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Oh! Come let’s sing Ohio’s praise,
And songs to Alma Mater raise;
While our hearts rebounding thrill,
With joy which death alone can still.
Summer’s heat or winter’s cold,
The seasons pass, the years will roll;
Time and change will surely show
How firm thy friendship—OHIO!

“Carmen Ohio”
Ohio State’s alma mater
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Chapter One  Introduction
INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

The Ohio State University is a public, Carnegie RU/VH (research university, very high activity), land-grant, urban institution. It began in 1870, as the small Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College—Ohio's response to the Morrill (Land-Grant) Act. Today it is one of the largest, most comprehensive universities in the United States, with:

- a 17-member Board of Trustees, responsible for oversight of academic programs, budgets, general administration, and employment of faculty and staff;
- 59,000 students (45,000 undergraduate; 10,000 graduate; 3,000 professional);
- 3,400 regular faculty (3,000 regular tenure track, 400 regular clinical track, and 25 research track);
- 20,000 staff;
- 18 academic colleges that include 102 departments/schools;
- a full range of undergraduate, graduate, and professional academic programs, offered on a “quarter” calendar;
- an annual budget of $3.7 billion (including over $600 million in research expenditures); and
- more than 400,000 living alumni.

The vast majority of faculty, staff, students, academic programs, and research activity is located at the Columbus campus. It is here that the central administration for the entire university is based and the major university-wide academic, fiscal, and personnel decisions are made. From here, most of the interactions with the Ohio General Assembly, various government agencies, and the Ohio Board of Regents occur. With its robust, diversified economy, Columbus is now the central city (population: 700,000) of a seven-county metropolitan region of 1.5 million people. The university has a growing set of partnerships with this metropolitan area.

Four regional campuses are located in smaller communities ranging in distance from 40 to 90 miles from Columbus. Included are campuses at Lima, Mansfield, Marion, and Newark, Ohio. Each was founded four decades ago, has between 70 and 110 faculty members (including regular and auxiliary faculty), and between 1,200 and 2,200 primarily undergraduate students. Each is “co-located” with one of Ohio’s public “technical colleges” and shares some physical facilities. Each is an integral part of its local community—a point of pride that results in considerable community support.

These campuses have a distinctive niche within the university’s academic structure. They draw heavily, but no longer exclusively, from their surrounding regions for enrollment. They maintain “open admissions” and provide, for many students, an important first step, or gateway, to higher education in general and to this university specifically. Included are recent high school graduates who are first-generation college-goers, as well as adults now starting or returning to complete a college education.

Although funded separately by the state, they are integrated with the Columbus campus.

- Their curricula include primarily introductory-level university-wide general education courses that are also taught in Columbus, and their students are formally affiliated with, and earn their degrees from, the university.
- Their senior administrators and faculty regularly interact with their counterparts on the Columbus campus.
The university began as an agricultural college and today maintains that important, historical tradition of service to, and interactions with, the agricultural sector of the state’s economy. This occurs formally through a sixth location, the Agricultural Technical Institute (ATI) in Wooster, Ohio, and its Ohio Agricultural and Research Development Center (OARDC). Through those activities, along with Ohio State University Extension and with the Office of University Outreach and Engagement, the university works directly with the populations in each of the state’s 88 counties—in rural areas, small non-metropolitan communities, and increasingly in major urban centers.

Stated simply, The Ohio State University has a presence in virtually every part of Ohio. It is truly a statewide public institution of higher education, very much a part of the modern economy and “culture” of the state.

The university is part of a large higher education network serving Ohio’s 11 million citizens and the 400,000+ students in postsecondary education. This includes 36 public institutions (13 universities, 23 community and/or technical colleges) and 50 independent universities and colleges. The nine-member Ohio Board of Regents, based in Columbus, serves as a planning and coordinating agency, primarily for the public institutions. The board works with a staff that currently includes a chancellor and four vice chancellors, who, among other functions:

- manage the distribution of state funding for higher education through a primarily enrollment-driven subsidy model;
- gather and analyze statewide data on enrollments and programs;
- oversee the process for evaluating/approving new academic degree programs; and
- administer targeted, competitive initiatives.

The university interacts with this board in many ways on a regular basis and, increasingly, interacts with the other higher education institutions, four-year and two-year, on statewide initiatives.

However, this university plays a distinctive role. As Ohio’s land-grant university with comprehensive research, instructional, and service missions, it serves the state as well as national and international constituencies. No other university in Ohio holds that designation or has that scope of comprehensiveness and responsibilities. Only one other public university (University of Cincinnati) and one private (Case Western Reserve University) hold Carnegie RU/VH status. As a result, our most frequent linkages are with peer institutions across the country and around the world. For example, the university, notably through its administrative team, is an active participant in national organizations such as the Association of American Universities (AAU), the American Council on Education (ACE), the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), and the International Institute of Education (IIE), among others.
ACCRREDITATION HISTORY

The university has been accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) since 1913. Its first full accreditation site visit by that organization occurred in 1966. The second was in 1977. In both instances the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education voted to continue accreditation at the doctoral degree level. The four regional campuses underwent separate reviews, including site visits, in 1972 and 1982. They were accredited to continue to offer lower-division courses including the degrees of associate of arts and the baccalaureate program in Early and Middle Childhood Education. In 1982 it was decided that, from that point forward, the regional campuses would become part of the full university accreditation review. As a result, the Columbus campus and the regional campuses were included in the accreditation site review in 1987. The university received continued accreditation at the doctoral (research and professional curricula) level at that time. In 1997, the university received a full 10-year re-accreditation, with the need for a “progress report,” in 1999, on student learning outcomes assessment.

PROGRESS ON RECOMMENDATIONS IDENTIFIED IN THE 1997 SITE VISIT TEAM REPORT

The “progress report” on student learning outcomes assessment was submitted and approved in 1999. Subsequent activity is documented in the discussion of Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching.

The site review team also made recommendations in five areas.

- “Increased attention to internal communications at all levels, particularly with the staff of the institution.”

