineering also have very few students per faculty member, while Biomedical Engineering and Civil Engineering look rather short on research funding. Those who do advance to candidacy in Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering take a very long time to finish, while the doctoral program in Nuclear Engineering seems to have few students finishing. Thus, there is concern about the welfare of the doctoral students in these departments. The Graduate School acknowledges that Biomedical Engineering, however, is a new program and is still building up and establishing itself.

The Graduate School classifies the doctoral program in Welding Engineering as a candidate for disinvestment or elimination. The Graduate School acknowledges the uniqueness of the doctoral program and thus, not surprisingly, the program attracts 88 percent of the students offered admission. However, verbal GREs are very low and the faculty attract limited research funding. The program and college should explore strengthening connections with the Edison Welding Institute and industry as a means of gaining additional support.

In conclusion, the ambitions of the college to "achieve world-class stature" and be "nationally recognized as the preeminent College of Engineering in achieving our land grant mission" are laudatory and the Graduate School notes the establishment of an associate dean position for graduate and professional education as helpful. However, the college statements about budgetary issues were sobering. To compete at a higher level is going to take more than better recruiting, as other large engineering schools are investing heavily in modern facilities and better support for students and faculty. Selective investment in the stronger departments and intelligent disinvestment by restructuring the weaker will be essential. The data itself suggest several steps that will be essential to attracting better students – more discriminating admissions, higher stipends (the levels listed are only 1/2 – 2/3 those at top departments), and better advising and mentoring to improve completion and time-to-degree.
College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences
Doctoral Program Assessment and Plan

Graduate School Response

Main Findings

- The Graduate School acknowledges the historic importance of FAES to Ohio State’s land grant mission, that the 10 FAES doctoral programs are one-of-a-kind in Ohio, and that the college has a long-standing commitment to providing leadership and training to foreign countries. The Graduate School also notes the strength of two FAES doctoral programs: Agricultural, Environmental, and Development Economics and Food Science and Nutrition.

- FAES is a significant piece of current environmental science/environmental studies/biological sciences doctoral training and research agendas at Ohio State. It should be a major part of any discussions regarding a university-wide initiative in these areas.

- The Graduate School notes that FAES and the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences have doctoral programs that would seem to be related: Agricultural, Environmental, and Development Economics and Rural Sociology (FAES) and Economics and Sociology (SBS). The Graduate School requests these programs to collaborate in ways that would bring new strength and recognition to these disciplines at Ohio State.

- Given the student demographics, the Graduate School asks if the Ph.D. is the appropriate terminal degree for the program in Agricultural and Extension Education.

- The Graduate School agrees with the college’s finding that Soil Science has students of unacceptably low quality.

Taxonomy

High Quality:
**Strong:** Agricultural, Environmental, and Development Economics; Food Science and Nutrition
**Good:** Food, Agricultural, and Biological Engineering; Horticulture and Crop Science; Plant Pathology

**New and/or Developing Doctoral Programs:** Natural Resources

**Programs that Must Reassess and/or Restructure:** Agricultural and Extension Education; Animal Sciences, Rural Sociology

**Candidates for Disinvestment or Elimination:** Comprehensive Vocational Education; Soil Science

Narrative

The Graduate School recognizes the thorough assessment process that FAES carried out for its doctoral programs and for its report, which classified its programs under the following categories: excellent, very good, good, needs improvement, and proposed elimination.

The Graduate School acknowledges the historic importance of FAES to Ohio State’s land grant mission, that the 10 FAES doctoral programs are one-of-a-kind in Ohio, and that the college has a long-standing commitment to providing leadership and training to foreign countries. The Graduate School notes the college’s statement about the existence of plans for “continued improvement” that have been developed and approved for each doctoral program. The Graduate School regards FAES as a significant piece of current environmental science/environmental studies/biological sciences doctoral training and research agendas at Ohio State. It should be a major part of any discussion regarding a university-wide initiative in these areas.
The Graduate School recognizes the strengths of the doctoral programs in Agricultural, Environmental, and Development Economics and Food Science and Nutrition and classifies them as strong. AEDE has a well-managed doctoral program with a strong national and international reputation, a good median time to degree (5.25 years), and full support for nearly all of its students. Given its strengths, the Graduate School asks if there is unrealized potential at Ohio State for AEDE and the Economics doctoral program in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences to collaborate in ways that would give new strength and recognition to economics as a whole at Ohio State.

The doctoral program in Food Science and Nutrition is seen as conducting research that is interdisciplinary and innovative with an excellent placement record. The Graduate School notes that about 70 percent of enrolling students are international and asks if the graduate program actively recruits domestic students. While not addressed specifically in the college document, the Graduate School recognizes the connections among the Department of Food Science and Technology, the doctoral program in Food Science and Nutrition, and the interdisciplinary Ohio State University Nutrition doctoral program. These programs appear under different names locally (within the college) and officially (within the Graduate School). Specifically, the department lists the doctoral program as simply “Food Science” and the interdisciplinary Ph.D. as “Nutrition.” There is a welcome clarity to these names; this may be the time to make these local practices official.

The Natural Resources doctoral program is relatively new and may be in a rebuilding phase, and the Graduate School classifies it as a new and developing program. The Graduate School observes that its areas of research expertise, as stated in the college report, may be too diffuse given its size. The Graduate School also observes that the current structure may not be optimal in terms of its relationships with the interdisciplinary Environmental Science Graduate Program. Faculty in Natural Resources appear to be advising approximately 30 percent of graduate students in the ESGP.

The Graduate School recognizes the performance and planning exhibited by the doctoral programs in Food, Agricultural, and Biological Engineering, Horticulture and Crop Science, and Plant Pathology and classifies them as good. The college’s document indicates that Horticulture and Crop Science has attended to doctoral program quality, but it is unclear how systematic, strategic, and sustained such efforts have been. There would seem to be opportunities for this doctoral program to participate in important ways in a reorganized Ohio State effort in the environmental sciences and environmental studies. The college report notes that Plant Pathology has a top ranking in the nation. The department appears to have a clear and publicly articulated sense of its research areas, and the college report acknowledges the successful student research that has been conducted and recognized nationally. The report also notes, as does the Graduate School, the low GRE verbal scores and number of petitions to the Graduate School for admission with a low GPA from the doctoral program in Plant Pathology.

The Graduate School notes uneven planning and/or program standards in Animal Sciences, Agricultural and Extension Education, and Rural Sociology and classifies these programs as needing reassessment or restructuring. Animal Sciences shows evidence of attracting underrepresented minorities to its doctoral program. The Graduate School notes the college’s description of Animal Science’s participation in several interdisciplinary programs and collaborations, especially the Ohio State University Nutrition Program. The Graduate School also acknowledges the report’s observation that Animal Science “does not receive credit for extensive involvement in this interdepartmental program.” Human and Community Resource Development has been asked by the college to address its low quantitative GRE scores. The Graduate School notes the large number of part-time students and negligible funding for doctoral students in this doctoral program. The Graduate School acknowledges its admirable completion rate but wonders if entrance and program standards are rigorous enough. Given the student demographics, the Graduate School asks if the Ph.D., which is focused on independent research, is the appropriate terminal degree in Agricultural and Extension Education. The Graduate School asks the college to consider whether or not a professional doctorate, focused on advanced practice, would be a better fit. The college report characterizes the Rural Sociology program as “rebuilding.” The Graduate School notes that Rural Sociology seems the odd program in FAES, which is focused largely in the sciences. The Graduate School requests Rural Sociology and Sociology (in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences) to collaborate in ways that would bring new strength and recognition to these disciplines at Ohio State. Or,
perhaps Rural Sociology might become a track within the social science side of the Natural Resources graduate program.

The Graduate School categorizes Soil Science as a candidate for disinvestment or elimination. The college identifies Soil Science as needing improvement but also identifies Ohio State’s long-standing in this area and highly regarded faculty. This program needs to attend to the quality of its graduate students. The college report suggests that the program may be made a track within an existing FAES graduate program, perhaps Natural Resources.

The college report identifies the interdisciplinary Comprehensive Vocational Education doctoral program for elimination, and the Graduate School concurs, noting that this doctoral program has been inactive for several years.
Fisher College of Business  
Doctoral Program Assessment and Plan  
Graduate School Response

Main Findings

- The Fisher College doctoral programs are a model of good management, oversight, planning, and administration. Treating the three doctoral programs as a single program for budgetary, resource management, and other administrative purposes serves the college well.

- Relatively low stipend levels vis a vis their benchmark peers is a recurring concern emerging from our review.

Taxonomy

High Quality: Accounting and Management Information Systems, Business Administration, Labor and Human Resources  
Strong:  
Good:  
New and/or Developing Doctoral Programs:  
Programs that Must Reassess and/or Restructure:  
Candidates for Disinvestment or Elimination:

Narrative

Renowned colleges of business, such as those located at Duke, Harvard and Pennsylvania, while not part of the central Arts and Sciences core of a major research university do, nevertheless, contribute a great deal to the luster and reputation of such universities. It should also be noted that the reputation of business colleges is more likely associated with their master’s level programs, particularly their portfolio of MBA offerings (“regular,” evening, part-time, Executive, etc.), than it is with doctoral education. This reality creates a difficult balancing act for a business school in a major research university setting where great value is placed on program contributions to doctoral education and the research enterprise. The Fisher College, through strategic choices to downsize their doctoral programs, has accomplished this delicate balance. Downsizing its doctoral programs has allowed the college to focus its attention and energies on quality and excellence at the doctoral level while additional resources can be focused on the master’s level programs that are so critical to the college’s national reputation. The Graduate School categorizes the Fisher College of Business’s three doctoral programs (Accounting and Management Information Systems, Business Administration, and Labor and Human Resources) as programs of high quality.

The Graduate School review of these programs revealed them to be models of good management. The programs have well defined goals that are put into play from the highly selective admissions processes for its excellent students (under 10 percent of applicants are admitted, with average credentials for students in the 3.5-plus GPA range and the 90th-plus percentile on standardized test scores), through their professional placement (with the goal being met of 50 percent placement in Carnegie Foundation-categorized “high research institutions”), and to their eventual career paths. These doctoral programs have excellent placement information and even monitor the publication records of their doctoral alumni.

These are programs in which serious and ongoing assessment is taking place. The Fisher College treats its three distinct programs as one for budgetary, resource management, and other administrative purposes. This approach, through the economies of scale, facilitates the monitoring and planning that appear to be associated with every facet of the college’s doctoral programming activities. The college’s decision to downsize its doctoral program population from approximately 100 to 55-60 students has had several beneficial consequences. These have included the upgrading of student quality, closer student/advisor relationships, and greater attention by faculty to individual students and their needs. Cutting back in size has also allowed the college to make some progress in enhancing student stipend.
levels which, in the college’s self-assessment, remains the central impediment to further program advancement.

The college’s record also documents that excellence and diversity are not competing goals but, rather, go hand in hand. The college’s record is strong in recruiting and training women and minorities in their doctoral programs and in moving these students through the program and on to excellent job placements. The quality of the student experience also appears to be at a high level in the Fisher College’s doctoral programs. While stipend levels, per se, are a recurring concern, the median student time to degree is five years. All doctoral students are guaranteed four years of funding support as RAs or TAs, with a fifth year possible depending on student progress towards degree and program needs. The college has been proactive in devising several novel and aggressive strategies in an effort to deal with their stipend concerns. These have included special non-degree educational programs offered by departments to raise funds for stipends, the foregoing by faculty of some of their individual earnings generated by Executive Education programs to “invest” in stipend resources, and several other innovative measures.
Main Findings

- The Graduate School finds that the doctoral programs in History and Linguistics are high quality, with potential to enhance the reputation of the university as a whole.

- The Graduate School acknowledges the college’s high regard for the doctoral program in English. The Graduate School, however, asks the college to clarify the areas of expertise in English as a first step in helping identify where Ohio State might excel or distinguish itself.

- The Graduate School notes that the stipends across most of the College of Humanities’ doctoral programs are consistently lower (typically between 1K-2K) than benchmarks.

- The Graduate School is concerned about the median time to degree in History (8.38 years) and East Asian Languages and Literature (8.75 years). East Asian Languages and Literature also has a high attrition rate that needs to be examined.

- The college report describes the doctoral programs in Philosophy, Spanish and Portuguese, and Greek and Latin as strong but in the midst of a rebuilding stage. The Graduate School notes the large number of international doctoral students in the Spanish and Portuguese program and asks if the program is actively recruiting domestic students and if the predominance of international doctoral students is linked to undergraduate language instruction.

- The Graduate School acknowledges the college’s assessment of the doctoral programs in French and Italian, Germanic Languages and Literatures, and Slavic and East European Languages and Literatures as “fundamentally sound” but with “limited potential for growth unless they are encouraged to move in different directions.” The Graduate School strongly encourages the College of Humanities to focus on the overall organization of its foreign language departments and on strategic planning to identify research areas where Ohio State might excel.

- The Graduate School notes that little attention was given to recruitment of graduate students in the college document and asks if active recruitment strategies exist for attracting diverse, highly talented graduate students to these doctoral programs.

Taxonomy

High Quality: History, Linguistics
Strong: English, Greek and Latin, Philosophy, Spanish and Portuguese
Good: East Asian Languages and Literatures
New and/or Developing Doctoral Programs: Comparative Studies, Near Eastern Languages and Cultures, Women’s Studies
Programs that Must Reassess and/or Restructure: French and Italian, Germanic Languages and Literatures, Slavic and East European Languages and Literatures
Candidates for Disinvestment or Elimination:

Narrative

The Graduate School is in general concurrence with the review of doctoral programs as presented by the College of Humanities. Its review placed departments within the College of Humanities into four tiers, acknowledging that “all of our doctoral programs are not equally poised to contribute to the mission or aspirations of the university in the same way or at the same level at this time.” This distinction among doctoral programs is a starting point for the Graduate School’s review.

The Graduate School categorizes two doctoral programs, History and Linguistics, as high quality and as having the potential to enhance Ohio State’s reputation. History has clearly paid attention to its Ph.D. program. Its decision in the late ’90s to reduce the size of its doctoral program and eliminate the terminal
master’s was a strategic and responsible one. The growing quality of the program is evidenced by the number and quality of applicants and the selectivity of the admissions process. Placement of graduates is good, with the department appearing to be active in supporting job seekers. The Graduate School notes with some concern the median time to degree of 8+ years and the low average stipends.

There is a clear tradition of excellence in the Linguistics doctoral program. The program recruits outstanding students, graduates them at a reasonable rate, and places graduates in excellent jobs. The Graduate School encourages Linguistics to continue to build strong ties with other doctoral programs and pursue opportunities for interdisciplinary research.

The Graduate School acknowledges the strength of the doctoral program in English and finds that its range and scope is diffuse. The college acknowledges English as a very strong department with outstanding strengths and as important to the university’s core mission. Time to degree is good, but data are not good on historical placement. The Graduate School recommends that the doctoral program in English identify the areas in which English can excel and achieve more national prominence. We encourage departmental and college attention to the relatively low stipends.

The graduate program in Philosophy is noted in the college report to be a “perennially highly ranked doctoral program” currently undergoing a transition brought about by the departure of five senior faculty. New students appear to be strong and the placement record excellent. A recent external review points to the considerable strengths of the department, specifically that recent hires have been “so stellar that the Department is in a very strong position, with a more promising trajectory than it had before the losses.” The Graduate School shares the college’s expectation that Philosophy will return to the highest ranks nationally.

The College of Humanities review deems the doctoral programs in Greek and Latin and in Spanish and Portuguese as having traditional strength and as undergoing a current transition or building phase. A recent external review of Greek and Latin pointed to opportunities for enhancing its national standing with focused effort. The Graduate School notes that the number of students earning degrees in a timely fashion appears problematic. Spanish and Portuguese is characterized by the dean as “building a doctoral program that will eventually claim a top national ranking.” It appears to be doing an admirable job of recruiting, graduating students in a timely fashion, and placing them in good positions upon graduation.

East Asian Languages and Literatures appears to have placed its graduates in excellent universities yet program data show some troubling trends. Students are strong based on GREs; they are apparently well funded; and TA stipends are higher than most Humanities units. But time to degree is very high and, more troubling, is what seems to be a low rate of advancement to candidacy.

Doctoral programs in French and Italian, Germanic Languages and Literatures, and Slavic and East European Languages and Literatures were characterized in the college report to be “fundamentally sound” yet with “limited potential for growth unless they are encouraged to move in different directions.” The Graduate School strongly encourages the College of Humanities to focus on the overall organization of the foreign language departments. They conceivably could benefit from consolidation, which would certainly make administrative sense. The college report emphasizes the importance of language study for America in a globalized world economy and culture fraught with political tensions, and it is hard to fault the logic here. But that case, however powerful, doesn’t help in determining how large individual programs and departments should be or how they should be organized.

The graduate programs in Near Eastern Languages and Cultures, Women’s Studies, and Comparative Studies are too new for assessment at this time.
Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs
Doctoral Program Assessment and Plan

Graduate School Response

Note: This report is in a different format from the others because the interdisciplinary graduate programs cross many colleges and present challenges and opportunities that are different than those within colleges.

There are five interdisciplinary graduate programs (IGPs) that are overseen by a Council of Life Sciences Deans: Environmental Sciences (ESGP); Neuroscience; Ohio State Biochemistry Program (OSBP); Biophysics; and Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology (MCDB). In its six-page report, the Council focuses on identifying fiscal and administrative processes for oversight of the IGPs and makes recommendations to streamline the programs.

The Council acknowledges that these five programs are “central to the university’s research and graduate education missions, serving faculty in numerous departments and colleges.” In addition, the deans note that “some programs and some faculty are critically dependent on IGPs as the primary source of doctoral students; chief among these are the biochemists….” The deans’ report makes a good case for the importance of all of these programs in that they address key issues facing the world and that they complement other aspects of work at Ohio State in the biological and medical sciences, two key areas within the overall university.

However, the Council notes that “as budgets have tightened within colleges, deans have struggled to identify the resources needed to keep the IGPs vibrant.” In their report, the Life Science Deans recommend continuing to support ESGP and Neuroscience in the current manner and merging the three biomedical IGPs. The Council states that the latter are “crucial for the institution’s mission,” and the council feels that the current structure is “no longer administratively or pedagogically defensible.” The Council believes that due to budget constraints, the colleges can no longer support the IGPs to the level required to ensure strong programs. Consolidation is seen as the best alternative to starving individual programs. The Life Science Deans envision a single director with 50 percent release time and 2-3 full-time staff, achieved by reallocation.

This recommendation by the Life Science Deans has generated the most controversy on campus of all of the doctoral assessment documents submitted to the Graduate School. The program directors and many faculty involved have registered their opposition to the proposal to merge the three programs on the grounds that it does not make sense programmatically or academically and that there were not appropriate opportunities for comment and feedback on the plan.

However, the Graduate School notes that the recommendation is consistent with the external review of the interdisciplinary programs carried out in 2004 and that many of the issues pointed out in that review apparently have not been addressed. Clearly, this is the time to do so, and we elaborate on this point below.

There is no question that Ohio State must have strong graduate programs in the biological and life sciences. It is important to note that there is no disagreement among the deans, program directors, and faculty on this point; indeed the report of the Life Science Deans repeatedly emphasized the importance of the programs. The deans expressed two main concerns: the need to strengthen the quality of incoming students to the programs and the need to establish a fiscally sustainable organization for the programs that will give them the support they need to thrive in the future.

In view of the deans’ recommendations and the initial faculty response, the Graduate School recommends that a task force with representation from all the main constituencies (e.g. deans, faculty, and researchers) of the biomedical IGPs be established to assess the current situation and begin to formulate a plan to address the problems raised by the deans with a goal of strengthening Ohio State’s research, doctoral training, and reputational profile in these areas.
As noted in the 2004 external review report, the programs must identify main research themes in those areas in which Ohio State can excel and must address the issues of overlap among the existing programs; those research themes in turn would provide a basis for developing an appropriate organizational plan. Participants from outside the university should also be consulted, such as members of the 2004 review team and/or other leaders from universities that have been addressing similar challenges in the organization of the life sciences in their institutions.

In the meantime, adequate resources and support must be provided to the programs to maintain their health while reorganization plans are developed.

**Main Finding**

These efforts for the IGPs must be carried out in coordination with similar ones in related areas. As is mentioned in other reports, one of the main outcomes of Ohio State’s doctoral program assessment is the identification of global issues and the interconnected nature of the graduate programs in the biological and life sciences at Ohio State. For example, the College of Biological Sciences is developing a strategic plan that must consider what scope of activities it can support, how its programs should be organized, and what relationship it should have to the IGPs and other programs in the Life Sciences. In the Health Sciences, the Colleges of Medicine, Pharmacy, Veterinary Medicine, and Dentistry have important graduate and research programs that connect with efforts in the Biological Sciences and the IGPs. Indeed, 10 of Ohio State’s 18 colleges are active participants in the different biological and life science graduate programs across the university.

In summary, the strategic planning efforts for the biological and life sciences represent one of the greatest challenges and one of the greatest opportunities for Ohio State. Getting things right for the IGPs is a crucial component of this overall effort.
Main Findings

- With the arrival of a new director, the John Glenn School of Public Affairs is now positioned to move forward, and this report is the first step toward strengthening the doctoral program.

- The hiring of two new professional staff to support doctoral and master’s students represents a significant investment of resources and opportunity to recruit better students. A more detailed plan needs to be developed, both for recruiting in general and for improving diversity.

- There was relatively little discussion of the faculty and the role they play in doctoral program quality. One problem of JGSPA is that, other than the director, there is only one full professor on the faculty (and he was just promoted), so senior leadership and mentoring is scarce. However, the small size of the group offers an opportunity for them to come together under the leadership of the director to develop a focused approach to strengthening the doctoral program.

- The JGSPA is well-poised to form collaborative relationships with other units on campus, but little information was provided in the report. This area is ripe for future development and for strengthening the doctoral program and indeed the school overall. This is especially important because of the small size of the doctoral program compared to its benchmarks.

- Because of its recent formation and hiring of a new director, the school’s program needs time to develop and establish itself. It is taking steps to improve its doctoral program. It would be logical to review its progress at the five-year mark of its existence, i.e., 2011.

Taxonomy

High Quality:

Strong:

Good:

New and/or Developing Doctoral Programs: Public Policy and Management

Programs that Must Reassess and/or Restructure:

Candidates for Disinvestment or Elimination:

Narrative

The John Glenn School of Public Affairs (JGSPA) was created in 2006 through the merger of the School of Public Policy and Management and the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy. The School has a new director since autumn of 2007. Its Ph.D. program, which was formerly in the School of Public Policy and Management, is small (17 enrolled autumn quarter ‘07); the majority of the students are in the master’s program.

The mission of the John Glenn School is “to serve as the center of the university’s policy-related teaching, research, and outreach activities.” In terms of quality, its GREs are low relative to benchmarks (V=590, Q=670) but time to degree is good. Placement is acceptable, as placement in think tanks and policy research centers is respected in this field.

The school’s plan identified the following opportunities to pursue: (1) to provide services to state/federal agencies for revenue generation; (2) to meet the growing demand for civil service professionals and faculty; (3) to stay focused on faculty who are quantitative/empirically based, which is an emerging trend in the field. JGSPA considers its comparative strengths to be (1) the empirical/analytic focus of its faculty; (2) joint initiatives with other units on campus; and (3) demanding curriculum and requirements.
For the doctoral student cohorts that entered during the years 2003–2007, 47 percent of the students were female and 21 percent were African American. To improve diversity, the school plans to develop contacts with universities that have large populations of underrepresented groups, in particular, Hispanic students.

To strengthen its doctoral program, the school has recently increased its support for students and its recruiting competitiveness by funding four doctoral students for four years of study. It has also hired two new professional staff members to support recruiting and placement, and it plans better advertising of faculty research to attract better students.
Main Findings

- The doctoral programs in the College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences (MAPS) are largely central to the core research and teaching missions of a major research university.

- While the college is home to a large number of distinguished faculty colleagues with superb research and funding records, none of the doctoral programs has a “top 20” ranking. In the Chemistry, Mathematics, and Physics doctoral programs there also appears to be a disconnect between such acknowledged excellence and the quality of the graduate experience for doctoral students.

- The following observations and issues are interrelated and need to be addressed in a focused way: The doctoral programs in MAPS have not, largely, been able to transform the large numbers of Graduate School fellowship offers into enrolled students. Ph.D. completion rates in Chemistry, Mathematics and Physics are low. Stipend rates are an ongoing college concern. MAPS TAs generally have very high teaching loads brought on by the college’s teaching responsibilities. Placement records in the college’s largest doctoral programs are spotty.

- In regard to the issues above, the approach of the Astronomy doctoral program should be explored as a model for other MAPS doctoral programs.

- The Geological Sciences doctoral program, while small, has global cachet associated with the strength of its faculty and the Byrd Polar Institute. Given such advantages, the doctoral program is an underachiever and should be a prime player in an university-wide effort to amplify Ohio State’s strengths in environmental/earth sciences, perhaps through a global climate change graduate program focus.

- The doctoral programs in MAPS acknowledge difficulty in recruiting strong domestic students generally and minority students and women in particular. While the Graduate School acknowledges that this is a national problem, serious strategic planning is necessary to address it here.

Taxonomy

**High Quality:** Astronomy

**Strong:** Chemistry, Mathematics, and Physics

**Good:** Biostatistics, Chemical Physics, Geological Sciences, Statistics

**New and/or Developing Doctoral Programs:**

**Candidates for Disinvestment or Elimination:**

Narrative

The Graduate School acknowledges that assessment of the College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences doctoral programs presents unique challenges because they range from extremely small, elite and non-central to the university’s undergraduate teaching mission (Astronomy) to unusually big, with a seeming under-population of doctoral students and one of the university’s largest undergraduate teaching loads (Mathematics with 61 faculty). Chemistry is in the middle of this range with a heavy undergraduate teaching responsibility, with a small faculty, and high graduate student/faculty ratio (nearly 6-1).

In addition, the doctoral programs in MAPS face recruitment challenges that mirror those of the disciplines nationally. The college-wide problem of attracting underrepresented minorities specifically and
domestic students more generally is real and substantial. About 30-40 percent of the students in Statistics and Mathematics are U.S. citizens. The doctoral programs (except for Mathematics and Physics) have had some success in attracting female students, so there is evidence that inroads can be made in addressing demographic concerns.

The Graduate School ranks Astronomy as a high quality and model doctoral program where the excellence of the faculty and its research support is matched by a high quality graduate student experience. While some initiatives in Astronomy, such as its morning coffee series, may be difficult to pursue in the Physics, Chemistry, or Mathematics doctoral programs, nevertheless, the faculty commitment to the graduate program evidenced in so many ways in Astronomy (including its success in time to degree relative to its benchmark peers) warrants study and exportation throughout MAPS doctoral programs.

The Graduate School finds that there is a disconnect in the three largest MAPS doctoral programs (Chemistry, Mathematics, and Physics) between the excellence of their faculty, the prominence of their research efforts, and the quality of the graduate experience of the college’s students. While these doctoral programs are strong overall, significant problems in their graduate student experience hamper their full potential. For example, while the college’s doctoral programs perform extraordinarily well in winning university fellowships for its well-credentialed applicants, MAPS is among the poorest college performers in translating fellowship offers into enrolled students. The Graduate School notes that this result may result from competition with the very best programs in the country. However, the Graduate School finds that the doctoral programs need to examine closely their fellowship competition performance and try to understand the source of their problematic enrollment success. The Graduate School also notes that Ph.D. completion rates in Chemistry, Mathematics, and Physics are unacceptably low and may reflect both the loss of the very best applicants and a problematic graduate student quality of life. The college acknowledges that stipend rates are an ongoing problem and that MAPS TAs have a heavy teaching workload that may impair their ability to make dissertation progress and complete their degrees. In addition, the Graduate School finds that insufficient attention has been placed on monitoring professional placements, which is a subtle metric of graduate student neglect. In summary, the Graduate School finds that the three largest MAPS doctoral programs must reconcile their clearly strong faculties and research programs with the college’s undergraduate teaching responsibilities and do so in ways that support a quality of student life that is commensurate with the programs’ inherent strengths and acknowledged excellence. Because of their centrality to a major public research university’s mission, and their focal role in the arts and sciences core, the problems in the doctoral programs in Mathematics, Chemistry, and Physics must be a high priority for resolution.

The Graduate School ranks the doctoral programs in Chemical Physics, Biostatistics, Geological Sciences, and Statistics as good. The Graduate School notes that the Statistics program has many interdisciplinary connections and provides important methodological training for a wide swath of graduate students across the university well beyond the confines of its own program. While a small program, Geological Sciences presents an enigma because there are very clear strengths and excellence as well as global cachet in the Byrd Polar Institute, which it houses. Nevertheless, the Graduate School finds that this program could be more successful in converting these research strengths into a wider recognition of the doctoral program, the production of doctoral degrees, and participation in a university-wide initiative in the environmental and earth sciences.
College of Medicine
and Integrated Biomedical Science Graduate Program (IBGP)
Doctoral Program Assessment and Plan

Graduate School Response

Main Findings

• The College of Medicine and its Integrated Biomedical Science Graduate Program (IBGP) are central to Ohio State’s mission and its overall national standing. The formation and development of the program to date have shown innovation. The description and plan for moving the program forward are well-organized.

• The program needs to keep improving the level of its entering students and broadening its recruiting efforts to attract the best students in the nation. Its students have not yet attained the high level desired for this program. They are good, but their GRE scores, for example, are not at the level of the best interdisciplinary or Mathematical and Physical Sciences programs.

• The College of Medicine cannot unilaterally disinvest in the biomedical Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs (IGPs). While the college presents a plausible case from its own perspective for reducing its support of the IGPs and enhancing support of the IBGP, the whole issue of interdisciplinary programs in the life sciences must first be reassessed from a top-level university perspective to determine how Ohio State can make best use of its considerable resources and talent in the life sciences.

• Ohio State has the opportunity to develop unique and cutting edge research and graduate programs in the life sciences by taking advantage of its strengths in all 10 colleges currently involved in biological and life sciences research and graduate programs. This is the highest-priority finding for Ohio State as a whole to emerge from the assessment of doctoral programs.

Taxonomy

High Quality:
Strong: Integrated Biomedical Science Graduate Program

Good:
New and/or Developing Doctoral Programs: Health and Rehabilitation Sciences
Programs that Must Reassess and/or Restructure: Anatomy
Candidates for Disinvestment or Elimination:

Narrative

The College of Medicine has three doctoral programs. The largest is the Integrated Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program (IBGP), which was created in 2001 by the merging of four departmental graduate programs to provide a single interface to the large number of faculty and programs in the college. It offers students 11 different tracks of research emphasis. The IBGP is cited by the college as being “ahead of its time with respect to the NIH Roadmap for accelerating the translation of basic science discoveries to clinical care.” In addition, there is a new program (since 2005) in Health and Rehabilitation Sciences and a small program in Anatomy, which is in transition. The College of Medicine also contributes to four interdisciplinary graduate programs (IGP). Most of the resources of the college are in the IBGP.

The College of Medicine’s plans to reorganize the Anatomy program represent attempts to build on strengths within the college and the university as a whole. Anatomical Informatics represents a potential cutting edge and translational research opportunity. Clearly, the college’s doctoral programs are central to the mission of the university in their own right and they provide important adjuncts to the primarily clinical mission of the college. A vibrant doctoral program in the biomedical sciences is critical to the success of a highly ranked medical program.

However, the IBGP needs to keep improving the level of its entering students and broadening its recruiting efforts to attract the best students in the nation. The program data compiled by the Office of
Institutional Research and Planning do not indicate that the students have yet attained the high level desired for this program. GRE scores, for example, are not at the level of the best IGP or Mathematical and Physical Sciences doctoral programs. Little information is available for an assessment of the program relative to peers or national standards.

The college outlines a plan to gradually divest itself of the four Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs in the Life Sciences. While its goal of redirecting its resources towards strengthening its own programs might make sense internally, the situation with the IGPs is critically important to all the life and biological sciences programs at Ohio State and must be assessed first from a university-wide perspective. As mentioned above, this is the highest priority finding from the overall assessment of doctoral programs.

There are several initiatives underway to increase the competitive edge of the college’s doctoral programs. The college has created a new position of associate dean for research education and graduate studies, and it has committed to the creation of a Center for Clinical and Translational Science which holds promise to garner external NIH funding. It has also appointed a new IBGP director and associate director. The college has sought to increase student stipends, to enhance the interview process, and to provide increased monitoring and support to doctoral students.

Whereas the current status of underrepresented minority students is rather poor, the college and IBGP propose to increase diversity through early recruitment of Ohio State and regional undergraduate students and development of specialized mentoring of underrepresented minority students. It also plans to invite nationally prominent minority researchers for seminars and special mentoring events. The Graduate School encourages the college to consult with Cyndi Freeman, director of graduate student recruitment and diversity initiatives in the Graduate School.

The college has proposed several initiatives to improve recruitment, including increased student stipends, first year financial achievement awards for top students, and enhanced student research support including travel awards. However, these programs have not been implemented and appear dependent on money derived from the divestment in the IGPs.
Main Findings

- The College of Nursing report makes clear that the state of Ohio and the nation are facing a serious nursing shortage and this situation is exacerbated by the shortage of Ph.D.-prepared nursing faculty.

- The Graduate School notes little evidence of strategic or long-term planning in the document prepared by the College of Nursing. Specifically, the college needs to identify new or emerging opportunities where the college can excel or ways that the doctoral program can gain a competitive edge over other institutions.

- The Graduate School supports the college’s encouragement of talented undergraduate and master’s students to continue directly into the doctoral program.

- The Graduate School encourages the College of Nursing to take a strategic, long-term, and focused approach to recruitment and to solicit advice from and collaborate with other Ohio State health sciences graduate programs with demonstrated success in this area.

- The new Doctor of Nursing Practice degree is an alternative for current practitioners seeking an advanced degree but for whom a Ph.D. research degree is not practical or appropriate. The Graduate School encourages the college to actively counsel potential graduate students about each graduate degree so as to ensure that the most research-focused students are encouraged to pursue the Ph.D.

- The College of Nursing report gives little attention to the areas of research emphases within the college. Collaborations between the College of Nursing and other Ohio State health science doctoral programs would seem to be expected but none are noted in the college document. Such opportunities should be explored and actively pursued.

Taxonomy

High Quality:

Strong:

Good:

New and/or Developing Doctoral Programs:

Programs that Must Reassess and/or Restructure: Nursing

Candidates for Disinvestment or Elimination:

Narrative

The College of Nursing makes the case that the serious nursing shortage is exacerbated by a shortage of nursing faculty and that Ph.D.-prepared faculty are critical for both Ohio and the country. The rest of the college report focuses almost entirely on the current profile of its doctoral students and its planned enhancements to raise the student quality profile. The Graduate School notes that new or emerging opportunities or ways that the doctoral program could gain a competitive edge over other institutions are not explored.