Effective communication in an institution of this size is important but always a challenge to implement fully. Progress continues to be made on two fronts. First, with growing electronic media, information about institutional initiatives, new policies and procedures, and events is disseminated through several outlets. Examples include: onCampus—a highly respected and used publication (electronic and hard copy editions) for faculty and staff, with four to five issues per quarter; and OSU Today, an electronic bulletin board sent each weekday (twice a week during summer quarter) to all faculty and staff that includes links for relevant follow-up activity. In addition, selected units have their own communication strategies: the Office of Academic Affairs, each quarter, produces Key Notes, and the Office of Human Resources has a set of publications to keep faculty and staff informed of ongoing activities. Each academic and academic support unit has its own web page. A growing number of units on campus have one or more communication staff members, and the university has an Office of University Relations with a specific Internal Communications division.

Second, communication occurs through participation in decision making processes. Faculty and students remain involved, formally, through the University Senate. Staff are not members of the senate; however, the chair of the University Staff Advisory Committee (USAC) is a non-voting member of the senate. USAC meets regularly, interacts formally with the university president, executive vice president and provost, senior vice president for business and finance, and associate vice president for human resources, and issues an annual report. Colleges and academic support units typically have a USAC contact person. Staff members are always represented on all special
committees and task forces as well as senior administrative searches. Nonetheless, the university needs to work continuously on effective communication with staff members.

- “Maintaining the selective investment program for enhancement at the university's centers of excellence.”

A hallmark of this university for the past decade, despite leadership change, has been the continued commitment by the Office of the President, the Office of Academic Affairs, and the Office of Research to focus on strong academic programs and invest in them. Increasingly the emphasis has been on interdisciplinary efforts. Rigorous competitive processes were established. In the late 1990s, Academic Enrichment and Selective Investment served as the investment mechanisms. In 2005, the executive vice president and provost established, and in 2006 implemented, Targeted Investments in Excellence. Recently these activities have been linked to related processes initiated through the Ohio Board of Regents. These activities are discussed in more detail in other sections of this report.

- “Continued support for the program “Innovation by Substitution,” as illustrated by the many recent restructuring initiatives. In doing so, we suggest planning for increasing numbers of adult and part-time students, and additional consolidations such as the telephone/data system.”

Examples from academic support units are outlined under Criterion Two: Preparing for the Future, but for academic units, some restructuring has continued, related increasingly to shifting academic emphases. For example, over the past decade new academic departments have been created: Biomedical Engineering, Aviation, and Urology. At the programmatic level where change is continuous, examples include, at the graduate level in the College of Medicine, the merger of a set of existing programs into the Integrated Biomedical Graduate Program, and at the undergraduate level in the Department of Anthropology, a shift from the B.A. program to the B.S. degree to reflect a shift to physical anthropology.

More broadly, the past two years have seen major changes. In 2006, the College of Education and the College of Human Ecology merged to better align their related missions; and the John Glenn School of Public Affairs, a unit reporting directly to the Office of Academic Affairs to help emphasize the importance of public policy activity at the institutional level, was created from a separate School of Public Policy and Management and the John Glenn Institute of Public Service and Public Policy. Early in 2007, the School of Public Health became the first new college in two decades, giving it a status needed to help with its growing national research and instructional stature.

With regard to enrollment structure, the numbers of adult and part-time students have not increased substantially on the Columbus campus, but they do remain an important element of enrollment on the regional campuses and are given considerable attention. Instead, there has been growing attention at the state level to articulation and transfer. The university accepts more than 3,000 transfer students each year. The university is heavily involved in ensuring through a state-approved Transfer Module (general education) and Transfer Assurance Guides (undergraduate majors) that students from other public institutions in Ohio (two-year and four-year) may transfer seamlessly and have credit accepted and applied. This process is underway; the university has assumed a leadership role at the state level; and the application of transfer credit will become an increasingly important part of enrollment and student progress. Attention to established, and perhaps new, formal arrangements—notably with two-year community colleges—is likely to need careful planning.
• “Swift implementation of a functioning “Continuous Quality Improvement” program, which will be made possible by a partnership with the Ford Motor Company”

Lessons learned from such partnerships have been very useful and have been translated, at the institutional level, through a new round of program review for both academic and academic support units. Based on the highly successful process at Northwestern University, these reviews began in 2004. Administered through the Office of Academic Affairs, they are data-driven, analytic, issues-oriented reviews, completed in six- to nine-month periods and supplemented with an external review team assessment. In addition, the role of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning has been enhanced considerably. Data of various types are provided to the academic and academic support units on a regular basis for short-term and long-term planning purposes. This is discussed more fully with regard to Criterion Two: Preparing for the Future. And, as noted with regard to Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching, the specification of goals and objectives for academic programs, specification of how they are being achieved, and use of that information in curricular planning, is being implemented throughout the university.

• “Preparing undergraduate students to become global citizens and developing additional opportunities for ‘study abroad’ experiences.”

The university has been, and remains, committed to this recommendation. There is an “international” component to the general education curriculum and a growing number of students interested in undergraduate major programs with such an emphasis, notably in the interdisciplinary undergraduate major in international studies (almost 800 majors), and in programs in Social and Behavioral Sciences, Humanities, Education and Human Ecology, and Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences, among others. In addition: there are six “area studies” centers; a well-known and respected Foreign Language Center; and the recently developed state-of-the-art World Media and Culture Center (Hagerty Hall).

With regard to study abroad, participation has grown dramatically over the past decade. Approximately 1,800 students now study abroad annually (a threefold increase over the decade) of whom 85% are undergraduate students. Today 19% of undergraduate students study abroad during their career at the university—up from less that 10% a decade ago. The university president has suggested that this proportion should be significantly higher.

The Office of International Affairs (OIA) reports to the executive vice president and provost and includes an International Education division. This office currently is undergoing leadership change. To help with that process, in January 2007, the university president established a university-wide International Programs Task Force charged with outlining a vision for the university in this area. Its deliberations will include the role of undergraduate educational opportunities. It will issue a progress report in May 2007.
MAJOR CHANGES SINCE THE 1997 RE-ACCREDITATION REVIEW

The past 10 years have been characterized by dramatic institutional change.

Through the terms of three university presidents—E. Gordon Gee (1990-98), William E. Kirwan (1998-2002), and Karen A. Holbrook (2002-2007)—and three provosts—Richard J. Sisson (1993-1998), Edward J. Ray (1998-2003), and Barbara R. Snyder (2003-2007)—the university has undertaken a set of institution-wide initiatives related to the internal goal of continuously improving, and thus strengthening, the various components of its academic mission. The initiatives have been shaped substantially by two major events.

- In 2000, following an elaborate, yearlong, highly consultative process, the university established an Academic Plan. This plan has provided the framework for virtually all aspects of institutional planning and has become embedded within the culture of the university. The plan focuses on six strategies:
  - Build a world-class faculty.
  - Develop academic programs that define Ohio State as the nation’s leading public land-grant university.
  - Improve the quality of the teaching and learning environment.
  - Enhance and better serve the student body.
  - Create a more diverse university community.
  - Help build Ohio’s future.

Each strategy has a set of supporting actions. “Strategic indicators” (metrics) for each component of the plan are produced and published annually for the institution and for each of its colleges.

- In 2003, following more than five years of internal discussion, budget restructuring was implemented.

Following two decades of variability in the state subsidy for higher education, including years with no budget increases (“flat” budgets) as well as years with budget decreases, the university responded with various “cost containment” (1986-87), “strategic planning” (1987-90), and “early retirement” initiatives (1985, 1988, 1991). Then discussions began to address, more fully, a rethinking of internal allocations of funds.

The result was the establishment of a process that:
  - specified the academic colleges as the budget “centers” within the university;
  - rebased budgets to better reflect enrollment patterns (resulting in a reallocation of funds, for example, from selected professional and health sciences colleges to selected arts and sciences colleges); and then
  - established more detailed annual budgeting practices and procedures.

This new approach has given considerable budgetary control to the 18 academic colleges in what is an already highly decentralized institution. The approach has also brought with it increased transparency in budget decision making at all levels, and has included monitoring on an annual basis by the central administration and the University Senate’s relevant committees.
Together these two important initiatives, supported by enhanced use of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning, have shaped many of the activities that are highlighted throughout this report. Examples include:

- With regard to the research mission and its related activities: continued efforts to focus the academic mission through “selective investment” and “targeted investment in excellence” programs; the creation, abolition, and alteration of selected academic units; a new round of regular academic and academic support program reviews; establishment of new categories of faculty (regular clinical-track faculty outside the health sciences, and research-track faculty); enhanced interdisciplinary work as evidenced by new centers, institutes, and academic programs; and, most notably perhaps, highly successful efforts to increase external research funding—all leading to improved national rankings for the university.

- With regard to the instructional mission: the move to year-round “selective admissions” of undergraduate students that has raised dramatically the academic credentials of the freshman class; a wide array of efforts to strengthen the undergraduate experience, leading to substantial improvements in first-year retention and time to degree; and a detailed review of the general education curriculum. Undergraduate education will continue to receive careful attention. Now attention is turning to a parallel examination of graduate and professional education.

- With regard to outreach: the establishment of the vice president for university outreach and the Office of University Outreach and Engagement to help coordinate and nurture ongoing activity and help identify institutional directions.

- With regard to the regional campuses: a Presidential Commission on the Regional Campuses (2002) recommended tighter integration of these campuses with the Columbus campus in “systemic terms” and the need to confront longer-term issues such as programmatic expansion.

These examples demonstrate the many ways this university has been involved in a decade of “continuous self-study” to enhance excellence in its academic mission, all within the framework of the Academic Plan and the new budgeting model. The remainder of this report organizes and analyzes such activities around the criteria for re-accreditation.
### Selected Comparisons: A Statistical Summary of Then and Now

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment (Columbus Campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>35,647</td>
<td>38,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Baccalaureate Professional</td>
<td>2,724</td>
<td>3,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>9,907</td>
<td>10,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Men</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Non-Ohio Residents</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Students of Color</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% International Students</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Student Profile</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average ACT Composite</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average SAT Combined</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>1198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative % in 10%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative % in top 25%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First-Year Retention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minority Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Six-Year Graduation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minority Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty and Staff</strong> (FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>2,920.6</td>
<td>3,008.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>1,000.1</td>
<td>1,455.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Faculty</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>193.5</td>
<td>412.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Professional Staff</td>
<td>8,054.1</td>
<td>12,967.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>5,520.5</td>
<td>5,334.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Employees</td>
<td>5,501.0</td>
<td>5,012.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$1.61 billion</td>
<td>$3.76 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriations as a % of Revenue</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees as a % of Revenue</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$1.59 billion</td>
<td>$3.72 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditures</td>
<td>$289 million</td>
<td>$652 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuition and Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>$3,660</td>
<td>$8,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>$5,187</td>
<td>$9,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>$767.7 million</td>
<td>$2.02 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Space (in square feet)</td>
<td>404,726</td>
<td>465,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Space (in square feet)</td>
<td>1,895,200</td>
<td>2,112,335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The 2006 staff totals include new staff members from three additional hospitals that are now part of the OSU Medical Center.*
THE SELF-STUDY PROCESS

Planning for the self-study process began in April 2004. The university president and executive vice president and provost met, reviewed the Higher Learning Commission’s (HLC) revised criteria for accreditation, and initiated a process to be followed.

The process was administered through the Office of Academic Affairs and began formally in 2005. A Faculty Fellow, Professor Stephanie Davidson (Department of Speech and Hearing Science) was appointed to oversee activities. She led a five-member coordinating team, appointed to facilitate data collection and report preparation, that met weekly.

She also led a 15-member steering committee, representing a broad cross section of faculty, staff, students, and administrators, that was appointed and met approximately monthly from January through September 2006, and then approximately biweekly through March 2007. It served to:

- provide an avenue of communication between the coordinating team and constituents across the university (faculty, staff, students, administrators);
- review and provide comment on the self-study goals and process, and on the documentation proposed to demonstrate compliance with the criteria for accreditation; and
- evaluate and provide suggested revisions to drafts of the self-study report.

The committee proposed that the goal was to produce a self-study report that would:

- present evidence of the university’s compliance with all of the Higher Learning Commission’s criteria;
- provide a comprehensive, objective, and evidence-based review of the university’s current strengths and challenges and, where appropriate, suggest next steps; and
- contribute valuable information to the university’s ongoing planning and improvement processes.

It was decided to organize the re-accreditation self-study into two main parts—one focusing on the university’s compliance with the HLC’s Criteria for Accreditation, and another focusing on a special emphasis on graduate and post-baccalaureate professional education—a topic being addressed by two university-wide committees. In this way, the institution was able to align the re-accreditation process with an important topical matter, and in so doing engage the university community in a discussion of the topic. A College Special Emphasis Liaison Committee was appointed in spring 2006 to facilitate each academic college’s participation in the Special Emphasis. This committee included one or two faculty from each college, appointed by the dean. The college liaisons led the process at the local academic levels and reported their results to the steering committee.