The graduate program in nursing is currently ranked 32 of 285 programs. Most graduate students are enrolled in the master’s program. The doctoral program is one of four in the state of Ohio and, since its beginnings in 1986, it has enrolled a small number of students, many of those part-time. Current
enrollment is 29 students, with 17 enrolled full time. The average age of doctoral students is 38.7 years, which is acknowledged as problematic. The college is encouraging undergraduate and master’s students to continue directly on to the doctoral degree without seeking work experience, as has been the norm in the past. It is anticipated that this will lead to the average age of doctoral students decreasing over time.

The GRE scores of doctoral students in nursing are the lowest among the health sciences colleges and lower than most benchmark institutions. The program has recently set a minimum of 500 for both the verbal and quantitative GRE scores for new doctoral applicants and expects this, paired with new recruitment techniques and increased stipend support, to yield a stronger doctoral student body. The Graduate School believes that the GRE bar has been set too low and urges the College of Nursing to revisit this threshold.

The College of Nursing’s report notes that the doctoral program currently has a small percentage of male and minority students and no international students and intends to “aggressively recruit” a more diverse student body. One strategy is to join with other schools of nursing to cooperate in recruitment activities. We acknowledge this plan and encourage the college to consult with the other Ohio State health sciences colleges that have a tradition of aggressive recruitment. Other recruitment strategies would benefit from consultation with Cyndi Freeman, the Graduate School’s director of graduate student recruitment and diversity initiatives.

With an older, predominately female doctoral student population, the College of Nursing notes that many of its doctoral graduates are place-bound and unlikely to accept employment opportunities outside the state of Ohio. Those few who have are in faculty and post-doc positions at a variety of institutions. The college is hopeful that by recruiting younger and more research-focused students its future graduates will be successful in attaining first positions at prestigious universities throughout the United States. The time to degree for nursing doctoral students is seven years, which is higher than many benchmark institutions. The college indicates plans to begin a seminar for post-candidacy students and to review individual progression toward the degree on a regular basis.

A new Doctor of Nursing Practice degree, directed to nurses interested in clinical practice or clinical research rather than research, is nearing implementation and is seen as an alternative to the Ph.D. The college anticipates that students will “self-select into the program that is most congruent with their goals,” and thus will assist in heightening the quality of the Ph.D. program. The Graduate School agrees that it is important to differentiate between students interested in a practice-oriented curriculum and those interested in a research focus. We encourage the College of Nursing to focus its recruitment efforts towards those seeking a research degree and not to leave it to students to choose between degree programs.

In addition to enhanced recruitment efforts, the college plans to increase funding for doctoral students as a way to compete for stronger students and to encourage full-time enrollment. This will be accomplished via more doctoral scholarships, increased GA stipends, and increased support for students applying for grants and other research opportunities. A budget plan is proposed to accomplish these and other goals. Again, we encourage the college to align its resources with proven recruitment strategies.

The Graduate School understands that the college is in a state of transition, having lost six senior faculty to retirements and other career opportunities in the past five years. The college must address emerging scholarly opportunities as it seeks to improve the quality of its doctoral program and gain a competitive edge over other institutions. Further we would encourage attention to potential collaborations with other health sciences colleges, partnerships which would seem to be beneficial to the College of Nursing.
Main Findings

- Oral health has been identified as the number one health problem in the state of Ohio and this small, strong program serves to link basic research in oral health and medicine with patient care.
- Time to degree for Oral Biology students is good, retention is strong, and all graduates of the program continue to work in oral health and medicine.
- The College of Dentistry’s Oral Biology doctoral program has a 23 percent market share of benchmark institution degrees and a 30 percent share of CIC degrees.
- The Graduate School notes the lack of diversity in the Oral Biology program, with most students being of international origins, and encourages the program to directly address the recruitment and retention of domestic underrepresented minority students.

Taxonomy

High Quality:
Strong: Oral Biology

Good:
New and/or Developing Doctoral Programs:
Programs that Must Reassess and/or Restructure:
Candidates for Disinvestment or Elimination:

Narrative

The Graduate School categorizes the doctoral program in Oral Biology as strong. Oral Biology is the only doctoral degree program in the College of Dentistry. Students may earn either the Ph.D. or combined Ph.D./D.D.S. It is the only program of its kind in Ohio and one of 15 in the country. The College of Dentistry makes the case that its program contributes to the Academic Plan of the university by virtue of its high quality and by the college’s multidisciplinary collaborations. The Graduate School agrees that the Oral Biology Ph.D. is vital to the academic environment of the college and that this unique program contributes to the overall reputation of the research agenda in the Health Sciences.

Those students entering the doctoral program in Oral Biology who take the GRE score at the highest levels among students in the Health Sciences. A better indicator of quality is the number of students proceeding to candidacy and to degree in a timely manner. Here, the program also has a strong record. Most students pass candidacy prior to earning 135 hours, and time to degree for more recent single-degree students is 4.25 years. Retention is high, with 78 percent of admitted students earning the doctorate. The College of Dentistry reports that this success is due in part to students not being admitted to the doctoral program without a committed laboratory and principal investigator/mentor being identified. Placement is also notable, with 10 graduates currently holding faculty positions, four others in research positions in industry, and the most recent graduates enrolled in post-graduate residency programs. The college notes that none of their graduates has left the field of oral health and medicine.

The Graduate School notes the lack of diversity in students enrolled in the Oral Biology doctoral program. The current student body is 50 percent female, and only one student is an underrepresented minority. Of further concern is that the majority of students admitted to the doctoral program are international students. More discussion of this point would have been useful. The College of Dentistry acknowledges the need to focus more resources on the recruitment of a diverse domestic class. It has developed a series of targeted activities to address this issue and plans to use its various dental associations, student organizations, and faculty to assist in the effort. The Graduate School cautions that these efforts must be focused and sustained and must have the full support of the college’s administrators and faculty to be
successful. The Graduate School encourages the college to consult with Cyndi Freeman, director of graduate student recruitment and diversity initiatives.

The college’s report notes that oral health has been identified as the number one health problem in the state of Ohio. The need to increase basic research in oral health and medicine and to link this research with patient care has been recognized at the national level and is seen by the college as an opportunity for its basic and clinical researchers to excel. The Oral Biology doctoral program is viewed as the “necessary arm” to move the college into this new area of translational research.

Data show that the college has a 23 percent of the market share of benchmark institution degrees and a 30 percent share of CIC degrees. It seeks to maintain its competitive edge over other institutions by offering competitive funding packages for students. The awarding and renewal of a peer-reviewed T32 training grant and support from faculty who are heavily funded with grants from NIH and NSF are seen as contributing to this competitive edge. The college also plans to foster the Ph.D./D.D.S. program as a way to attract and retain students. A detailed budget plan for increasing funding packages is not provided. Rather the college’s report identifies its current budget support and notes that it is “prepared to continue to invest in the growth and success of the program.”
College of Pharmacy
Doctoral Program Assessment and Plan
Graduate School Response

Main Findings

- All measures of student and faculty quality provide evidence of a high quality doctoral program in the College of Pharmacy.
- The Graduate School believes that the college’s efforts to increase the diversity of its student body is a model for other units to emulate.
- Plans for a new Translational Science track in the College of Pharmacy’s doctoral program address emerging opportunities in pharmacy and tie in nicely with the university’s Clinical and Translational Science Award Program efforts.

Taxonomy

High Quality: Pharmacy
Strong:
Good:
New and/or Developing Doctoral Programs:
Programs that Must Reassess and/or Restructure:
Candidates for Disinvestment or Elimination:

Narrative

The Graduate School categorizes the doctoral program in Pharmacy as high quality. The College of Pharmacy has prepared a meticulous report, replete with key findings from and details about its self-assessment, and with a well-conceived plan for further development and for progress along key fronts. Various measures of student and faculty quality all point to a high quality doctoral program and successful graduates. The report offers solid evidence for the college’s very positive evaluation of its doctoral program. The intrinsic connection between pharmaceutical research and Ohio State’s biomedical reputation on the one hand and pharmaceutical research and health care on the other make a compelling argument for the importance of the doctoral program in Pharmacy.

There are currently four areas of specialization within the College of Pharmacy doctoral program: Medicinal Chemistry and Pharmacognosy, Pharmaceutics, Pharmacology, and Pharmaceutical Administration. The median time to candidacy is 3.1 years and median time to degree is 5.1 years, with a high percentage of students admitted proceeding to graduation. Average GRE scores of admitted students are strong and are competitive with peer institutions. The Graduate School notes some concern with the slight decline of GRE scores of admitted students over the past three years and a drop in yield rate over the same time period. These changes may be indicators of increased competition from other institutions and should continue to be monitored.

The College of Pharmacy has acted upon its stated commitment to ethnic and gender diversity and is a model for other colleges to follow. The college was the first pharmacy program in the country to establish an affiliation agreement with a minority institution (Xavier University of Louisiana) and has additional agreements in place with the Atlanta University Center (Clark Atlanta, Morehouse, and Spelman) and the University of Puerto Rico. As a result, approximately 30 percent of the college’s domestic graduate students are members of a minority group. The gender balance is approximately 50:50.

A top priority identified by College of Pharmacy faculty is put forth in response to one of the themes identified by the “NIH Roadmap for Medical Research.” The NIH’s Clinical and Translational Science Award Program (CTSA) is seen as enabling more rapid development of new treatments for patients, and in conjunction with Ohio State’s applying for a CTSA, the college plans to initiate a new Translational
Science track in its doctoral program. This track is designed for students holding the Doctor of Pharmacy degree or currently enrolled in the Pharm.D. program. The college report notes that the new track “addresses the opportunity provided by NIH in clinical and translational science, and it positions the college research and graduate education programs to participate in the larger OSU CTSA effort.” The Graduate School encourages further investigation of this emerging area and concurs that Ohio State could potentially be a leading player in translational science.
College of Public Health
Doctoral Program Assessment and Plan
Graduate School Response

Main Findings
- The College of Public Health is the only accredited public health program in Ohio and its doctoral program is young and evolving.
- The college has identified strategies for improving diversity and for continuing the recruitment and retention of high quality graduate students and has committed college funds to achieve these goals.
- The Graduate School believes that the college’s faculty quality and research provide an excellent base on which to continue to grow the doctoral program.
- Collaborations with other health sciences colleges and the development of dual degree programs will assist the College of Public Health in more clearly establishing its identity in relation to benchmark universities.

Taxonomy
High Quality:
Strong:
Good:
New and/or Developing Doctoral Programs: Public Health
Programs that Must Reassess and/or Restructure:
Candidates for Disinvestment or Elimination:

Narrative
The Graduate School concurs with the College of Public Health’s assessment that its doctoral program is “young and evolving, growing in size and strength.” The current Ph.D. in Public Health grew out of the doctoral program in preventive medicine which began in the 1960s. Five specializations were approved in 2005: biostatistics; environmental health sciences; epidemiology; health behavior and health promotion; and health services management and policy. The program currently enrolls 34 students. The college also enrolls students in a professionally oriented master’s program. The college report makes the case that, as the only accredited public health program in the state of Ohio, the college is critical to the land grant mission of Ohio State. As the lead college in the Targeted Investment in Excellence program in public health preparedness, the college is demonstrating its centrality to addressing public health issues in the community and its collaborative role in bringing together researchers and students from diverse disciplines to combat infectious diseases.

Time to degree is good, at 4.75 years, although these data reflect the prior general public health doctoral program. The College of Public Health is currently ranked 21 of 36 schools. The college report indicates that only two schools as young as Ohio State’s are ranked slightly higher, and both those programs are larger.

The college has committed to hiring a director for its new Center for Health Equity and Multicultural Health, which it believes will support its efforts to recruit a more diverse faculty and student body. It is also participating in a variety of recruitment efforts and is working on an NIH proposal focused on the recruitment of underrepresented students. Public Health has identified strengthening its doctoral program as a high-priority goal in its strategic plan. A budget plan targets internal college resources to accomplish these proposed enhancements.
The college provides a fairly even-handed discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the Public Health doctoral program in terms of faculty, size, and funding. The college report notes that faculty size has increased from 27 in 2003 to 44 in 2007, with annual research expenditures growing from $2.9 million to $5.4 million over the same time period. Five faculty are AAAS fellows, and relationships are being developed with other research entities on campus that will be beneficial to faculty and students alike. The small size of the doctoral program is seen by the college as a weakness. The Graduate School believes the strategic decision to limit Ph.D. admissions during this transition period was a wise one and cautions Public Health to thoughtfully increase doctoral enrollment with a focus on high quality students.

The College of Public Health recognizes that its most promising opportunities lie within the comprehensiveness of the university’s health sciences complex. Partnerships have already been established with Veterinary Medicine and the Comprehensive Cancer Center, for example, and a joint Ph.D. program in biostatistics is currently being developed with the Department of Statistics. The college report notes some concern with the new doctoral program being able to gain a competitive edge over other institutions with older, more well-established programs. The Graduate School acknowledges that it is difficult to discern what the “identity” of Public Health will be vis a vis its competitors. The College of Public Health is moving in the right direction with a focus on collaboration and on strengthening its faculty. With similar attention on the improvement of student quality and commitment to funding its graduate students, we are confident the college will find its voice and reasonably be able to increase its ranking over time. The Graduate School recognizes that the College of Public Health has a young doctoral program and needs time to build and solidify its resources.
Main Findings

- The Graduate School recognizes the strategic planning and implementation that has already occurred within the college to enhance and develop the quality of its doctoral programs.

- Political Science and Psychology are recognized as high quality programs.

- Economics is a strong department and needs to address attrition problems with its doctoral students. The Graduate School requests Economics and Agricultural, Environmental, and Development Economics (in the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences) to collaborate in ways that would bring new strength to these disciplines at Ohio State.

- The Graduate School notes the strength of the Atmospheric Sciences doctoral program and regards it as a key component of Ohio State’s overall potential for prominence in environmental and earth sciences.

- Time to degree in Sociology must be improved and consideration be given to reducing the size of the doctoral program. The Graduate School requests Sociology and Rural Sociology (in the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences) to collaborate in ways that would bring new strength to these disciplines at Ohio State.

- Speech and Hearing Science is a small program and is focused on its professional master’s and Doctor of Audiology program. The Graduate School recommends further consideration of whether the program should be focused solely on professional training at the graduate level.

- Active recruitment of graduate students, especially by faculty, needs to be a core part of any recruitment activity. Documents shared with the Graduate School did not explicitly address how potential graduate students were attracted to Ohio State.

Taxonomy

High Quality: Political Science, Psychology
Strong: Atmospheric Sciences, Economics, Geography,
Good: Communication, Sociology
New and/or Developing Doctoral Programs: Anthropology
Programs that Must Reassess and/or Restructure: Speech and Hearing Science
Candidates for Disinvestment or Elimination:

Narrative

The Graduate School appreciates the systematic assessments evident in the report prepared by the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and recognizes the strategic planning and implementation that has already occurred within the college to enhance and develop the quality of its doctoral programs. The college appears to have employed three successful strategies: focusing programs on strengths and not on being comprehensive, hiring high quality faculty in those focused areas, and increasing standards for doctoral admissions and investing more college-level funds in highly sought-after graduate students. With some variations, which are explained below, the Graduate School largely concurs with the recommendations made by the college.

Political Science and Psychology are high quality doctoral programs that stand out in terms of overall quality, planning, focus, and potential to enhance the standing of the university. Political Science is one of Ohio State’s top 20 programs. Its doctoral students rank among the best in the university in terms of GRE
scores; the program also is one of the best in terms of winning University Fellowships and successfully enrolling award recipients. Placements are strong and getting stronger, and the doctoral program is actively attending to time to degree, which is already approximately the disciplinary norm. The department is planning to reduce the graduate student cohort size to align it with faculty resources and to better align the program with competitors. The program is concerned that financial support of graduate students lags behind competitors and that teaching duties hamper Ph.D. candidates’ ability to create stronger publication records. Psychology has already reduced the size of its doctoral program by focusing its areas of research. The program also attracts very strong students with one of the highest mean GRE scores at Ohio State; the program is also one of the most successful at recruiting students who win and accept University Fellowships. The department has had substantial retirements and some faculty losses to other departments recently. According to the college report, Psychology’s “principal challenge is to maintain the quality and standing of its faculty and to move unequivocally into the top 20 of psychology departments nationwide.”

Economics, Geography, and Atmospheric Sciences are strong programs with areas that need attention before they can achieve high quality. Economics was recognized as one of the top three departments in the college report. The Graduate School acknowledges the strengths of this program and its centrality to a research university. The Graduate School notes problems in its graduate program, particularly in the unacceptably high attrition rate. Specifically, Economics needs to develop a plan of action with appropriate focus on how it can better retain its best graduate students and improve its national standing. The Graduate School asks the college to explore possible convergences between Economics and the doctoral program in Agricultural, Environmental, and Development Economics in the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences as an opportunity to strengthen Ohio State’s standing in economics. Geography is already a top-five program according to the last NRC study in 1993. It is in a rebuilding phase with its faculty and is working to, as noted in the college report, “make the quality and placement of its doctoral students more commensurate with its top-five national standing.” The Graduate School notes that the existence of a doctoral program, Atmospheric Sciences, within Geography as somewhat unique within the university. Atmospheric Sciences is a strong program and the Graduate School sees it as an important component in Ohio State’s existing strengths in the environmental sciences. Furthermore, the Graduate School regards the existence of earth and environmental science programs across five colleges and numerous doctoral programs as an opportunity, with more consideration, for Ohio State to excel in these areas.

Anthropology is in a development stage. Over the last decade, Anthropology identified two areas for emphasis: physical anthropology and archeology. The Graduate School concurs that the program is on a solid trajectory and supports the college’s assessment that the next step is building a stronger student base.

Communication and Sociology are good doctoral programs and have feasible plans to move ahead. The Graduate School notes that Communication is a growing program, having undergone significant refocusing of effort. That effort has been focused on the faculty; the program is in the midst of developing the quality of its students. The Graduate School notes the indicators of quality in Sociology in terms of its faculty but finds that the quality of its graduate students is not commensurate. The Graduate School concurs with the college’s assessment that time to degree needs to be improved and the graduate program reduced in size “to better synchronize its faculty and resource capacity.” The Graduate School also notes the existence of the Rural Sociology doctoral program in the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Science and suggests that further consideration should be taken to determine if the separation of the two programs continues to be academically sound or if there are opportunities to take better advantage of the strengths of both programs.

Speech and Hearing Science is a very small doctoral program with the bulk of its effort focused on the professional master’s program and Doctor of Audiology professional doctorate program. The program has lost several senior faculty members. The Graduate School notes that the Ph.D. program does not appear to be a priority for the program and recommends further consideration of whether the program should be refocused on professional training at the graduate level.
Main Findings

- The Graduate School acknowledges the College of Social Work's attention in recent years to its graduate program, specifically the graduate curriculum and on-going efforts to improve the faculty and research productivity.

- Given current resources, the Graduate School asks if the bachelor's, MSW, and doctoral programs are appropriately sized and prioritized.

- The Graduate School notes the three areas of research foci identified in the college report and recommends that the college also explore interdisciplinary ties with other doctoral programs (such as education and health) that are working in those areas.

- The Graduate School notes that recruiting efforts and plans for future recruitment activities seem to be focused on Ohio. The Graduate School recommends an approach to recruitment focused first on quality and one that will draw upon students nationally.

Taxonomy

High Quality:
Strong:
Good: Social Work
New and/or Developing Doctoral Programs:
Programs that Must Reassess and/or Restructure:
Candidates for Disinvestment or Elimination:

Narrative

The College of Social Work has one doctoral program. It is one of the oldest in the United States, and it is the only social work doctoral program in a public university in Ohio. The college report notes that the college and its doctoral program are “in the midst of conducting a comprehensive review of the objectives of the program and its curriculum, the supports available to students, and outcomes of the program.” In light of these comprehensive plans for improving its research and doctoral programs, the Graduate School categorizes the doctoral program in Social Work as good.

The Graduate School recognizes that the College of Social Work is working on improving the quality of its doctoral students and as part of a measure of that quality will require the GRE for all applicants starting with autumn quarter 2008. The college report notes, however, that existing GRE scores are “not representative of the capacity of the entering students, since in many cases it is the weaker applicants who either submit or [are] asked to submit GREs.” Completion and attrition rates need to be verified; the college notes discrepancies between the central data and college records.

The college is attending to the faculty to help strengthen the doctoral program. Merit raises and starting salaries have been increased, and the college has set expectations for all new faculty “to compete for funding at the highest levels available in their respective fields.” The overall research infrastructure of the college has been improved. A position of associate dean for research has been established, and the college has set a goal for at least 75 percent of the faculty to be involved in funded scholarly activities within four years. The college expects to be able to fund more graduate students with an increase in faculty success in securing extramural support.
The Graduate School notes the diversity among graduate students that exists in the doctoral program in Social Work and the college’s efforts to continue to reach out to underrepresented minorities. The college has also consulted with Cyndi Freeman, the Graduate School’s director of graduate student recruitment and diversity initiatives.

The Graduate School notes that the research strengths of the faculty are described as in aging, adult and child behavioral health, and child and family welfare. The college report states that these are the three areas in which the college “has decided to concentrate and enhance its capacity.” The Graduate School also finds that given these focus areas the doctoral program in Social Work would seem to be well-poised to develop links with other doctoral programs on campus (perhaps in education and health) but there seems to be no evidence yet of such interdisciplinary ties.

The Graduate School commends the college’s plans to increase the rigor of the graduate curriculum and recommends attention be given to the development of and in-house instruction in research methodology. The Graduate School also asks for further assessment of the relationship between the bachelor’s degree program, the MSW program, and the doctoral program. How are the three programs prioritized within the college? Are the three programs appropriately sized given the number of faculty, research and service expectations, and attention to quality? The Graduate School also notes that doctoral program recruiting efforts appear to be focused on Ohio and recommends a national approach focused on quality.
Main Findings

- The Graduate School finds that the college’s plan to combine its three doctoral programs into one called “Comparative Medicine” is a logical and strategic move and should be pursued. This plan builds upon the strengths of the Veterinary Biosciences doctoral program, which the Graduate School categorizes as high quality.

- The Graduate School notes the attention that has already been given to recruitment of high quality and diverse students and the creation of a quality graduate student experience.

- The Graduate School notes the existence of research foci that build upon interdisciplinary collaborations across the university, particularly in the health sciences, and further notes high potential for connections with key interdisciplinary programs in the life sciences.

Taxonomy

High Quality: Veterinary Biosciences

Strong:

Good:

New and/or Developing Doctoral Programs:

Programs that Must Reassess and/or Restructure: Veterinary Clinical Sciences, Veterinary Preventive Medicine (See footnote below.)

Candidates for Disinvestment or Elimination:

Narrative

The College of Veterinary Medicine presently has three graduate programs: Veterinary Biosciences, Veterinary Clinical Sciences, and Veterinary Preventive Medicine. In its report, the college proposes a reorganization of these programs into a single doctoral program in Comparative Medicine. The college document positions this move as a strategic response to a growing awareness worldwide of the “close interconnections between human and animal health.” The Graduate School supports the forward-thinking nature of this proposal. The Graduate School recognizes that this plan builds upon the strengths of the existing Veterinary Biosciences doctoral program, which the Graduate School categorizes as high quality. The Graduate School notes that the college focused on the Veterinary Biosciences doctoral program in its report and expects the college to flesh out the proposed reorganization in the college’s response to the Graduate School assessment and in its strategic plan.

The department of Veterinary Biosciences recently underwent its external review through the Office of Academic Affairs. The external reviewers found the department to be “among the very best programs of its type at both the national and international levels.” Its Veterinary Biosciences doctoral program is ranked 5th of 28. The Graduate School finds that the College of Veterinary Medicine has created a high quality doctoral program. It has a strong, well-focused, and well-planned program with high potential for connection with Ohio State’s other health sciences and key interdisciplinary programs in the life sciences.

---

1 The College of Veterinary Medicine is proposing that its three doctoral programs be reorganized into one to be called “Comparative Medicine.” The college proposal builds upon the high quality of the Veterinary Biosciences doctoral program.
Indicators are that the Veterinary Biosciences doctoral program’s faculty and graduate students are very strong. Of its 29 faculty, seven are AAAS fellows and one is a National Academy Institute of Medicine member. Extramural funding per faculty member is high, and the publication rate per faculty is also high. The pool of doctoral students is strong, with virtually 100 percent enrollment of admitted students, 100 percent completion over the past three years for which data are available, and an average of five years to degree. The low attrition rate is remarkable and is likely due to the high quality of students and attention to creating an outstanding environment for doctoral student training and development. The program has attended to diversity in the development of its student cohorts. Approximately four or five underrepresented minority students have joined the program per year since 2004. The college also hired a recruitment director to help lead those efforts. The Graduate School recommends that the College of Veterinary Medicine’s director consult with Cyndi Freeman, the Graduate School’s director of graduate student recruitment and diversity initiatives, to coordinate efforts.

The Graduate School commends the College of Veterinary Medicine’s attention to identifying new and emerging opportunities for the college’s doctoral programs and to identifying ways in which Ohio State can gain a competitive edge over other institutions. The college is the only veterinary college in Ohio. With the exception of the University of Minnesota (which does not have optometry), Ohio State is unique in having colleges of medicine, veterinary medicine, pharmacy, public health, dentistry, and optometry on the same campus. College of Veterinary Medicine faculty and graduate students are already involved in collaborations with the health sciences, physical sciences, and agriculture. In addition, the college expects the proposed reorganization into a single doctoral program in Comparative Medicine responds to the national need for more veterinarian scientists to fill faculty positions, positions in the pharmaceutical industry, and government.
Vision Science
College of Optometry
Doctoral Program Assessment and Plan
Graduate School Response

Main Findings
- The Graduate School acknowledges that Vision Science is a nationally recognized program with a strong record of high quality graduates.
- Diversity has been focused on the matriculation of international students. The Graduate School encourages Vision Science to detail its plans for the recruitment and retention of underrepresented domestic minorities.
- Vision Science is a niche doctoral program that is a model for a small unit at a large university.

Taxonomy
High Quality:
Strong: Vision Science
Good:

New and/or Developing Doctoral Programs:
Programs that Must Reassess and/or Restructure:
Candidates for Disinvestment or Elimination:

Narrative
The Graduate School categorizes the doctoral program in Vision Science as strong. This small niche doctoral program in the College of Optometry is one of six such programs in the country that produces O.D./Ph.D.s. Since its inception in 1942 (as Physiological Optics), the program has granted 49 Ph.D.s, which the college report notes is “more than any other program associated with an optometric institution.” There are currently 16 students enrolled in the doctoral program which graduates, on average, one student per academic year. The college also enrolls 34 students in a master’s program.

The College of Optometry points to the success of its graduates as a measure of quality, noting that 13 graduates have served as deans or presidents of optometry schools or colleges, five of them currently in office. Several graduates have received high honors from the American Academy of Optometry and similar organizations.

Contrary to customary academic practice, several graduates of the Vision Science doctoral program currently serve as faculty members in the college. The Graduate School recognizes that this practice is discipline specific and has allowed the College of Optometry to strengthen an already high quality doctoral program. The recent completion of the college’s Wildermuth Optometric Research Center is expected to continue to add to the faculty’s research productivity while attracting strong students to the doctoral program.

Student diversity has been measured by the matriculation of international students, which the college reports has occurred only over the past 12 years and has contributed to the increased international reputation of the college. Ten of the current students are female and there is no representation of domestic ethnic minorities. The college notes that there have been to date only two African American optometrists who have obtained Ph.D.s from American institutions, one of whom graduated from Ohio State. The college does not provide details about plans to recruit and retain underrepresented minorities but notes that its own master’s program may be the best source for students. New approaches to recruitment of high quality students include the recent decision to eliminate the requirement of a master’s degree for admission to the doctoral program in Vision Science and the consideration of actively recruiting non-optometrists to the program.
The College of Optometry’s report does not provide a budget plan for strengthening the doctoral program or for the recruitment of a diverse student body. Rather, it notes that an ongoing strategic planning process “will inform budgetary goals that will strengthen the doctoral program.” Increased emphasis on GRAs funded by federal and industry dollars, anticipated renewal of a training grant, and the possible recruitment of students directly from their undergraduate programs are mentioned as possible strategies. The Graduate School recognizes the importance of the strategic planning process. We encourage the College of Optometry to commit to specific approaches and tactics for strengthening the doctoral program and for attracting a more diverse student body that can then be thoughtfully implemented and appropriately evaluated.

The Graduate School believes that the College of Optometry is a model for a small unit that can make large contributions to the university as a whole.
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Executive Summary

Promoting excellence in graduate education, especially at the doctoral level, is critical in realizing the goal of the University’s Academic Plan to make The Ohio State University a leading public university. With this in mind, the Committee to Review the Graduate School was created by the Provost to review the Graduate School, but in actuality it had a broader mandate – to review how the University structures graduate education and performs the functions necessary to support it in achieving excellence and to recommend changes for improvement where warranted. The Committee met from March 2005 through January 2006 to perform its task and issue its report. The resulting report is unanimously supported by Committee members.

The report begins with the recognition that there are some serious problems facing graduate education at Ohio State, which limit our ability to concentrate resources and energies as effectively as is necessary to realize our high aspirations for graduate education. The primary problems are financial, involving the failure to fund doctoral education appropriately, especially under the new budget system, and to fund doctoral fellowships at a level that enables us to compete with the nation’s top universities. Additional problems are the uneven quality of graduate programs and the failure to regulate quality in an effective manner. The report contains numerous recommendations to address these and other problems.

Part I of the report, circulated to the University community in November 2005, recommends that the current structure for graduate education be maintained: a Graduate School that is aligned with the academic units of the University in reporting directly to the Provost. This model has served the University well, and it is the preferred model among all but a handful of our peer universities. Part II of the report, which is promulgated for the first time below, recommends that many of the core functions of the present Graduate School also be continued -- including its oversight of quality in graduate programs, its investment of University fellowship funds to support graduate students, and its oversight of admissions and recruitment of graduate students – but with some important operational changes. We envision an even stronger role for the Dean of the Graduate School in fulfilling these responsibilities. Among the most important of the recommendations for changes are:

Related to the structure of the Graduate School:
- Appoint the Dean of the Graduate School to the President’s Cabinet.
- Create a new Graduate Council to work directly with the Graduate School and its Dean.

Related to Graduate School funding competitions:
- Increase funding for first-year and dissertation Graduate School fellowships.
- Eliminate the Graduate School’s Post-Doctoral Fellowship Program.
- Give top priority for Graduate School fellowships, fee authorizations, and research grants to PhD students and other students like them who are pursuing degrees requiring original scholarly or creative work that is necessary for faculty or research careers.
  - PhD/MFA applicants would be eligible for University Fellowships.
  - Some terminal masters students would be eligible for Enrichment Fellowships.
- Require a minimum level of program quality for its students to be eligible to compete for Graduate School fellowships.
• Grant eligibility for Graduate School fellowships to incumbent Ohio State students moving from masters to PhD programs if they had not been considered previously for fellowships.
• Decentralize the University Fellowship decisions to colleges, where the number of fellowships and the allocation rules make it feasible; other Graduate School fellowships would continue to be decided centrally.
• Reallocate to University or Presidential fellowships any fee authorization or other funds freed up by following the Committee’s recommended rules for eligibility.
• Discount tuition for graduate students while they are at the dissertation stage, if it is not financially disadvantageous to the University.

Related to Graduate School oversight for graduate education:
• Establish Graduate School criteria for Graduate Faculty status, but local program and college decide who qualifies.
• Eliminate Graduate School Representatives from examination committees, but encourage committees to include faculty from outside the programs as regular committee members.
• Require annual dissertation progress reports to the chairs of graduate studies committees and probation, then termination, for dissertation students earning consecutive U grades.
• Conduct regular program reviews for all graduate programs under the aegis of the Graduate School.
• Require all programs and the Graduate School to maintain up-to-date records on a variety of metrics related to quality and the funding of graduate education.

Related to the Graduate School role in services, recruitment, admissions, and placement
• Move the reporting line of the Graduate Admissions Office to the Graduate School.
• Require separate admission decisions for masters and PhD degree programs.
• Give the Graduate School responsibility for coordinating, maintaining, and enhancing the effectiveness of University-wide programs for recruiting graduate students, especially minority, domestic, and Ohio students.
• Assign the responsibility for nominating graduate student Fulbright Fellows to the Graduate School.
• Provide additional funding to the Graduate School so that it can establish and maintain a career development office for graduate students.
Introduction

Great research universities have great graduate programs. As The Ohio State University moves up in standing among research universities, and aspires to move even higher as articulated in its Academic Plan, attention must focus on improving the quality of its graduate programs, especially doctoral programs, which figure so prominently in university reputations. The efforts of individual departments and colleges, through their recruitment and development of distinguished faculty and their construction of cutting-edge high-quality programs are, of course, essential to this improvement. These efforts can be impeded or supported by the structuring and financing of graduate education. Recent movement to a new budgeting system, without explicit attention to how it might affect graduate education, and the increasing competition for graduate students as the University aspires to become a top public university make it even more imperative to examine the University’s role in graduate education at this time. The imminent search to replace the long-standing Dean of the Graduate School provides an opportunity to take a comprehensive look at the Graduate School and its role in graduate education at Ohio State.

Attention to graduate education at Ohio State is long overdue. During the last decade, the University has devoted considerable effort to improvement at the undergraduate and faculty levels. The investment of more resources in the recruitment and funding of top undergraduate students has yielded increases in the quality of the student body and in consequent retention and graduation rates. The recently-released report of the Committee for the University-wide Review of Undergraduate Education (the so-called “McHale Committee,” named after its chair) is now stimulating campus-wide discussion about how to best align our curricular requirements with these changes in the student body. Through its Selective Investment and Academic Enrichment programs and its initiatives to improve faculty compensation relative to peer universities, the University has supported and enhanced the quality of its faculty. The recently-launched Provost’s initiative for Targeted Investments in Excellence promises to advance the University even more towards attaining the faculty excellence goals espoused in the Academic Plan.

Provost Snyder has appointed two committees to examine graduate education at Ohio State. The Committee on Graduate Education (the so-called “Freeman Committee,” named after its chair) was established in July 2004 to:

1. assess the alignment of doctoral education with the academic plan; recommend an appropriate funding model to support outstanding doctoral programs; suggest how resources might be redistributed or reinvested to support outstanding doctoral programs; and devise metrics that might be used for a cyclical review of the quality of doctoral programs.1

Part I of the Freeman Committee report, focused on the financing of graduate education, was released in September 2005. The Committee to Review the Graduate School (the so-called “Beck Committee,” named after its chair) was established in March 2005 “to consider the current structure and functions of the Graduate School, the optimal structure and functions, and recommendations for change that will bridge any gap.” In particular, the Beck Committee was asked to:

1 The quote is from the Provost’s 9/13/05 memo to the University community releasing Part 1 of the Freeman Committee Report.
examine the current organizational structure; the various models of graduate schools among our benchmarks; the appropriate mission of a graduate school in a research institution; the functions of the Graduate School and its committees; the desired interaction between the Graduate School and colleges and departments and between the Graduate School and the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of Research; and some specific issues, such as the process by which Graduate School fellowships are allocated and the role of Graduate School representatives on graduate examinations and PhD defenses.  