Professor W. Randy Smith, vice provost for academic programs, Office of Academic Affairs, was involved throughout the process, as member of both the coordinating team and the steering committee, and interacted regularly with the university’s liaison at HLC.
MAKING THE CASE FOR ACCREDITATION

Through the self-study process, Ohio State has gained a better understanding of its strengths and its opportunities for improvement. This report provides a thorough and accurate overview that:

- provides evidence of the university’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation and the associated Core Components;
- demonstrates the many ways that Ohio State is future-oriented, learning-focused, connected, and distinctive; and
- identifies opportunities for improvement related to the Criteria for Accreditation and graduate and post-baccalaureate professional education.

We believe we meet the Commission’s requirements for re-accreditation and respectfully request re-accreditation for a 10-year period.
Chapter Two

Criterion One:
Mission and Integrity

Criterion Two:
Preparing for the Future
The Ohio State University uses its mission and planning activities to ensure that it constantly moves toward its overarching goal of becoming one of the world’s truly great universities. Over the past decade, a new Academic Plan and a new budgeting model were developed and implemented. They provide the foundation for much that we do; therefore, Criterion One and Criterion Two are intricately linked at the university and presented together in this chapter.
“Our highest priority at Ohio State is to fulfill our promise to our students—undergraduate, graduate, and professional—through teaching and learning, research and scholarship, and service and engagement, as defined in our Academic Plan. Our promise to them is to be recognized as one of the world’s great public research and teaching universities to benefit our state and the nation.”

State of the University Address
Delivered by Dr. Karen A. Holbrook
President, The Ohio State University
September 29, 2005

In 2000, following a highly consultative process led by then-President William E. Kirwan, the Board of Trustees approved the Academic Plan. Its development and implementation represent a significant step since the 1997 re-accreditation. It is a unique document that unites Ohio State’s purpose, core values, and vision for the future with a strategic plan directed toward achieving our overarching goal of becoming one of the world’s truly great universities. This vision stands today as the guiding conceptual framework for the strategies and initiatives outlined in the Academic Plan itself. It also reflects the values and aspirations of a broad cross section of the university community and its external constituencies.
University Vision

Purpose
To advance the well-being of the people of Ohio and the global community through the creation and dissemination of knowledge.

Core Values
• Pursue knowledge for its own sake.
• Ignite in our students a lifelong love of learning.
• Produce discoveries that make the world a better place.
• Celebrate and learn from our diversity.
• Open the world to our students.

Overarching Goal
The Ohio State University will be among the world’s truly great universities.

Future
The Ohio State University will be recognized worldwide for the quality and impact of its research, teaching, and service. Our students will be able to learn and to advance knowledge in all areas. As a 21st-century land-grant university, The Ohio State University will set the standard for the creation and dissemination of knowledge in service to its communities, state, nation, and the world. Our faculty, students, and staff will be among the best in the nation.

Academic excellence will be enriched by an environment that mirrors the diverse world in which we live. Within this environment, we will come to value the differences in one another along with the similarities, and to appreciate that the human condition is best served through understanding, acceptance, and mutual respect. Throughout the learning process, our faculty and staff will find the highest levels of fulfillment and satisfaction as they collaborate to educate and support a student body recognized for its scholarship and integrity.

Students will have the opportunity to learn on our campuses or from locations around the world through the innovative use of technology. The quality of our physical facilities and grounds will be consistent with our world-class status. Extracurricular activities will support the personal growth of all members of our community. Our intercollegiate athletic programs will routinely rank among the elite few.
Graduation rates for all students will compare favorably with the nation’s best public universities. Most of all, our graduates will be among the most sought after by the world’s best employers and will become leaders in their communities and accomplished professionals in their chosen work. We will lead Ohio to a dynamic knowledge economy, and our research, widely known for its multidisciplinary programs, will help solve the most challenging social, cultural, technical, and health-related problems.

The excellence of our programs will be recognized by the highest levels of public and private support. As a result, The Ohio State University will earn an intensity of alumni loyalty and of public esteem unsurpassed by any other university.

**Six Strategies of the Academic Plan**

- Build a world-class faculty.
- Develop academic programs that define Ohio State as the nation’s leading public land-grant university.
- Improve the quality of the teaching and learning environment.
- Enhance and better serve the student body.
- Create a more diverse university community.
- Help build Ohio’s future.
The original document specified a series of “supporting initiatives” that could be accomplished during the first three to five years of the 10-year plan. In 2002, President Karen A. Holbrook embraced the plan and its outcomes-based approach and further developed the plan by working with university leadership to specify a Leadership Agenda. This agenda prioritized actions and focused on those most likely to help Ohio State reach its goals.

As we move into the second five years of the plan, President Holbrook identified three areas of priority focus: 1) providing a distinctive education for our students; 2) facilitating cutting-edge interdisciplinary research; and 3) supporting 21st-century outreach and engagement. Working within the context of the plan and areas of priority focus, the executive vice president and provost defined a set of annual academic priorities and pursued strategic initiatives to drive progress. Using the 2006 academic priorities as an example, Figure 1 illustrates the intentional connection between the Academic Plan, the Leadership Agenda, and our academic priorities.

As shown, the Academic Plan serves as the driving force behind the university’s actions. The president’s Leadership Agenda and the university’s academic priorities flow from (red arrows) and support (blue arrows) the plan. As an example, one strategy is to “develop academic programs that define Ohio State as the nation’s leading public land-grant university.” This strategy is supported by the Leadership Agenda’s priority to “provide distinctive educational experiences and opportunities for students.” This, in turn, is supported by a specific academic priority for 2006 to “complete a university-wide review of undergraduate education.”

![Diagram](image.png)

**Figure 1. Relationship between the Academic Plan, the Leadership Agenda focus areas, and academic priorities**
UNDERSTANDING, VALUING, AND PURSUING OUR MISSION (Core Component 1c)

“The aims of our Academic Plan all point to one overarching goal: we want Ohio State to be the premier public land-grant research university in the nation.”