The earlier findings of the Freeman Committee, as described in its Part I report, provided an important context for the considerations of our Committee. In particular, that committee found that Ohio State “lags behind its peers in production of PhD graduates, and there has been a decline in PhD production over the last ten years, during the same time enrollment in masters programs has surged.”

One important contributor to a decline in PhDs awarded by OSU, according to the Freeman Committee, is how the University funds PhD education. Under the new University budgeting model, state subsidies for graduate education are distributed to graduate programs as they are earned – at the masters subsidy levels for graduate students through their first 50 earned credits and at the doctoral subsidy levels for students who had already earned 50 credits. Since the Board of Regents has set a fixed cap on doctoral subsidy dollars, however, the greater the number of 50+-credit students, the lower the subsidy for any single student. Because masters students were often earning more than 50 credits and their numbers were growing, this meant that doctoral students were being increasingly under-funded (relative even to the subsidy levels set in the Regents’ formula) through the new budgeting system. By contrast, the new budgeting system has been a boon to masters programs and encourages their growth. Because Regents’ funding for masters programs was not capped, many departments benefited financially – first, from enrollment growth at the masters level and, second, from the extra subsidy their masters programs earned from students earning more than 50 credits for graduation. Untrammeled growth in masters enrollments under the OSU budget model, in short, has undermined doctoral programs at Ohio State.

The funding problem for doctoral education is exacerbated by two additional unintended consequences of changes in the budget model. First, marginal increases in subsidy and fee income earned from PhD students are charged central taxes and central services fees and, for the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences, an additional Arts and Sciences Federation tax. Where departments and colleges are paying the students’ fees, as is the case for many PhD students, this means that they pay central taxes and service fees, and the Federation tax, on their own fee expenditures. Second, with the change to the new budgeting system, the Office of Research discontinued its long-standing policy of providing fee authorizations to students funded on external research grants. Even though the net increases in indirect cost recoveries are returned to the colleges without any central tax, these monies often become mingled with other revenues coming into the colleges and are not applied to fee authorizations for graduate students. Because of these two factors, less money may be available for funding PhD students than under the previous budgeting system.

2 These passages are quoted from the Provost’s charge to the Beck Committee. For the full charge, see Appendix A below or http://oaa.osu.edu/pdf/gradschool.pdf.
3 See page 2, Executive Summary, of the Freeman Committee’s Part I report.
The Freeman Committee also found substantial variation in the quality of doctoral programs, in part because there was little central control over the quality of students admitted to them and because of virtually free movement of students from masters into doctoral programs. The Freeman Committee proposed to develop key metrics to use in regularly evaluating the quality of graduate programs and to have periodic comprehensive reviews to gauge doctoral program quality. The committee also called for an alignment of graduate student funding with program quality in the investment of University dollars in graduate education. This situation too affected funding for top-quality graduate students and their programs under the new budgeting model, as Regents’ doctoral subsidies were allocated to programs based on numbers of students rather than program quality, further hindering the development of first-class doctoral programs. These problems of inadequate financial support for doctoral education and inadequate control over its quality, the Freeman Committee concluded, must be addressed if Ohio State is to move into the top ranks of doctoral programs in the country.

To identify the key issues involved in reviewing the Graduate School and to gather information on how these issues might be addressed and resolved, representatives of the Beck Committee met with a variety of campus groups; and the Committee heard from visitors to its meetings and analyzed data supplied by the Graduate School staff. Through two Committee members who served simultaneously on the Freeman and Beck Committees and regular reports to the Beck Committee of Freeman Committee findings and proposals, the deliberations of the Committee were informed by the earlier findings and proposals from the Freeman Committee. To gather information on how peer universities structured graduate education and performed key functions in support of it, the Committee also surveyed graduate school deans and their equivalents at peer universities. Appendix C contains the questions utilized in this survey, and Appendix D displays the pre-coded answers to them.

Two previous reports related to graduate education at OSU also guided the Graduate School Review Committee. We carefully considered the recommendations from an earlier 1995 Provost-appointed Graduate School Review Committee (the so-called “Ripley Committee”). Our recommendations echo many of theirs – reaffirming some that were adopted and renewing many that never were implemented. In 2001, the Central Investment Review Committee on Graduate School Funding Competitions (the so-called “Cerny Committee”) addressed issues of Graduate School funding. Its key recommendations were not implemented, but we considered them seriously in our review. In the following pages, we note when either of these committees had addressed the issue that we were addressing and what was recommended.

Our response to the Provost’s charge comes in two parts, circulated at two different times. Part I, on “the Structure of the Graduate School,” was submitted to the Provost on November 11, 2005, and circulated to the University community soon thereafter. Because the structural question had to be settled before the search for a new leader of the Graduate School

---

4 The campus groups with which committee members met are listed in Appendix B. The committee also solicited comments from the University community more broadly through an email “phorum” on the Office of Academic Affairs website, and emails were received by the Committee’s chair.
5 Visitors to Committee meetings are listed in Appendix B.
6 The universities surveyed included the 14 CIC schools plus Arizona, Texas, UCLA, and Washington.
could commence, the Committee felt that it was imperative to communicate its recommendation to maintain a freestanding Graduate School reporting to the Provost as soon as it had reached that decision. The recommendations and their supporting rationales appear virtually verbatim, except for the introduction, as Part I of the current report below. Part II below focuses on the functions of the Graduate School. It contains numerous recommendations about what the responsibilities of the Graduate School should be and how they should be fulfilled, as well as (in the passage that follows) the justifications for the recommendations.7

**Part I**

**The Structure of the Graduate School**8

Several important issues are involved in considering the structure of the Graduate School at The Ohio State University: Where should the Graduate School be located in the University’s structure? To whom should the head of the Graduate School report? What should be the relationship between the Graduate School and the Office of Research? To address these issues, the Committee began by reviewing the structural arrangements for the oversight of graduate studies at peer universities and by interviewing several administrators experienced with different structural arrangements. Basically, there are two different models for administering graduate studies. The first model is OSU’s current arrangement, which separates the administrative leaders for graduate study from those for research -- usually with a graduate school dean who reports to the institution’s chief academic officer (or provost) and a top administrative official for research who reports directly to the university’s chief executive (the president or chancellor). The alternative model combines these two positions, with the top administrator for research and graduate studies sometimes reporting directly to the university’s chief executive and sometimes reporting to the chief academic officer.9

Among the 18 peer institutions we surveyed on this question, only four (Arizona, Indiana-Purdue at Indianapolis, Penn State, Wisconsin-Madison10) combined the two positions. Each institution appeared to be satisfied with its present structural arrangement. While several reported that they had experienced both arrangements in their recent history and did not view one to be inherently superior to the other in principle, the most recent changes have been in the direction of the separated model. The Ohio State University too has experienced both models, but the campus now has become accustomed to a free-standing graduate school whose dean reports to the provost. We believe that the separated model has served us well. Based on these considerations, two specific recommendations follow.

**Recommendation I.1: Continue present structural arrangement for the Graduate School.**
We see no compelling reason to change from the present structural arrangement whereby the

---

7 The Committee is especially grateful to Susan Reeser and Bobbi Davis-Jones of the Graduate School and Janet Myers of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences for their assistance.
8 Part I was previously circulated to the University community in November, 2005.
9 These models are described in the Council of Graduate Schools’ *Organization and Administration of Graduate Education*, published in 1990.
10 Wisconsin-Madison combines these two positions in the graduate school, placing their office of research under the supervision of the graduate school dean.
Dean of the Graduate School oversees graduate studies and reports to the Senior Vice President and Provost.

This recommendation leaves the Dean of the Graduate School and the Senior Vice President for Research as separate positions. Over the past two decades, these two offices have developed heavy responsibilities for very different, yet very important, aspects of university affairs. Each is a full-time administrative job, with its own responsibilities, clienteles, and functions. The vesting of both research and graduate studies oversight in one official would overload that individual and likely relegate to second place either research or graduate studies. Moreover, the strong leader and advocate for high quality graduate programs that we (and the Freeman Committee) envision for Ohio State requires a strong Dean of the Graduate School with a direct reporting line to the Provost – just as our thriving research enterprise requires the full attention of the Senior Vice President for Research. This recommendation is in line with the recommendation of the Ripley Committee.

**Recommendation I.2: Foster close cooperation between Dean of the Graduate School and Senior Vice President for Research.** One of the key criteria in the selection of the new Dean of the Graduate School should be the expectation of close cooperation between the Dean and the Senior Vice President for Research.

Graduate studies and research are intertwined in many ways at research universities. While we recommend that administrative responsibilities for them remain separate, we also recognize that close cooperation between the Dean of the Graduate School and the Senior Vice President for Research is important for The Ohio State University to realize its Academic Plan goals in both graduate studies and research.

**Part II**

**The Functions of the Graduate School**

**A. The Governance Structure for Graduate Education**

In order for the Graduate School to play the role we envision, it needs strong leadership from its Dean and advisory committees. It also needs to communicate effectively with faculty and student groups beyond the immediate purview of the Graduate School, including the Council of Graduate Students, the University Senate, the Office of Research’s advisory committee, and college and departmental leaders and graduate committees. We believe that the current governance structure of the Graduate School leads to unnecessary duplication of the work of the various committees and an unnecessary drain on faculty and student time. We also believe that the current structure does not adequately encourage faculty engagement and innovation in putting forward new initiatives. The following recommendations are designed to achieve three goals: (1) a stronger and more effective governance structure for the Graduate School; (2) better communication among various constituencies involved with graduate education across campus; and (3) more efficient and effective use of faculty and student time.
We realize that these recommendations require changes beyond the purview of the Graduate School itself -- and are well beyond the mandate of the Graduate School Review Committee. We believe that they are necessary, nonetheless, to provide the appropriate forum for Graduate School policy-making and to marshal support for high-quality graduate education across the University. Based on these considerations, we offer the following recommendations:

**Recommendation II.A.1: Appoint Dean to President’s Cabinet.** The Dean of the Graduate School should be a member of the President’s Cabinet.

A guiding principle behind all of our recommendations is that the Graduate School should be a stronger unit in and of itself while also having better communication with other units across campus. To this end, we believe that the Dean should be a member of the President’s Cabinet, where he or she can be a powerful advocate for graduate education. In making this recommendation, we echo the Ripley Committee Report, which noted that “it is our understanding that the individual would also be a member of the President’s Executive Committee, an appointment we strongly support” (p. 1).

**Recommendation II.A.2: Create Graduate Council to work with Graduate School Dean.** The principal legislative and advisory body of the Graduate School should be a Graduate Council that reports to the Dean of the Graduate School and has responsibility for considering, enacting, and implementing policies and rules related to graduate study.

Currently, the Council on Research and Graduate Studies (CRGS) combines policy-making for the Graduate School with policy-making for the Office of Research, perhaps as a carry-over from a time when these two units were overseen by a single administrative head. We believe that an advisory committee that works directly with the Graduate School Dean is more appropriate for realizing the goals of this report. The new Graduate Council should serve the following functions: (1) to initiate Graduate School policies and standards and to act upon any questions about them; (2) to establish rules and policies governing graduate associates and graduate fellowships, including overseeing eligibility and allocation procedures for Graduate School fellowships; and (3) to provide oversight for interdisciplinary and one-of-a-kind programs. These functions were previously the province of the Council on Research and Graduate Council’s Policy and Standards and Graduate Associate and Fellowship committees. Given the changes we are recommending in the selection process for university fellows (see section II.B. below), we believe that the Graduate Council will play an increasingly important role regarding policies for graduate fellowships. In making this recommendation, we endorse in principle the proposal of the Ripley Committee for “replacing the present Research and Graduate Council by a university-level Graduate Studies Council broadly representative of the colleges. This new council…would engage principally in broad oversight designed to promote excellence and would advise the vice provost/graduate dean” (p. 8).

**Recommendation II.A.2.a: Size of the Graduate Council.** The size of the Graduate Council should be significantly reduced from the current 42 members of CRGS to a number that ensures adequate representation of various constituencies yet operates efficiently in fulfilling its responsibilities – in our view, approximately 12-15 members. Two to three of these members should be graduate students. The Graduate Dean and Associate and Assistant Dean(s) will serve as ex-officio members of the Council.
The current size of the structure makes it difficult to recruit and retain new members, to schedule meetings, and, most importantly, to be flexible and efficient in deciding on policy. While seeming to invite broad participation, the large size in fact often leads to primary decisions being made by staff and by the few committee members who are able to attend regularly and stay abreast of current issues and information. A smaller size will encourage greater engagement from its members.

**Recommendation II.A.2.b: Length of term of Graduate Council members.** Faculty members of the Graduate Council should serve a three-year term; student members should serve a one-year term.

The current four-year term for faculty requires an unusually long commitment. Reducing the term by a year will make it easier to recruit members to serve on the committee and will provide turnover that will promote new ideas and greater participation. At the same time, a three-year term gives members enough time to build experience and complete specific initiatives. Approximately a third of the faculty members of the council should rotate off the Council each year. Graduate students currently serve one-year terms, with the possibility of re-election to another term. We see no reason to change this policy, given the time constraints faced by graduate students and the transitory nature of the graduate student population.

**Recommendation II.A.2.c: Selection of Graduate Council members.** Faculty members of the Graduate Council should be chosen by a vote of the graduate faculty in the arts and sciences, professional, and health sciences cluster constituencies and in rough proportion to the number of graduate students overseen by the Graduate School within each cluster. Graduate student representation should be chosen by the Council of Graduate Students. We also suggest that there be three slots on the Graduate Council for at-large faculty members appointed by the Dean.

The graduate faculty should elect most of the faculty members of the Council. Such a system preserves the representation inherent in the CRGS and encourages greater engagement of the faculty than an appointment process. At the same time, we believe that allowing the Dean to appoint several members who complement the background of the elected members will help to create a strong Graduate School. Since the Council of Graduate Students has responsibilities for appointing graduate students to university committees, it should have responsibility for determining the graduate student members.

**Recommendation II.A.3: Require Graduate School concurrence, but no Graduate School level review of graduate curriculum.** While Graduate School concurrence will be required for all graduate course and curricular changes, the Graduate School should no longer be a separate review level for graduate curriculum proposals.

The curriculum approval process at Ohio State is multi-layered, and it often proves to be inefficient and to discourage innovation. Responsibility for curriculum is vested in the department/program faculty, college curriculum committees, and the Council on Academic Affairs — and, for the graduate curriculum, the Graduate School. With graduate faculty already serving at each of these levels, we see no compelling justification for retaining the Graduate School as an extra layer of committee review. At present, it only seems to duplicate subsequent CAA reviews. Instead, we encourage CAA to develop a separate sub-committee with graduate faculty and graduate student representation to handle graduate curriculum matters. A sufficient Graduate School presence in this process can be achieved by requiring its concurrence for all graduate curriculum changes.
Recommendation II.A.4: Review Council on Research and Graduate Studies (CRGS). If the preceding recommendations II.A.2 and II.A.3 are implemented, the functions of CRGS will be greatly diminished, and it should be reviewed to determine its continuing role.

In its current form, the CRGS is divided into four standing committees to handle graduate education and research issues: Curriculum, Graduate Associate and Fellowship, Policy and Standards, and Research. Three of these standing committees overlap with committees of the University Senate: the Council on Academic Affairs (CAA); the Research Committee (which is comprised of members from the CRGS and the Senate); and the Graduate Associate Compensation and Benefits Committee (GCBC). The GCBC focuses on specific benefits and compensation issues for graduate associates. This committee serves a more limited function than the Graduate Associate and Fellowship Committee, which sets academic policies for GAs and fellows as well as policies regarding the University Fellowship competition. Under our recommendations, the Graduate School’s advisory committee, the Graduate Council, will deal with Graduate School policy, standards, graduate associates, and fellowships. Curricular functions will be ceded to CAA. If these changes are implemented, the role of the Research and Graduate Council must be reviewed. A Research and Graduate Council with many fewer functions could remain as the locus for coordination between the Graduate School and the Office of Research, or as an advisory committee on research.

Recommendation II.A.5: Dean appoints ad hoc selection committees. The Dean should appoint separate faculty committees, drawn from the different college clusters in proportion to the number of graduate students overseen by the Graduate School in each cluster, to select Presidential and Enrichment Fellows as well as recipients of Alumni Grants for Graduate Research and Scholarship. Members should be appointed to staggered three-year terms. The Dean also can appoint ad hoc committees in response to any unexpected situations or opportunities.

This is the current practice, and the Committee endorses it. Centralized competitions need centralized faculty selection committees that are representative of the different colleges involved in the Graduate School. We believe that keeping these committees separate from the Graduate Council leads to wider involvement of the graduate faculty, as well as to more efficient and focused selection processes. Providing for a three-year staggered term maintains experience on the committee, yet allows for regular rotation of membership.

Recommendation II.A.6: Continue to allow some graduate programs not to be overseen by the Graduate School. Professional masters and doctoral programs accredited by external groups do not need to be overseen by the Graduate School. Joint professional programs awarding a PhD should be overseen by the Graduate School, in cooperation with their home professional school.

The Graduate School does not currently oversee all graduate programs at the University, especially professional masters and doctoral programs governed by accreditation requirements, and this should continue. While students from these programs should be eligible to receive the graduation services they need from the Graduate School, only students in programs overseen by the Graduate School should be eligible for Graduate School financial support.
B. The Graduate School Role in the Funding of Graduate Education

At present, the Graduate School plays a critical role in graduate and post-graduate education through five programs for funding graduate students and one program for post-doctoral fellows.\footnote{It is important to note that the Graduate School provides only a small part of the funding for graduate students. Most of the funding is provided by grants, departments, and colleges through GRA and GTA appointments.} It provides \textbf{University Fellowships} and \textbf{Enrichment Fellowships} that cover stipends and fee authorizations to attract new graduate students. It provides \textit{ad hoc fee authorizations} to match stipends awarded by departments/colleges. The Graduate School also awards \textbf{Alumni Grants for Graduate Research and Scholarship (AGGRS)} to Ohio State dissertation or thesis students and \textbf{Presidential Fellowships} to dissertation and MFA students. The Graduate School also has budgeted funds for a limited number of \textit{post-doctoral fellowships}, even though it has not spent this money in recent years in anticipation of possible budget cuts. Allocation decisions for five of these six programs have been made by faculty committees in centralized competitions run by the Graduate School. Allocations of \textit{ad hoc} fee authorizations are made by the Dean of the Graduate School.

In consideration of the importance of these programs for the quality of graduate education and for graduate students, the Graduate School Review Committee reviewed each one of them and developed a series of complementary recommendations regarding them. Our overall conclusion from this review is that, relative to our peer public and private university competitors and to how much funding the Graduate School has available for direct student support, Ohio State dedicates insufficient fellowship funding to students pursuing the highest graduate degrees to be able to realize the goals of the Academic Plan and to play a major leadership role in producing the top scholars, researchers, and creative artists of the future.

We concur with the Freeman Committee that the national and international reputation of the University is significantly related to the quality of the students who earn its highest graduate degrees, primarily the PhD. These are the graduates who are producing the original research and creative works that advance the frontiers of knowledge and creativity. It is from among such graduates at Ohio State and elsewhere that the ranks of university/college faculty and industry and government research and development scientists are renewed. The University has a powerful interest in preparing the next generation of faculty and research leaders. Recruiting the best graduate students for the highest degrees at Ohio State and then supporting them adequately with fellowships to complete their degrees expeditiously should be the highest priority for the investment of centralized University funds in graduate education.

Increased funding so that the Graduate School can support this critically important group of students is necessary. We urge the University to make this additional investment in excellence for graduate education. We also strongly encourage the Graduate School to maximize its spending on fellowships for incoming and advanced students from the funds it currently controls. The case is obvious for using Graduate School fellowships to recruit students pursuing the PhD degree in a discipline or program that offers the PhD, including those first-year students who are entering at the masters level \textit{en route} to their PhD. There are cases in the creative arts where the
MFA fulfills the functions of the PhD in requiring original creative work and serving as the entry degree for faculty, and they should be targeted for this investment too.

Figure 1 shows the breakdown of the $13.4 million the Graduate School spent in FY05 (Autumn Quarter 2004 through Summer Quarter 2005) on its five pre-doctoral and one post-doctoral financial support programs. Presidential Fellowship funds are dedicated to supporting students seeking the highest degrees already, but a considerable number of entry-level fellowships and ad hoc fee authorizations also are awarded to candidates for terminal and/or tagged masters degrees who are not pursuing a higher-level degree at Ohio State. We urge that Graduate School fellowship and grant funds be concentrated on students seeking the highest degrees in their fields -- that is, as will be explained below, for PhD and selected MFA students in programs that report directly to the Graduate School.

What follows is an integrated set of specific recommendations for concentrating Graduate School funding on PhD/MFA aspirants and for achieving other important goals in the funding of graduate students. Several key principles guide these recommendations: First, for realizing the goals of the Academic Plan, Graduate School funds are best invested in fellowships and fee authorizations designed to recruit the highest-quality new students, promote diversity, and reduce the time to degree of our best dissertation students. These students should come from high-quality programs that require original research or creative work leading towards faculty or research careers. Second, commitments to new students must be made as early as possible to increase the probability of recruiting them to OSU. Third, graduate faculty whose expertise is as close as possible to the candidates’ areas of specialization should adjudicate the competitions, and programs should have to supply only the necessary information in their nomination pack-
ages. By following these principles, on its own the Graduate School could reallocate considera-

bly more money to support PhD/MFA students. In addition, the Graduate School fellowship

competitions could become more efficient in using faculty time and more effective in making

fellowship choices that advance program excellence.

**Recommendation II.B.1: Increase funding for University, Enrichment, and Presidential

Fellowships.** The Graduate School should retain its University, Enrichment, and Presidential

fellowship programs. More funds should be invested in them, especially in first-year fellow-

ships, through the allocation of additional fellowship funds from central administration and the

Graduate School’s own internal reallocations.¹²

Providing fellowship opportunities to recruit new students, to increase the diversity of the

graduate student population, and to facilitate earlier completion of doctoral dissertations are im-

portant University goals, as embraced in the Academic Plan. The current fellowship programs,

therefore, should be continued. Given OSU’s challenges in competing with the nation’s top uni-

versities in attracting the best graduate students, moreover, additional money needs to be

invested by the University to raise stipends for and increase the numbers of graduate fellowships,

especially multi-year packages for new students, and to keep fellowship stipends at a competitive

level. Through internal reallocations of Graduate School funds and additional University funds

dedicated to fellowships, OSU could recruit more top-quality new students and support more dis-

tertation-level students.

**Recommendation II.B.2: Restrict University and Presidential Fellowships to PhD and MFA

students.** Given the shortage of University funds for Graduate School fellowships, they need to

be dedicated, as the top priority, to doctoral students and other students like them who are pursu-

ing degrees requiring original scholarly or creative work that is necessary for faculty or top-level

research careers. These are the PhD or MFA degrees in programs that are overseen by the

Graduate School. Students applying to programs that offer a PhD or an MFA, including those

entering at the masters level *en route* to the PhD in that program, should be automatically eligi-

ble to be nominated for Graduate School fellowships, subject to whatever student quality criteria

the Graduate School stipulates. Ohio State students from masters programs who have been ad-

mitted for doctoral study at Ohio State also are eligible if they had not been eligible for Graduate

School fellowships previously.

Because of the importance of high-quality doctoral programs for the University’s national

reputation, the consequent centrality assigned to doctoral programs in the Freeman Committee

Report, the need to support original research and creative work leading to degrees necessary for

faculty and research positions, and the value for the continuous renewal of faculty ranks of sup-

porting programs giving degrees required for faculty careers, the Committee strongly

recommends restricting Graduate School fellowships to students pursuing the highest degree in

their field (i.e., the PhD and in some cases the MFA). Other doctoral programs and masters pro-

grams in which students are required to complete original research or original creative works to

earn a degree for entry into faculty and research positions can petition the Graduate School for

¹² Our recommendation of more University funding of graduate school fellowships echoes the 2001 recommenda-

tion of the Cerny Committee.
eligibility to submit nominees to the Graduate School fellowship competition. The Graduate Council (see section II.A.2. above) will review such petitions and advise the Dean of the Graduate School on whether to approve them. Because of a dire need to support incumbent graduate students beyond their first year and to encourage graduates from masters programs to pursue doctoral study after earning their initial degree at Ohio State, this recommendation also allows students not eligible for a previous round of Graduate School University or Enrichment Fellowships to become eligible if admitted to a PhD program.

**Recommendation II.B.3: Broaden eligibility for Enrichment Fellowships to some masters students.** To enhance diversity, it is sometimes necessary to attract students to graduate study by first involving them in masters programs. Therefore, while the top priority for Enrichment Fellowships should be applicants who are pursuing PhD or MFA programs, applicants to high-quality terminal masters programs should also be considered. Applicants for tagged masters programs, which prepare students for careers outside of academia and research, however, should not be eligible for Enrichment Fellowships.

Enrichment Fellowships, which are dedicated to enhancing the diversity of the graduate student population, have accounted for about a third of all Graduate School fellowships in recent years. Diversity enhancement is conceptualized in a variety of ways by the programs nominating candidates for these fellowships – from, e.g., increasing the representation of minorities or women to adding students who are the first college graduates in their families or who have overcome physical and economic disadvantages to meet the high standards required for graduate study. To date, the Enrichment Fellowship program has been most successful in attracting masters students to the University. The program has had little effect, however, on enhancing the diversity of PhD and MFA cohorts -- and, thereby, contributing to the diversity of those earning the highest degrees in their fields. The goals of diversity in the graduate student population are best served by concentrating Enrichment Fellowships on students pursuing the highest degrees in their fields and, secondarily, by supporting outstanding applicants for terminal masters degrees in the hope that they can be recruited for higher degrees after they are on campus. Even though there are shortcomings in student diversity at every level, the shortages at the PhD and MFA levels create the most serious problems for higher education, especially in the lack of diversity in candidates for faculty and top research or creative positions.

**Recommendation II.B.4: Base continuing program eligibility for Graduate School fellowships on program reviews.** The Graduate School, with the advice of its Graduate Council (see II.A.2 above), needs to review each graduate program at Ohio State initially and then periodically to determine whether the program continues to meet the degree-sought and quality criteria for eligibility stipulated by the Graduate School for fellowships and fee authorizations.

In addition to not meeting the criteria established in II.B.2 and II.B.3 above, graduate programs can be designated through the University’s review process as ineligible for Graduate School fellowships and/or fee authorizations if they fail to meet minimum standards for quality

---

13 Of the 117 Enrichment Fellows in the most recent cohorts (2001 and 2002) who can be tracked through completion of the first phase of their graduate study, for example, 80% left the University without pursuing the highest degree in their area: 56 of these students left with a tagged or terminal masters degree and 16 left without any degree at all.
as established by the University. This recommendation recognizes that program quality should be a criterion for student eligibility for fellowships.

**Recommendation II.B.5: Decentralize University Fellowship competition.** The University Fellowship competition should be decentralized to the college level.

There is considerable dissatisfaction with the current graduate fellowship competition. The most often cited complaints are: (a) awards are announced too late in many cases to attract top students; (b) preparing and reviewing nominations is highly labor-intensive; (c) because the Graduate School fellowship committee typically lacks the specialized expertise to make the best qualitative judgments of applicants, some of the most desirable applicants are passed over. The Committee carefully considered alternative ways to award University Fellowships to graduate student applicants. Rather than fine-tune the centralized competition through which University Fellows are chosen, the Committee recommends that the University adopt a decentralized approach with some regulations built in to ensure that fellowships are awarded to highly qualified students. While urging that offers be made earlier and greater weight be given to departmental rankings, the Ripley Committee recommended that Graduate School fellowship competitions remain centralized. Its recommendations for fine tuning of the centralized competition were adopted, but dissatisfaction with the centralized competition remains high. Reflecting that dissatisfaction, the Cerny Committee called for decentralization of the kind we are recommending. Our proposal realizes the advantages of decentralization while retaining the controls over quality and budget that centralization provides. The principal issues in implementing our recommendation are how to determine the initial allocation and then how to adjust that allocation based upon the quality of the programs and applicants in future years. A set of recommended procedures follows for the implementation of a decentralized University Fellowship competition.

**Recommendation II.B.5.a: Allocate fellowships to colleges by formula based on past success.** Initially, each college eligible for Graduate School fellowships will be allocated a share of the total number of University Fellowship positions to be awarded that year, with each position funded at the same base stipend and fee authorization level set by the Graduate School. We encourage colleges or programs, using their own funds, to supplement these awards to provide more attractive fellowship packages. The initial college allocation will be a function of its proportionate share of fellowships won and accepted by PhD/MFA students (adjusted to comply with the new Graduate School rules on eligibility recommended in II.B.2 above) and its PhD/MFA completion rates during the preceding three years. If qualitative assessments of graduate programs have been developed by the University in time for this initial allocation, they should be employed as well. The precise initial allocation formula to be used by relying upon these two or three factors will be developed by the Graduate School with the approval of its Graduate Council. The Graduate School will provide cash to fund the stipends and fee authorizations for each student who accepts a fellowship up to the number allocated to that college, but the annual rate for the fellowships will remain in the Graduate School.

---

14 In its 2001 report, the Cerny Committee cited “dissatisfaction and frustration with the first-year fellowship competition” (p. 1) in recommending decentralization, albeit through a different procedure than we propose. It went on to say: “Our intuition and that of most of the Graduate Studies Chairs, however, is that the current system used by the Graduate School to select fellowship recipients is a highly inefficient method of arriving at a less than optimal result” (p. 3). In its response to the Cerny Committee report, the Graduate Associate and Fellowship Committee of the Research and Graduate Council identified a number of problems with a decentralized approach of the kind recommended by the Cerny Committee. We have taken these problems into account in fashioning our proposal.
Recommendation II.B.5.b: Allocate fellowships at college level following Graduate School guidelines. Each college will select its fellows directly. To qualify for consideration at the college level, fellows must meet the following minimum Graduate School standards: They must (a) be pursuing a PhD or MFA degree, (b) be identifiable as new applicants for the particular PhD or MFA program, and (c) satisfy minimum GRE and GPA requirements (if currently required for that particular graduate program) set by the Graduate School for that year’s fellowship competition. In addition, to be eligible for college selection, the programs of otherwise eligible students must meet the standards for quality determined by the Graduate School using metrics implemented from the Freeman Committee Report. A fixed number of waivers, to be determined by the Dean of the Graduate School in consultation with the Graduate Council, from the minimum GRE/GPA requirements for fellowship eligibility can be granted to each college by the Graduate School following an expedited process. Using their own funds, colleges and departments/programs have the option to fund University Fellows at a higher level or award more University Fellowships than the allocated number. Colleges also can determine how their fellowship allocations will be divided between single-year and multi-year fellowships, and they can opt to defer the start of the fellowship period to the second year if that is more beneficial in recruiting a student.

Recommendation II.B.5.c: Revise fellowship allocation formulas after 3 years. After the first three years of this decentralized fellowship allocation process, the allocation formula should be modified to include: (a) updated PhD/MFA completion rates, (b) the number of applicants to the program who meet the Graduate School’s minimum GRE and GPA fellowship requirements, and (c) evaluations of program quality as determined through University reviews. It will be the responsibility of the Graduate School and its Graduate Council to develop this new formula in accordance with the Graduate School standards stipulated above.

Recommendation II.B.5.d: Apply same procedures to interdisciplinary degree programs. Interdisciplinary degree programs will be subject to the same formulas stipulated above for initial and subsequent allocations of University Fellowship. The procedures for the University Fellowship competitions should follow those for individual colleges except that each college participating in the interdisciplinary program must be represented in the selection process.

Recommendation II.B.5.e: Require college reports on fellowship awards. By the end of the second week of the autumn term, each college is to report to the Graduate School on its student-by-student awards of University Fellowships. If any students are awarded University Fellowships who do not meet the standards stipulated above or exceed the number of waivers granted, the college will lose that fellowship in subsequent Graduate School allocations. College deans also will be held responsible for allocating their fellowships on the basis of student and program quality, and they will be expected to report to the Graduate School the fellowship allocation rules that they used in the college competition.

Recommendation II.B.6: Retain centralized University Enrichment Fellowship competition. The competition for University Enrichment Fellowships should remain centralized as before, but with the possibility of offering them as multi-year fellowships like some of the University Fellowships.
Despite the Committee’s preference for decentralization of fellowship competitions, we believe that decentralization is not viable for Enrichment Fellowships. The number of candidates for these fellowships varies too much across the years in the various colleges to make reasonable \textit{a priori} allocations to them. The overall number of fellowship winners is relatively low. The legal constraints on how diversity can be considered in fellowship allocations also must be fully honored. In every other respect but diversity goals, though, the Enrichment Fellowship and the University Fellowship should be parallel programs, including multi-year provisions for Enrichment Fellowships. This change will enhance the University’s ability to attract the most competitive students who add to its diversity.

\textbf{Recommendation II.B.7: Follow strict guidelines in awarding fee authorizations not tied to Graduate School Fellowships.} The Graduate School should allocate any of its fee authorization funds that are not tied to Graduate School Fellowships as matches for stipend funds won in extramural competitions by students/programs eligible for Graduate School fellowships.

The Graduate School automatically provides fee authorizations to Graduate School fellowship winners, and it also provides stand-alone fee authorizations to support students whose stipends are funded through training grants received by their programs or fellowships they have won on their own. In FY05, the Graduate School devoted about $3.4M to this \textit{ad hoc} fee authorization program. A majority of these funds in the past have been spent for terminal or tagged masters students, supplementary summer programs for new graduate students, or programs specified in earlier arrangements. These complementary fee authorizations were awarded by the Graduate School on a program-by-program \textit{ad hoc} basis. We believe that the allocation of fee authorizations not linked to Graduate School fellowships should be guided by clear and consistent principles. First, they should be reserved as supplements to attract high-quality PhD/MFA students. Second, they should go only to students in programs eligible for Graduate School fellowship funding. Third, the top priority should be to provide them as matching funds for stipends awarded in competitions, especially national and international competitions. The Graduate School Dean should award these supplementary fee authorizations in strict accordance with these guidelines. Programs receiving “stand-alone” fee authorizations should report to the Graduate School on exactly how this money was used.

\textbf{Recommendation II.B.8: Retain centralized Presidential Fellowship competition.} Graduate School Presidential Fellowships need to be supported at least at current levels, governed by the same rules for allocation as other Graduate School fellowship programs, and awarded through a centralized competition involving a Graduate School committee. In evaluating fellowship nominees, this committee should evaluate students’ quality within their area and not impose its own judgments about the quality of one area of study over another.