State of Academic Affairs Address
Delivered by Ms. Barbara Snyder
Executive Vice President and Provost
January 12, 2006

The Academic Plan is readily available to both internal and external constituent groups and is prominently displayed in numerous sections of the Ohio State web site (home page for Academics, Research, Outreach, and Faculty/Staff.) As seen in the various quotations throughout this document, the plan is routinely acknowledged in speeches by the president, the executive vice president and provost, and others in leadership positions.

The Academic Plan has also achieved prominence due to its importance to the campus-wide benchmarking and strategic planning process. The plan includes a candid acknowledgement of the university’s current position among other large, public institutions and identifies a set of nine “aspirational” peers, or benchmark institutions. These institutions are public, comprehensive research universities ranked higher than Ohio State academically, similarly structured, and are the institutions whose successes we most want to emulate.

This set of benchmark universities is the basis for comparison data reported in the Academic Plan Scorecard and Report on Strategic Indicators. Annually, each of the 18 colleges is asked to measure and report contributions to meeting the goals of the Academic Plan. These contributions are captured by the College Academic Quality Indicators (Figure 2). Colleges not only report on common indicators, such as faculty honors and awards, but they also report on agreed upon unique indicators for the college. For instance, the College of the Arts reports on faculty performances and exhibits as a unique indicator for “build a world-class faculty” and on the number of its public events as a unique indicator for “help build Ohio’s future.” The College of Dentistry, on the other hand, uses the amount of National Institutes of Health (NIH) funding as one of its unique indicators for “build a world-class faculty” and the number of patient visits to its clinic as a unique indicator for “help build Ohio’s future.” The use of specialized indicators allows each college’s faculty to understand that they contribute to the Academic Plan in distinctive ways.

Academic support units (such as Student Affairs, Student Financial Aid, University Registrar) also report on their contributions to the Academic Plan as captured by the Academic Support Unit Indicators (Figure 2). Business and Finance, for instance, measures the percentage
of undergraduates who feel safe on campus, and Student Affairs measures student satisfaction with life in the residence halls. As is the case with the unique indicators used in each college, the Academic Support Unit Indicators demonstrate to staff across the university their unique contribution to the goals of the plan.

The university has experienced considerable success in each of the components of the Academic Plan. Indeed, those components align well with the Higher Learning Commission’s Core Criteria and examples of success are discussed in each section of this report and are reflected in the Academic Plan Scorecard.

Because of the Academic Plan’s ubiquitous presence in all planning and budgetary activities for the colleges and support units, faculty, staff, and students in positions of leadership across the university understand the plan and consistently use it for strategic planning and decision making. Specific examples are detailed below.

The effect on faculty of the visibility of the Academic Plan on the web site and in speeches is not directly known, but the 2004-2005 HERI Faculty Survey indicated that 86.3 percent of faculty felt that the institution’s national image was an issue “of high or highest priority”—the highest percentage assigned to any issue. This finding suggests that most faculty are aware of Ohio State’s goal to become the nation’s premier land-grant university. As a result of the self-study, we recognize that we need to learn more about staff and student awareness of the plan, and the university needs to continue efforts to make staff and students better aware of the plan.

RECOGNIZING, RESPECTING, AND APPRECIATING DIVERSITY: CREATING A MORE DIVERSE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY (Core Component 1b)

“I’ve said often that the most important part of a university education for our students, more than simply building intellectual capacity or training them for a career in their chosen field, is to help prepare them for the world outside of our campus walls. Ohio State’s motto is ‘Education for Citizenship’ in our community, state, nation, and the world, and to be that kind of citizen our university must offer a learning environment that mirrors the diverse, global world in which we live.”

Karen A. Holbrook, President
“Scientists rightly argue that we must protect natural resources like the world’s rain forests because their rich and largely unexplored biodiversity holds great promise for medical advances. In a similar way, I believe that we need to protect the rich social diversity of our species and act on the assumption that every culture and every individual has, or may have, important gifts that can benefit us all. We as educators have the professional duty to seek out their gifts and talents wherever they can be found and to nurture them.”

Mac Stewart, Vice Provost and Chief Diversity Officer

The Diversity Plan

Diversity has long been a focal point and a priority at the university, as well as a source of pride given the university’s role in enhancing diversity among faculty, staff, and students. In January 1999, the president and executive vice president and provost charged a committee of administrators, faculty, and staff to develop an action plan to assist Ohio State in achieving its goals related to diversity. The work of that committee led to the development of the 2000 Ohio State Diversity Action Plan, created in close coordination with the Academic Plan.

The Diversity Plan articulates a set of six objectives and a set of strategies for achieving each objective. The plan is updated annually by the university’s Diversity Council, a group appointed by the president. Each year, all academic and vice presidential units provide information regarding progress made in meeting the goals of the plan. This information is analyzed by the Diversity Council, which issues a report of its findings to the university community.

Through the efforts of the university’s Diversity Council and its partners, significant progress has been made. Tangible evidence of this progress can be seen in the creation and expansion of environments that celebrate and support diversity such as the Women’s Place, the Multicultural Center, and the Bell Resource Center on the African American Male, and in the increasing research and scholarship devoted to issues of diversity through programs such as the President’s and Provost’s Diversity Lecture Series and through the creation of the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity.

Objectives of the Diversity Action Plan

- Create a supportive environment that is welcoming for all individuals.
- Recruit and retain greater numbers of women and minorities into faculty, staff, and administrative positions (including deans, chairs, and vice presidents).
- Recruit, retain, and graduate greater numbers of ethnic minority students.
- Provide incentives to academic and academic support units for developing models of excellence for increasing diversity.
- Collect and organize data to systematically and effectively assess progress and to align/realign programs intended to enhance diversity.
- Assign accountability to achieve the progress envisioned in this action plan.

Council on Diversity Annual Reports
Further evidence of Ohio State’s commitment to diversity can be found in its ongoing efforts to track progress and outcomes. A detailed assessment of diversity planning and progress across colleges is completed annually and reported in the Council for Diversity’s Annual Reports—see, for example, the reports for 2005 and 2006. The Academic Plan also mandates ongoing tracking and assessment of progress in creating a diverse university community and environment via strategic indicators for faculty, staff, and students. A 2000 to 2006 comparison of the Academic Plan Strategic Indicators is shown in Figure 3. As can be seen, the scorecard tracks a number of diversity outcomes, such as the percentage of minority faculty, staff, and students on campus, as well as graduation rates for minority students.

One of the many positive trajectories that can be seen in the scorecard is the improvement in first- to second-year persistence (or freshman retention rate) among African Americans; this figure has climbed from 74% to 88% (based on the 1998 to 2005 cohorts).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategic indicator</th>
<th>Ohio State</th>
<th>Benchmark Average</th>
<th>Change in Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUILD A WORLD-CLASS FACULTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006 Scorecard</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Market Share of Publications (1996-98 vs 2002-2004)</td>
<td>2000 Scorecard</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006 Scorecard</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Market Share of Citations (1996-98 vs 2002-2004)</td>
<td>2000 Scorecard</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006 Scorecard</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006 Scorecard</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Average Faculty Compensation (FY 2000 vs FY2006)</td>
<td>2000 Scorecard</td>
<td>$70,354</td>
<td>$72,330</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006 Scorecard</td>
<td>$89,162</td>
<td>$90,595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in Gap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($543)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINE OHIO STATE AS THE LEADING PUBLIC LAND-GANT UNIVERSITY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. U.S. News Academic Reputation Score (1999 vs 2006)</td>
<td>2000 Scorecard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NRC Academic Ph.D. programs among the top 25% (1992)</td>
<td>2000 Scorecard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. The Academic Plan Scorecard—2000 to 2006
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategic indicator</th>
<th>Ohio State 2000 Scorecard</th>
<th>Ohio State 2006 Scorecard</th>
<th>Benchmark Average 2000 Scorecard</th>
<th>Benchmark Average 2006 Scorecard</th>
<th>Change in Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the Quality of the Teaching and Learning Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. % of Faculty Satisfied Overall (1999 vs 2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. % of Students Satisfied with Instruction and Courses (1998***)</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. % of Students Satisfied with Campus Facilities (1998***)</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. % of Seniors Satisfied with Quality of Educational Experience (2004)</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. % of Seniors Satisfied with Class Size (2004)</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. % of Seniors Satisfied with Quality of Instruction (2004)</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. % of Seniors Satisfied with Relationships with Faculty (2004)</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance and Better Serve the Student Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. % of Freshmen in the Top 10% of H.S. Class (1999 vs 2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Freshman Retention Rate (1998 vs 2004 cohorts)</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Six-year Graduation Rate (1993 vs 1999 cohorts)</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Average GMAT score for M.B.A. students (1999 vs 2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td>638</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Average GRE verbal score for graduate students (1998 vs 2005)**</td>
<td></td>
<td>527</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Average GRE quantitative score for graduate students (1998 vs 2005)**</td>
<td></td>
<td>628</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Average GRE analytic/writing score for graduate students (1998 vs 2005)**</td>
<td></td>
<td>610</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. % of Students Satisfied with Student Support Services (1998**)</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. % of Seniors Satisfied with Quality of Academic Advising (2004)</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a Diverse University Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. % of Women Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty (1997 vs 2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. % of African American, Hispanic, and Native American Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty (1997 vs 2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. % of Minority Staff (1997 vs 2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. % of African American and Hispanic Students (1998 vs 2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. African American Freshmen Retention Rate (1998 vs 2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hispanic Freshmen Retention Rate (1998 vs 2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>-11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. African American 6-Year Graduation Rate (1998 vs 2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hispanic 6-Year Graduation Rate (1998 vs 2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Build Ohio’s Future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of Invention Disclosures (1998 vs 2004)</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of Start Up Companies (1998 vs 2004)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Revenue from Income Generating Licenses (1998 vs 2004)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.8 M</td>
<td>$0.6 mil</td>
<td>$7.3M</td>
<td>$17.5 mil</td>
<td>$11.4M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 (continued). The Academic Plan Scorecard—2000 to 2006
Diversity in the Student Body. Progress on diversity is evaluated by comparisons with our designated benchmark universities (Figure 4). With regard to percentage of minority students, we place 7th among the 10 institutions¹. This appears to be due to relatively low enrollments of Asian and Hispanic students. Ohio State does very well in the enrollment of African American students.

A closer examination of the data, however, demonstrates that the university compares favorably to its Midwest benchmarks, where the proportion of Asian and Hispanic students is lower than in the southern and western states (Figure 5). Ohio State places 2nd among the 10 institutions¹ using this comparison.

One significant area of strength is in the number of Ph.D.s granted to minority students—Ohio State is routinely recognized as one of the top 10 institutions in the number of degrees awarded to minorities.

Diversity in the Faculty and Administrative Ranks. The proportion of women faculty has remained relatively constant over the past six years. It currently stands at 28.5%. We compare favorably with our benchmarks in this category; only two of our comparison institutions have a higher percentage of women faculty members than does Ohio State¹.

¹ Data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning
The proportion of minority faculty has increased slightly over the past six years and currently stands at 16.9%. We are slightly above the benchmark average (16.1%) and have moved from 5th place (in 2003) to 4th place (in 2005) among the institutions.1

Ohio State is committed to further improvements in the recruitment and retention of women and minority faculty and has committed resources to examine the issue and recommend next steps for moving forward (Faculty Cohort Project and the Report of the Work Group on Flexible Workloads for Tenure Track Faculty).

Diversity among Staff Members.
Staff diversity is broken into several categories—those in executive or administrative, clerical, other professional, skilled crafts, technical or paraprofessional, and service positions (Figure 8). Ohio State has a lower percentage of minority staff than the benchmark mean in every category except service positions, where the percentage is higher1.

Figure 6. A comparison of the faculty gender distribution at Ohio State and the faculty gender distribution at the benchmarks.

Figure 7. A comparison of student diversity at Ohio State and student diversity at the benchmarks.

1 Data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning
The recruitment, retention, and advancement of women and minority staff members remain issues of concern to the university. The Council on Diversity, the Office of Minority Affairs, The Women’s Place (through its Staff Leadership Series), and the University Staff Advisory Council (through its annual staff compensation and benefits recommendations and quarterly town meetings with the president) provide important avenues for improved opportunities for women and minority staff members.

Educational Access. The university’s commitment to educational access is yet another demonstration of the significance placed on creating a more diverse academic community. More than half of Ohio State students receive financial aid, and, of the six public universities in Ohio with selective admissions, it ranks 5th in the cost of tuition and fees. Moreover, of those same universities, we rank 1st in terms of financial aid as a percentage of tuition. Despite this achievement, the university intends to improve its ability to provide educational opportunities for economically disadvantaged students.