The Committee believes the Presidential Fellowships are an important part of the Graduate School’s fellowship program and deserve more funding in the future. Eligibility for Presidential Fellowships should be determined by the rules for other Graduate School fellowships (dedicated to MFA/PhD students in programs reporting to the Graduate School whose students are certified as eligible for Graduate School fellowships.) Because of the small number

\footnote{15 The Cerny Committee reached the same conclusion as we have about not decentralizing the Enrichment Fellowship competition.}
of Presidential Fellowships awarded each year and the year-to-year variation in what programs receive them, the fellows need to be selected on a centralized basis by a Graduate School committee, appointed by the Dean. One of the frequent complaints about the centralized committee is that members sometimes base their judgments of candidates on their evaluations of the candidates’ general areas of study. It is difficult to compare candidates across areas of study. In doing so, however, it is the responsibility of committee members to focus on candidates’ quality within their chosen area and genre as documented by the nomination materials – and to refrain from employing their own judgments of the areas.

**Recommendation II.B.9: Discontinue Graduate School Post-doctoral Fellowships.** The Graduate School Post-Doctoral Fellowship program should be discontinued, and its budgeted funds should be reallocated.

For several years, in practice the Graduate School has not been investing any resources to fund post-doctoral fellowships, even though the program remains in principle. While such fellowships are a valuable part of professional training, we believe that the responsibility for supporting post-doctoral fellows needs to be assumed by the individual programs and/or faculty who are sponsoring them.

**Recommendation II.B.10: Reallocate financial support funds to highest priority uses.** Any fee authorization or other financial support funds freed up by application of eligibility conditions in these recommendations should be reallocated to the Graduate School’s University and Presidential fellowship programs.

Graduate School fellowships need more funding for the University to compete in recruiting and supporting graduate students. All fee authorization and post-doctoral fellowship funds that become available through cost savings should be used for an increase in student fellowships.

**Recommendation II.B.11: Continue, but streamline, the Alumni Grants for Graduate Research and Scholarship (AGGRS) competition.** Funding for the AGGRS program should continue at present levels plus periodic “cost of living” adjustments. Requirements for proposals should be less onerous, and a centralized Graduate School committee, appointed by the Dean, should make the selections.

This program has been valuable in supporting dissertation and thesis research. Currently, however, there is a widespread belief that advisors and applicants have to devote more effort in preparing their proposals and that AGGRS committees have to read more material in support of a proposal than is necessary to make good awards decisions. Therefore, this recommendation calls for changing the guidelines for AGGRS applications so that shorter proposals and fewer letters of support are required. Although we prefer decentralization of the competitions for Graduate School fellowships and grants, we feel that it is not preferable in this case because of the variation across the years in programs housing the winning candidates and the relatively small amount of money involved.

**Recommendation II.B.12: Discount tuition for post-candidacy PhD students.** Once PhD students have satisfied the requirements for admission to candidacy, the University should seriously
consider charging them a significantly lower rate for tuition/fees. Before recommending this change to the Board of Trustees, however, it must be determined not to be harmful to the University’s fiscal situation in a thorough review by the Senate Fiscal Committee, the Provost, and the Senior Vice President for Business and Finance.

Lower tuition for dissertation students is a common practice at peer universities, and it is recommended by the Freeman Committee for implementation here. Since doctoral students who have completed their candidacy examination are not making heavy demands upon their program, even if they must take a full load of course credits, they should not be forced to pay standard tuition levels as they work on their dissertations.

**Recommendation II.B.13: Continue fourth-quarter fee authorization program.** Graduate Associates who have been funded for three consecutive quarters should continue to be eligible for fourth-quarter fee authorizations, which are provided by the program from which their earlier funding was received.

This is the current policy at the University, but it has been questioned because the new budgeting system requires programs to pay for fee authorizations. The Committee feels that funded graduate students deserve this benefit and that it should continue. It should be recognized, however, that net increases in graduate fees impose a cost that departments and colleges must bear in paying these fee authorizations.

**C. Quality Control of Graduate Education**

The Committee recognizes that unambiguous measures of quality are elusive. The duty of balancing different fields of study, different measures of scholarship, and different goals of programs is best left for college determination, if possible. Nonetheless, the central authority of the Graduate School is the appropriate point for general oversight of quality control regarding graduate programs. The Graduate School should be responsible for determining the relative investment in graduate student support across colleges. It is thus the appropriate authority for adjusting levels of support due to performance that is either improving or lagging. The following recommendations are consistent with those of both the Freeman Committee and the Ripley Committee, but they are more detailed.

**Recommendation II.C.1: Hold departments and colleges responsible for quality of their graduate programs.** The responsibility for the quality and functioning of graduate programs is shared by the department, the college housing the program (or for interdisciplinary programs, the colleges), and the Graduate School.

Everyone responsible for supporting and evaluating instruction and scholarship should be concerned with and responsible for graduate education. As the Ripley Committee recommended ten years ago, the artificial separation should end between the graduate faculty and Graduate School on the one hand and departments/colleges on the other. Departments and colleges are primarily responsible for the funding of graduate education and its quality. The Graduate School (and the Office of Academic Affairs) must work with them to assure that the University’s goals for graduate education are met and must hold them responsible when they are not.
**Recommendation II.C.2:** Hold departments and colleges responsible for reporting data on their programs. All graduate degree-granting programs have the responsibility for keeping up-to-date data on time-to-degree, degree completions, the status of each student in the program, and other data that the Graduate School will identify. These data must be made available for program reviews and for summary reports to the Graduate School.

At present there are few standards for record keeping and no enforcement of what standards there are. It is clear that decisions on policies and resources must be based on the best and most complete data available. The most reasonable source of, and repository for, these data is the department or program. Summaries of these data and other data, as specified by the Graduate School Dean, need to be kept by graduate programs and shared with the college and the Graduate School, which has the overall responsibility for overseeing graduate program data collections and dissemination. This was a recommendation of the Ripley Committee.

**Recommendation II.C.3:** Regularly review graduate programs. All graduate programs should be reviewed every seven to ten years by the Graduate School, preferably as part of a broader review of the department or interdisciplinary program by the Office of Academic Affairs. These reviews must include (a) the program’s re-evaluation of the eligibility for graduate faculty status for each member of its graduate faculty, (b) an assessment of the program’s quality using objective metrics established by the Graduate School, (c) an assessment of the program’s quality by external evaluators approved by the Provost and the Dean of the Graduate School, and (d) a determination of whether the program should be eligible for Graduate School fellowships and fee authorizations. If it satisfies the above conditions, an accreditation review, or other similarly exhaustive external review of the rigor of the program, can be conducted concurrently with or be substituted for the University review with prior approval of the Provost and the Dean of the Graduate School.

The Committee agrees with the Freeman Committee Report where it states that resources are not, at present, allocated according to program quality. The Graduate School, along with Office of Academic Affairs, must take responsibility for program reviews that can be the basis for assessing program quality. Our recommendation echoes a recommendation of the Ripley Committee Report that was not implemented.

**Recommendation II.C.4:** Exempt professional programs accredited by external groups from standard University reviews. Professional programs that must meet standards external to OSU for continuing accreditation do not need to be reviewed under the auspices of the Graduate School.

The overall quality of all University programs should be reviewed periodically. Professional accreditation reviews are well established, rigorous, and detailed. We believe that they can be substituted for University reviews.

**Recommendation II.C.5:** Graduate School and colleges should monitor compliance with reviews. The Graduate School and the college deans share the responsibility for monitoring de-
partment or program implementation of recommendations arising from Office of Academic Af-
fairs and Graduate School reviews.

Undertaking reviews of graduate programs without follow-up evaluations of compliance
is not sensible. The Graduate School is the most appropriate unit for ongoing monitoring of
changes to graduate programs, as it must be responsible for institutional resource reallocations
that might arise post-review.

**Recommendation II.C.6: Decentralize decisions about graduate faculty status.** The Graduate
School should have clear policy guidelines on formal designations for categories of graduate
faculty (currently M and P) regarding what designations are necessary and by what minimal cri-
teria they are made. At a minimum, the Graduate School should require that P faculty (1) be
pursuing an active program of scholarly research or creative activity that has led to publications
or creative work, and (2) exhibit a willingness to participate in and share the responsibilities for
graduate education. These criteria should be applied to both University and non-University
graduate faculty. The program’s graduate studies committee and the department chair should
make the decisions on faculty status following these guidelines. Graduate faculty status is not
permanent and is subject to change upon review.

Alternatives to the present system were discussed. Peer universities vary in how they as-
sign graduate faculty status, and in some instances all faculty have graduate status. The
Committee believes that graduate faculty status provides an important additional quality control
mechanism that should be retained. Such status is not to be taken for granted by faculty. The
authorization to guide dissertation research should not be automatically conferred, or continued
indefinitely. By taking a more formal approach to graduate faculty status we believe that stu-
dents and the university will benefit. The Ripley Committee recommended local control over
graduate faculty status. We are recommending that the decision be vested in departments and
programs, as it is now, but that clear Graduate School criteria be applied in making the local de-
cisions, as routinely enforced by the department chair and college dean.

**Recommendation II.C.7: Eliminate external Graduate School representatives on examina-
tion committees.** Even though we encourage candidacy and final oral examination committees
to include an outside member chosen by the student and her/his advisor, the current requirement
that the Graduate School assigns to the committee a member of the graduate faculty from outside
the program should be eliminated.

The present system of selecting and recruiting Graduate School representatives to serve
on candidacy and final examinations functions poorly. The Ripley Committee urged that it be
reviewed, but it has never been. Because of the lack of volunteers, faculty are often asked at the
last minute to serve on committees in fields in which they have little or no expertise. A great
deal of effort is expended by the Graduate School in trying to find faculty to serve. On the other
hand, there is concern that eliminating outside representatives on examinations may be detri-
mental to graduate students, because there would be no one to protect them from unfair treatment. In
the end, we concluded that this dysfunctional system of outside representatives serves neither the
University nor the students well. The system is a remnant of the past, when there may have been
reason not to trust faculty and departments to perform their quality control and fair treatment re-
sponsibilities faithfully. With a stronger faculty, external program reviews, and more responsibility for graduate program performance by chairs and deans, outside representatives are not necessary today. Student complaints or grievances should be raised with the chair of the program’s graduate studies committee and, if not resolved there, should be addressed through the normal University grievance process. Despite our recommendation to end the Graduate School representatives procedure, we recognize that it can be valuable to have outside members with relevant substantive expertise on dissertation committees. We encourage students and their advisors to consider including a suitable faculty member from outside of their program on dissertation committees.

**Recommendation II.C.8: Require dissertation progress reports.** Doctoral dissertation committees should meet at least once a year to provide the chair of the program's graduate studies committee with a written progress report on the dissertation. The format of the report may be determined by the graduate studies committee. Copies of the report will be sent to the department chair or the appropriate administrator of an interdisciplinary program and to the college dean. These annual reports may be used to review the progress of individual students, the status of graduate faculty, and the program itself. They should be part of the information provided in periodic program reviews.

The Committee is convinced that formally monitoring progress to degree will provide useful input to those students (and their advisors) who are already making good progress and to those students (and advisors) who need more substantial guidance in order to insure timely completion of degrees. At present, there is no established procedure for monitoring progress beyond the individual responsibilities of dissertation chairs and, in some cases, individual program requirements.

**Recommendation II.C.9: Require probation and, ultimately, dismissal for continuing “Unsatisfactory” grades for 999s.** Any dissertation student who receives U’s in 999 courses for two consecutive quarters of enrollment should be placed on academic probation by the Graduate School. Before continuing for a third quarter, the student will meet with the chair of the Graduate Studies Committee to review her/his progress toward the degree. After a third quarter of U’s, the student will be denied registration in graduate courses and terminated from the program.

At present there is no Graduate School mechanism for the termination of students who are not making progress toward a degree. This recommendation, like II.C.8, is intended to increase accountability about whether the student is actively engaged in working towards a degree.

**D. Admissions, Recruitment, and Services**

The Graduate School provides essential services for facilitating, supporting, and enhancing graduate education at The Ohio State University. These services must be provided or overseen by the Graduate School in an effective and timely manner. They include admissions, recruitment, student services, and various administrative functions. Many of our recommendations in this area reinforce and extend the recommendations of the Ripley Committee Report.
ADMISSIONS

Currently, graduate student application materials are received in the Graduate Admissions Office, which is located in the University Office of Admissions, and in the offices of the graduate programs. On-line application procedures are readily accessible via the OSU website and facilitate the application process. Reviews of the applications and decisions on admission are made at the department/college level. Minimal admission criteria are set by the Graduate School.

Recommendation II.D.1: Change reporting line of Graduate Admissions Office. Without changing the physical location of the Graduate Admissions Office, its reporting line should be shifted to the Graduate School.

Although the Graduate Admissions Office is run very professionally and effectively at present, there is the potential under different leadership for the processing of graduate student applications in an office outside of the Graduate School to create coordination problems, with graduate admissions too disconnected from the oversight of other aspects of graduate education. Our recommendation of separate graduate admissions standards and decisions for masters and doctoral program admissions (see II.D.2 below) make it even more important that the Graduate Admissions Office be a part of the Graduate School, even if its physical location is unchanged.

Recommendation II.D.2: Admit students separately to Masters and PhD programs. For graduate programs reporting to the Graduate School, we join the Freeman Committee in recommending that students be admitted separately to each degree program. Students accepted by a department or program to pursue a masters degree would be admitted by the Graduate School as masters students. Students accepted by a department or program to pursue a doctorate would be admitted as doctoral students, even if they were expected to earn a masters degree on the way. Students who had earned a masters degree at Ohio State without having been admitted to a doctoral program would have to apply and be admitted to a doctoral program before they would be allowed to pursue doctoral study. Admission decisions would continue to be made as they are now in the departments and programs, except where the student does not meet minimum admission standards for the degree and the Graduate School decides whether to waive them. In all cases, a formal Graduate School admission would be required before the student could pursue the degree.

The current application form has the option for students to apply as “masters/doctoral,” “masters only,” and “doctoral only” students. In the past, it has been possible for “masters only” students to move from their masters program into a doctoral program, sometimes in the same department but sometimes in a different department, without having been accepted formally by the doctoral program. Our recommendation is designed to close this “loophole” by requiring departments to make an explicit decision to accept or not accept the student for doctoral study and to communicate that decision to the Graduate School, and by having the Graduate School confirm admission by officially enrolling the student as a doctoral student. Formal admission by the Graduate School to only one of these three categories at a time, with a clear message that change from the “masters only” to the “doctoral” category requires positive departmental and Graduate
School action, also should reduce confusion among potential applicants and make it easier to
determine the number of students seeking each particular degree. The Freeman Committee Re-
port points out the difficulty of differentiating masters from PhD students at present. Clearly
distinguishing them by separate admissions decisions can ameliorate this problem.

**Recommendation II.D.3:** Tailor admission criteria to level of degree being pursued. In all cases, minimal admission criteria would be set by the Graduate School, with the advice of the Graduate Council; higher requirements would be set for doctoral programs than for masters programs. Admission would be granted by the Graduate School automatically for all students recommended by their program who meet the minimum admission criteria. Programs seeking admission for a student who fails to meet the Graduate School’s minimum requirements can formally submit a request for admission to the Graduate School Dean.

This recommendation follows current practices, except that separate decisions, using separate standards, are to be employed for masters and doctoral students.

**Recommendation II.D.4:** Remove graduate non-degree students from Graduate School. Some students enroll in graduate programs to satisfy requirements for professional certification rather than for the purpose of earning a graduate degree. The Graduate School and the Office of Continuing Education should cooperate in determining whether these students can be channeled through a Continuing Education program rather than admitted to a graduate program.

Students seeking professional certification credits are different from regularly-enrolled graduate students pursuing degrees. The Graduate School should have oversight of the latter, but it may not be appropriate for this oversight to extend to the former.

**RECRUITMENT**

Active and aggressive recruitment of excellent potential graduate students is an essential factor in developing and maintaining high quality graduate programs. As discussed in the Ripley Committee Report, graduate student recruitment is primarily the responsibility of individual graduate programs. The Ripley Committee recommended that the Graduate School should support local unit recruiting and promote interactions and coordination across departments and programs. Our committee agrees that recruitment of graduate students is primarily the responsibility of the specific graduate program that would enroll the students. Yet, we believe that the Graduate School has special roles to play in assisting and monitoring local unit efforts at recruiting high quality graduate students, especially minority, domestic, and Ohio students.

**Recommendation II.D.5:** Broaden Graduate School role in general student recruitment. Where there are opportunities for effective recruitment through presence at broad recruiting events, the Graduate School has the responsibility for arranging for the representation of Ohio State University programs. Additional funding for the Graduate School is required to support this new function.

A Graduate School role in taking advantage of opportunities to showcase OSU graduate programs can valuably supplement local program efforts. These opportunities can include in-
volvement in events that provide information about graduate studies at Ohio State for undergraduate students and undergraduate advisors locally, regionally, and nationally; a user-friendly website explaining graduate educational opportunities at OSU; and promotion of graduate studies at appropriate recruiting events.

**Recommendation II.D.6: Broaden Graduate School role in focused student recruitment.**

The Graduate School has a special role to play in (1) recruiting to enhance the diversity of graduate students at Ohio State by coordinating diversity recruiting efforts and (2) strengthening the recruitment of domestic and Ohio students. Additional responsibilities here will require more funding for the Graduate School.