Analysis of past admissions records indicates that the ratio of the number of students who enrolled at Ohio State compared to those admitted (“yield”) was lowest among low-income students. In order to improve the matriculation rate of these students, Ohio State improved financial aid packages. For instance, it offered lower interest rate loans for these students, eliminated the difference between costs to attend the university and the aid that students received, and provided modest work study opportunities. Figure 9 shows that these changes dramatically improved the number of low-income students accepting admission to Ohio State. In fact, today, the highest “yield” is among students in the lowest income groups.

Figure 8. A comparison of staff diversity at Ohio State and the mean staff diversity among the benchmarks.

Figure 9. “Yield” as a function of student need (1998-2005). Note sharp increase in yield for the very highest-need students.
Although the changes made to date have been extraordinarily successful in improving the matriculation rate of admitted low-income students, too few low-income students apply. A new leadership position, the senior advisor for economic access, was created in 2006 to ensure that qualified students are not denied the opportunity to attend Ohio State because they lack the financial resources. This individual is responsible for developing programs to ensure economic diversity and access and for furthering the university’s efforts to educate students and their parents about the financial resources available for low-income students who want to go to college or continue into graduate and professional programs.

Student Response on the National Survey of Student Engagement. Additional evidence relative to creating a more diverse campus can also be found in the responses of our students to questions in the 2004 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE); more than half of the Ohio State respondents indicated that they had “often” or “very often”:

- included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments;
- had serious conversations with students of a race or ethnicity different from their own; and/or
- had serious conversations with students who are very different in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values.

When these results are compared to the results obtained from students at other AAU institutions, Ohio State students appear to be more advanced in their understanding of people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds. These experiences are inherently valuable and take on even more value given additional analyses that suggest a positive relationship between such experiences and students’ estimates of the university’s contribution to their learning.

A NEW SYSTEM TO ADDRESS CHANGING RESOURCE REALITIES: BUDGET Restructuring, Capital Planning, AND Development (Core Components 2a and 2b)

The key components of the university’s resource base may be summarized as follows.

- The university’s budget priorities are directly linked to and support strategic goals in the Academic Plan as outlined in the alignment of resources with strategic academic priorities and the annual current funds budget report to the Board of Trustees.
- The university’s operating budget, including auxiliary operations and the OSU Medical Center, is over $3.7 billion dollars annually, according to the current funds budget report (p. I.1).
- Over the last six years, the university’s endowment has doubled in size and currently has a value of $2 billion dollars and provides a growing source of funds for various priorities each year.
- Extramural funding for research has continued to increase, putting Ohio State above the $600 million dollar threshold for external research funding, placing the university 8th among public research universities.
- The capital planning process reflects a thorough, systematic approach to prioritizing facilities and infrastructure needs according to academic priori-

1 2004 NSSE Results (p. 3)
2 The NSSE Means Comparison Report, (2004 will be available in the resource room)
ties. The university continues to develop new sources of support and capital funding via a combination of private support, such as that obtained for the new university hotel and conference center, the Blackwell Inn; a combination of private support and state assistance such as that obtained for a large-scale renovation of the Thompson Library, the new Knowlton School of Architecture building, and the Fisher College of Business complex; and self-financed bonds repaid through user fees for the new Recreational Facility and Activity Center (RPAC).

- Efforts to ensure competitive levels of faculty compensation, that in turn attract and retain world-class faculty, have led to significant progress. According to the university’s Academic Plan Scorecard, overall average faculty compensation has improved over the last five years and is now close to the benchmark average. At the same time, there is more progress to be made as outlined in the 2006 Annual Salary Report from the Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee.

- The Office of Resource Planning provides the analytic and planning support for the university’s operating budget process as well as reports and projections based on various factors that influence revenue and expenditure levels.

Given this resource base, budget restructuring represents a critical feature of the university’s strategic efforts to leverage and enhance its resources to most effectively fulfill its mission. The established budget process (which is fundamentally a college “revenue and cost center” approach to marginal revenues and expenditures) is characterized by transparency, flexibility, and local incentives to reduce costs and generate additional revenue “by linking budgetary resources more closely to the manner in which those resources were generated” (Ad Hoc Budget Restructuring Review Committee, p. 1). With a foundation established by the Academic Plan, the budget system reflects a careful consideration of trends in external support and our strategies to diversify our revenue base to achieve our strategic goals.

At the time the new system was established, a list of potential unintended consequences of the new budget process was identified for further review by advisory committees and other members of the university community. In 2003, the University Senate Fiscal Committee was charged by the then-interim executive vice president and provost and the senior vice president for business and finance to systematically analyze the identified issues and make recommendations to prevent negative impacts. An Ad Hoc Restructuring Review Committee studied the issues and released a report in March of 2004. Examples of key issues studied and the committee’s recommendations are highlighted below.

- Enrollment-driven formulas for the distribution of state subsidy and tuition and fee revenues could potentially lower program quality by creating an incentive to cut costs by increasing class size and replacing regular tenure-track faculty with less expensive categories of instructors. The committee suggested monitoring the academic scorecard and college-specific indicators to ensure quality. The committee also recommended careful monitoring of class size as well as who is teaching the courses. This monitoring is occurring and is discussed with colleges during the biennial dialogue process.

- Budget restructuring could lead to a decrease in unique (and often expensive) opportunities available to students (such as honors courses and Freshman Seminars; interdisciplinary academic programs and research that necessitate...
negotiations across college boundaries; and study abroad). The committee noted that the data available at the time of the report (2004) revealed increases in honors courses, interdisciplinary teaching and research, and study abroad, and subsequent reviews show similar patterns.

- The incentives in the budget restructuring process may be in conflict with funding high-quality doctoral education programs. The Ad Hoc Committee Report states that this is the result of the “cap” on doctoral subsidy imposed by the Ohio Board of Regents in 1999. State subsidy for undergraduate education, M.A., and M.S. students is directly linked to enrollment at various levels of instruction and is therefore compatible with the enrollment-driven component of the new budgetary system. The doctoral subsidy funds received by the university each year, in contrast, have been decoupled from enrollment levels. The consequence of the application of enrollment-driven norms to doctoral education could be to provide an incentive to individual academic units to enlarge their incoming classes of Ph.D. students in order to increase their respective shares of subsidy funds, even though the university as a whole does not receive additional revenues in accord with increased enrollment. This issue led to the appointment of two committees, the Committee on Graduate Education and the Committee to Review the Graduate School. Each committee has released two reports and these reports play a key role in our Special Emphasis Self-Study of Graduate and Professional Education, the results of which are reported in Chapter 6.