As a public university, OSU has a responsibility to inform domestic and minority potential students broadly about graduate educational opportunities and financial assistance in various areas at OSU. As an Ohio university, the Graduate School also has a special responsibility to develop effective methods for the recruitment of high quality Ohio residents to join graduate programs at OSU. A major goal of the Academic Plan is enhancing diversity, and the Graduate School should develop and implement long-range plans to recruit minority graduate students. In particular, the Graduate School should play a more active role in coordinating the recruitment of underrepresented minority students. For example, the Graduate School should support participation in regional and national minority recruiting events, such as the Ohio Science and Engineering Alliance, the Annual Biomedical Research Conference for Minority Students (ABRCMS), the National McNair Research Conference and Graduate School Fair, and the various national programs available through disciplinary organizations. The active, aggressive recruitment of high quality domestic graduate students is especially important for graduate programs. In order to obtain financial support such as federal training grants, a significant proportion of the student body of a graduate program often must consist of high quality domestic students and minority students. The Graduate School should be supportive of efforts to meet these requirements at the local program level. Reviews of graduate programs should take into account program efforts and accomplishments in the recruiting of these students.

**Recommendation II.D.7: Review graduate student recruiting programs outside of the Graduate School.** The Office of Academic Affairs should review centrally-financed graduate student recruiting programs outside of the Graduate School to determine if they could be handled more effectively by either better coordination with or more oversight from the Graduate School.

The University supports programs for the recruiting of minority graduate students outside of the Graduate School, such as the Graduate and Professional Schools Visitation Day (GPSVD). These programs should be reviewed as to whether their goals would be better served by enhanced coordination with the Graduate School. The review should address whether reallocation of the funds for these programs to the Graduate School would increase the effectiveness of these programs.

**SERVICES**

The Committee acknowledges the importance and effectiveness of many of the services and administrative responsibilities currently within the oversight of the Graduate School, some
of which are shared with other units. We recommend that they be continued as they are. We also identify three additional services that would be valuable to graduate students. It should be realized that performing the new functions might require additional Graduate School funding and a reallocation of staff responsibilities.

**Recommendation II.D.8: Continue many present Graduate School services:** The following services are currently being provided by the Graduate School and, in the view of the committee, should be maintained by the Graduate School as they are: dissertation format checks; oversight of electronic dissertations; graduation services; a graduate school handbook; petitions for exceptions to rules; certification of graduate exams passage; and record/data keeping and reporting. We further recommend that the Graduate School continue to work with the Office of International Education (OIE) in facilitating and tracking OSU students traveling abroad, Faculty and TA Development (FTAD) in the development and oversight of programs to enhance teaching and other professional development programs, and the College of Education in conducting spoken English certification.

These services are important and, currently, they are performed professionally and well by the Graduate School and its partners. No change is needed in these operations.

**Recommendation II.D.9: Protect graduate student eligibility for deferrals of student loan repayments.** The Graduate School needs to coordinate regularly with the Office of Student Financial Aid to ensure that every graduate student in good standing qualifies for continued eligibility for student deferral of student loan repayments.

It has come to the attention of the Committee that some graduate students have been threatened with termination of their deferrals for student loan repayments because they were reported by the University not to be continuing students in good standing – either not enrolled during a particular quarter, typically the summer, or having graduated when they receive a masters degree on their way to a PhD. The Office of Student Financial Aid has assured us that neither condition should result in termination of the student deferment. It is the responsibility of the Graduate School to work with Financial Aid to make sure that no graduate student eligible for a deferment is denied that deferment because of internal University procedures or oversights.

**Recommendation II.D.10: Give Graduate School responsibility for graduate student nominations for Fulbright Fellowships.** The Graduate School should handle graduate student nominations for Fulbright Fellowships, which includes advertising the competition to solicit applicants and then overseeing the selection process. Responsibilities for this function may require more funding for the Graduate School.

The Office of International Education (OIE) currently handles the nominations of OSU graduate students for Fulbright Fellowships, whereas undergraduate nominations are handled by the Honors Program. OIE has recommended, and we concur, that the Graduate School should handle Fulbright graduate student nominations, which includes advertising the competition to solicit applicants and then overseeing the selection process through a centralized graduate faculty committee to select Ohio State nominees. The Graduate School also could advise applicants on how to draft a sound proposal.
**Recommendation II.D.11: Develop career development service in Graduate School.** The Graduate School should establish a career development office, which would provide (a) a dossier service for submitting PhD student materials to prospective college/university and other professional employers, (b) a career counseling service to assist PhD students in identifying professional positions, and (c) a location for current professional development programs. Substantial additional funding will be required for the Graduate School to provide this service.

The Graduate School should extend its support to graduate students by providing basic career services, particularly by facilitating the collection and distribution of materials for job searches, such as vitae and letters of recommendation. Additionally, we expect the Graduate School to continue to develop and maintain mentoring programs and professional development/enrichment services and workshops, such as the successful Preparation of Future Faculty (PFF), as a part of the functions this office.
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TO: Committee to Review the Graduate School

FROM: Barbara R. Snyder, Executive Vice President and Provost

RE: Committee Charge

DATE: March 11, 2005

Thank you for agreeing to serve on the committee to review the structure and functions of the Graduate School. Through your service on this committee, you will have the opportunity to shape the future of the Graduate School and to influence graduate education at the University.

In 1995, the Graduate School Review Committee, chaired by Dean Ripley, made several recommendations regarding the structure of the Graduate School. The overarching recommendation was that the structure be aligned with the structures that bear responsibilities for the academic programs—namely, the Office of Academic Affairs and the departments and colleges. An important first step was to appoint a Graduate Dean who would also hold the position of Vice Provost for Graduate Studies. At that time, it was envisioned that this individual would work closely with the Provost to evaluate programs and to seek expanded resources for the best programs.

Susan Huntington was appointed as Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Dean of the Graduate School subsequent to that report and has held the position for the past nine years. The Graduate School Review Committee also made several other recommendations; the committee’s final report is included in your materials.

Earlier this year, I appointed a committee, chaired by Dean Rick Freeman, to ensure that doctoral education is serving the goals of the Academic Plan. Specifically, I asked the committee to recommend a process and appropriate metrics to assess the quality of doctoral programs, and a funding model to align funding with quality. This committee is due to finish its work by the end of Spring Quarter.
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Since it has been almost ten years since the Graduate School has had an in-depth review, I want to take the opportunity created by a change in leadership to review its existing structure and functions. In general terms I am asking that you analyze the current structure and functions of the Graduate School to determine whether or not it is optimally positioned to support high quality graduate education. Put another way, I am asking you to consider the current structure and functions of the Graduate School, the optimal structure and functions, and recommendations for change that will bridge any gap.

As part of your charge I am requesting that you examine
  • the current organizational structure;
  • the various models of graduate schools among our benchmarks;
  • the appropriate mission of a graduate school in a research institution;
  • the functions of the Graduate School and its committees;
  • the desired interaction between the Graduate School and colleges and departments and between the Graduate School and the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of Research; and
  • some specific issues, such as the process by which Graduate School fellowships are allocated and the role of Graduate School representatives on graduate examinations and PhD defenses.

The above is not intended as an exhaustive list and your deliberations may lead you into other areas. My overall goal in asking you to undertake this assignment is to ensure that the Graduate School facilitates the maintenance of high quality graduate education working in concert with the departments and colleges.

If possible, I would like to have your report by June 30, 2005, so that we can make any needed structural and/or functional changes and recruit a permanent dean of the Graduate School.
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<th>Meeting Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 11, 2005</td>
<td>Executive Vice President and Provost Barbara Snyder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 17</td>
<td>Graduate School Dean Susan Huntington, Associate Deans William Clark and Elliot Slotnick, and Assistant Deans Lamar Murphy and Kathleen Wallace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6</td>
<td>Dr. Jules Lapidus, former OSU Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School, former President, Council of Graduate Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13</td>
<td>Graduate School Associate Deans William Clark and Elliot Slotnick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 26</td>
<td>Nance Hoza, Director, Office of Graduate and Professional Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27, 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outreach to University Community (appearances by Committee chair/members and news releases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Outreach Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 29, 2005</td>
<td>Chairs of Graduate Studies Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6</td>
<td>Research and Graduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6</td>
<td>College of Humanities Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8</td>
<td>Council of Graduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9</td>
<td>news release about Committee to University community via OnCampus and OSU Today, containing address of phorum for posting comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11</td>
<td>Campus-wide Open Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13</td>
<td>Freeman Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 6</td>
<td>College of Engineering Graduate Studies Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12</td>
<td>University Senate, Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Interim Progress Report released by email to University vice presidents, deans, department chairs, graduate study committee chairs, and Council of Graduate Students; and subsequently appearing in OnCampus and OSU Today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Part I Report released to University community by emails to vice presidents, deans, department chairs, graduate study committee chairs, and Council of Graduate Students; and subsequently appearing in OnCampus and OSU Today</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C:
Questionnaire for Survey of Peer University Graduate Deans

GRADUATE EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE

As the chair of the committee appointed by the Provost to review the structure and functions of the Graduate School at Ohio State University, I am contacting you to ask some questions about graduate education on your campus. We are asking these questions of the graduate deans or their equivalents at a small group of peer universities to inform our review of the Graduate School at Ohio State. Most questions simply request information about the graduate school or its equivalent at your university. In some cases, we ask additionally for your comments on the advantages and disadvantages of a particular arrangement. It should take you only 10-15 minutes to answer all of our questions. Answers to both kinds of questions, without attribution to particular sources, will be aggregated in our report. If you want us to treat any of your comments confidentially, please so indicate. If you would like to have a copy of our report, please check the box at the end of the questionnaire.

Paul A. Beck, Dean
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
The Ohio State University

INSTRUCTIONS: Please answer the following questions as best you can by checking the most appropriate response option or writing in your response and return the questionnaire to my assistant via e-mail at reeser.1@osu.edu or by fax to 614-292-3656 by June 14, 2005.

1. At Ohio State, the chief academic officer for graduate education is the Dean of the Graduate School, who reports directly to the University’s chief academic officer, the Provost. What is the structural arrangement at your university?
   __ a. Chief official for graduate education (e.g., the graduate dean) is separate from chief official for research and reports to:
      __ i. chief academic officer (e.g., the Provost)
      __ ii. president or the equivalent
      __ iii. both the president and chief academic officer
   __ b. Offices for graduate education and research are headed by the same person (e.g., a Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies), who reports to:
      __ i. chief academic officer
      __ ii. president
      __ iii. both the president and chief academic officer
   __ c. Other _____________________________ (please specify)
2. What do you see as the major advantages and disadvantages of the structural arrangement for graduate education at your university?

3. At Ohio State, the graduate faculty are nominated by each graduate program and formally represented by the program’s Graduate Studies Committee, whose chair works directly with the graduate school and its dean. How is the governance of graduate programs organized at your university?
   __ a. Through the graduate faculty and their representatives
   __ b. Through a department/program chair/director and its dean
   __ c. Through both the graduate faculty and the chairs and deans
   __ d. In some other way __________________________ (please specify)

4. What do you see as the major advantages and disadvantages of the organization at your university for administering graduate programs?

5. At some universities, the graduate dean is charged with the responsibility for periodic review of each graduate program. Who is responsible for reviews of graduate programs at your university?
   __ a. Graduate dean
   __ b. Chief academic officer (e.g., provost) reviews graduate programs as part of broader review of unit
   __ c. Graduate dean and chief academic officer work together in program reviews
   __ d. Other __________________________ (please specify)
   __ e. University does not currently do reviews of graduate programs (skip to Q10)

6. Do these reviews involve external review teams who make site visits?
   __ a. Yes, always
   __ b. Sometimes, but not always
   __ c. No

7. How often are these external reviews conducted? On the average, every ____ years?

8. How important are these reviews in academic plans for the units?
   __ a. Very important
   __ b. Somewhat important
   __ c. Not important at all

9. What do you see as the major advantages and disadvantages of how program reviews are conducted at your university?

10. Who in your university has responsibility for final approval of graduate curriculum and graduate program changes?
    __ a. Graduate school
    __ b. College deans
11. What do you see as the major advantages and disadvantages of your university’s current system of oversight?

12. In your university, does the graduate school or its equivalent appoint an outside member to all graduate exams who has not been chosen or recommended by the examining department/program or the student?
   __ a. Yes, dissertation defenses only
   __ b. Yes, general qualifying exams (or prelims) only
   __ c. Yes, both dissertation defenses and qualifying exams
   __ d. No

13. What do you see as the major advantages and disadvantages of your university’s current system of overseeing exams?

14. Is there a graduate faculty in your institution that does not include all members of the regular faculty?
   __ a. Yes
   __ b. No (Skip to Q16)

15. Is there a distinction between faculty who can be primary advisers only at the masters level and those who can be primary advisers at the masters and doctoral levels?
   __ a. Yes
   __ b. No

16. Are applications for admission to graduate programs in your university handled by an office that combines both undergraduate and graduate admissions or an office that handles only graduate applications?
   __ a. Combined undergraduate and graduate admissions office
   __ b. Separate graduate admissions office
   __ c. Other ___________________ (please specify)

17. Does your university manage the number of enrollments in its graduate programs or is this management left up to the departments/programs, as long as university standards are met?
   __ a. University manages enrollments
   __ b. Departments/programs manage own enrollments
   __ c. Other ___________________ (please specify)

18. If your university awards centrally-funded graduate school fellowships, how are the fellows selected?
a. Through a university-wide competition conducted by the graduate school
b. By the department or program itself, using some predetermined allocation of central funds
c. By a combination of both methods
d. Other ____________________________ (please specify)
e. University has no centrally-funded fellowships (skip to Q21)

19. In academic year 2004-05, how many students at your institution received centrally-funded graduate fellowships? _______

20. If graduate fellowship money from a central source is divided among programs according to a formula, what factors determine the proportion each program receives? Check all that apply.
   a. Quality of program (Please list the indicators: _____________________)
   b. Size of program
   c. Uniqueness of program
   d. Historical level of funding
   e. Other ____________________________ (please specify)

21. Does the university reduce the rate of tuition for full-time graduate students who are working on their doctoral dissertations?
   a. Yes
   b. No

Thank you.

(Name of Institution)  (Name of person completing the questionnaire)

Please check the following box if you would like to have a copy of the results of this survey.

[ ]
### OSU Graduate Education Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>Mich St</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>Penn St</th>
<th>Purdue</th>
<th>U Chic</th>
<th>IL-Chic</th>
<th>IL-UC</th>
<th>U Iowa</th>
<th>U Mich</th>
<th>U MN</th>
<th>WI-Mad</th>
<th>WI-Mil</th>
<th>IUPU</th>
<th>Texas AZ</th>
<th>UCLA</th>
<th>Texas Austin</th>
<th>U Wash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Chief Official for Graduate Education</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Chief official is separate from research/reports to:</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Chief academic officer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. President or the equivalent</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Both the president &amp; chief academic officer</td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Chief official is same for research &amp; grad educ.</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Chief academic officer</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. President or the equivalent</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Both the president &amp; chief academic officer</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Advantage/disadvantage of structure (see written)</td>
<td>wr</td>
<td>wr</td>
<td>wr</td>
<td>wr</td>
<td>wr</td>
<td>wr</td>
<td>wr</td>
<td>wr</td>
<td>wr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How is governance of graduate programs organized?</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Through graduate faculty &amp; their representatives</td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Through department/program chair/director/dean</td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Through graduate faculty, chairs &amp; deans</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. In some other way (see written response)</td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Advantage/disadvantage of organization (see written)</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Who is responsible for review of graduate programs?</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Graduate dean</td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Chief academic officer</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Graduate dean &amp; chief academic officer together</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other (see written response)</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Does not currently review graduate programs</td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do reviews involve external teams who make site visits?</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Yes, always</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Sometimes, but not always</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. No</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How often are external reviews conducted?</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How important are reviews in academic plans for units?</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Very important</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Somewhat important</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Not important at all</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Advantage/disadvantage of program reviews (see written)</td>
<td>wr</td>
<td>wr</td>
<td>wr</td>
<td>wr</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></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Peer Institutions

- Texas Austin
- UCLA
- U Wash
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>Mich St NW</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>Penn St</th>
<th>Purdue</th>
<th>U Chic</th>
<th>IL-Chic</th>
<th>IL-UC</th>
<th>U Iowa</th>
<th>U Mich</th>
<th>U MN</th>
<th>WI-Mad</th>
<th>WI-Mil</th>
<th>IUPU</th>
<th>U AZ</th>
<th>UCLA</th>
<th>Texas Austin</th>
<th>Wash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Who approves curriculum &amp; program changes?</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Graduate School</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. College deans</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Department/program faculty</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. University-level curriculum committee</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Program chairs/heads</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other (see written responses)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Advantage/disadvantage of system oversight (see written)</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Appointment of outside reviewer on all graduate exams?</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Yes, dissertation defenses only</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Yes, general qualifying exams (or prelims) only</td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Yes, both dissertation defenses and qualifying exams</td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. No</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Advantage/disadvantage of exam oversight (see written)</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Are all faculty included in graduate faculty?</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. No, (Skip to Q16)</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Faculty distinction for masters &amp; doctoral level advisers?</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. No</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Are Grad/UG admissions applications &amp; offices separate?</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Combined undergraduate &amp; graduate admissions office</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Separate graduate admissions office</td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Other (see written responses)</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Enrollment management by university or depts/pgrms?</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. University manages enrollments</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Departments/programs manage own enrollments</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Other (see written responses)</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. How are fellows selected?</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. University-wide competition conducted by graduate school</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Department/program using predetermined allocation</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. By a combination of both methods</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other (see written responses)</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. University has no centrally-funded fellowships</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. N of students who received centrally-funded fellowships?</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. What factors determine funding programs receive?</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Quality of program</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Size of program</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Uniqueness of program</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Historical level of funding</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other (see written responses)</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Does the university reduce the rate of tuition for full-time?</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. No</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer Institutions:
- Texas Austin
- UCLA
- Wash