The executive vice president and provost, the senior vice president for business and finance, and the University Senate Fiscal Committee share responsibility for monitoring the new budgetary system. Their task is to ensure that the system enhances transparency and accountability while better aligning financial incentives with academic priorities. Although budget restructuring does not resolve the university’s decreased level of financial support from the state, it does provide greater incentives for units to generate and allocate new resources consistent with the goals of the Academic Plan.

Overall, the university’s resource base has continued to expand to meet its commitments and achieve its goals, in spite of decreased state support for instruction and facilities (see Figure 10). Our ability to keep pace is due primarily to an increase in extramural funding for research, endowment income for multiple purposes, and tuition increases. The recent Productivity Report to the Ohio Board of Regents also provides a number of specific examples of steps taken in light of the state funding environment and reflects the university’s efforts to be an excellent steward of its resources.

Figure 10. Comparison of state support to tuition income for the past 20 years (*state support includes “State Share of Instruction,” “Success Challenge,” “Research Incentive (formerly known as Research Challenge),” and “Innovation Incentive” funding, and **tuition includes instructional, general, student activity, and recreation fees, and nonresident surcharge.)
At the same time, other external trends represent “threats” to our ability to enhance access and quality. Examples include:

- Increases in costs beyond the university’s direct control (such as compliance with governmental regulatory requirements—Sarbanes-Oxley, for instance, rising utility and health care costs, and regulations that limit flexibility in construction bids and contracts) add to the university’s operating and capital costs. In response, the university has implemented a number of cost-saving measures such as those included in the Productivity Report, the establishment of Your Plan for Health—a revision to current health plans designed to target wellness and prevention—and plans for the first “green” building in the history of the university.

- Tuition increases are a concern within the university and across the state and nation. Ohio State’s tuition is well below many other Ohio, publicly assisted universities (see 2007 current funds budget, p. 8). When combined with enhanced programs to promote access and the quality of the university’s academic programs, Ohio State is a tremendous value.

- Compared to the university’s benchmark institutions, although spending per full-time equivalent student is approximately 17% below the overall benchmark average as reflected in the current funds budget (p. 2), instructional spending is within 3% of the overall benchmark average; it is in support functions such as facilities and research support where the differences are most pronounced. This reflects in large part the lower level of state support for higher education, which places Ohio near the bottom of the 50 states.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) According to the Governor’s Commission on Higher Education and the Economy

PREPARING FOR A FUTURE SHAPED BY SOCIETAL AND ECONOMIC TRENDS  
(Core Component 2a)

“We could say this is a unique time, although we could say this every year as it is not clear that any time is less than unique. But the confluence of environmental issues, world issues, economic issues—in the broadest sense, from global to those at home in our state and on our campus—places additional demands on our institutions and on each of us as individuals. We are discovering that the world is “flat” and we are being challenged by other countries for our preeminent
position in the knowledge economy; that we are vulnerable to outside threats to our own land; that the United States, formerly first, is now ninth in the share of its population with at least a high school degree and only seventh in the share of the people who hold college degrees; and, as a recent *Chronicle of Higher Education* article reported, that we are in the midst of a wave of distrust of our national institutions—business, government, clergy, the legal system, and even higher education.

While there is justifiable anxiety about many issues—some under our control and some not—it places additional pressures on all of us to work collegially to continue the rise of this great university. We can be proud that Ohio State is achieving its promise, and we can be proud that the world is noticing. I look forward to another great year in pursuit of our agenda of excellence.”

---

Conclusion, President Karen Holbrook’s State of the University Address September 2005

The consideration of external social and economic trends in light of institutional capacity and mission is reflected within the university’s planning documents and strategic activities. Examples include:

*The Academic Plan.* External trends and the future operating environment were considered in the development of the plan as evident in the section titled **Setting the Stage.** The “Macro Trends” and “Funding Realities” sections include an identification and consideration of changing demographics, globalization, the increasing pace of change, the enhanced role of technology, and the funding environment. The resulting values, vision, mission, and goal statements of the university reflect this strategic
awareness of external trends and their implications for both the university and the future environment in which we will operate.

The Diversity Plan. After documenting the current state of diversity and research related to the role of diversity in higher education, the summary of the Diversity Action Committee Report from 2000 reflects the systematic and thoughtful consideration of external trends and the integral role of diversity when it stated:

“Successful achievement of the goals of this plan is important for many reasons, but prominent among them is the need to provide students with a complete and excellent education that prepares them for future work and careers in a global, multicultural world and economy.”

Responding to Better-Prepared Undergraduate Students: The Committee on the University-Wide Review of Undergraduate Education. In the mid 1990s, the university moved to selective admissions (with open admission maintained at the regional campuses) and implemented a number of research-based recruitment and retention initiatives through the Office of Enrollment Management and the First-Year Experience. As a result, there has been a steady and dramatic rise in the academic profile of entering undergraduates, their first- to second-year retention rates, and their six-year graduation rates. There have been a number of positive developments in the academic environment as well, such as increased Honors and Scholars programs, learning communities, and a newly established Undergraduate Research Office. These developments are outlined more fully under Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching.

In response to these changes, The Committee on the University-Wide Review of Undergraduate Education was named to formally examine the general education curriculum (GEC). This committee has made a number of recommendations for reforming the structure and size of the GEC to better serve the increasingly well-prepared undergraduate population—thus, the report reflects a thoughtful consideration of external trends and conditions, including the changing academic profile of the undergraduate student population at the university, as the basis for its recommendations. These recommendations are being discussed by relevant academic and curricular committees with implementation expected as soon as autumn 2007.

College Planning Documents Reflect Attention to the External Environment. At the local level, colleges and departments also demonstrate an understanding and consideration of their external environment in planning documents. The following examples demonstrate where colleges within the university consider external factors at the university and societal levels and include relevant stakeholders to accomplish planning and decision making in a changing environment.

• College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences
• College of Education and Human Ecology
USING ONGOING EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT TO INFORM STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
(Core Component 2c)

Another key development underlying the university’s progress since the last re-accreditation visit has been the continuous integration and development of data-driven, analytic decision making to enhance the quality of academic programs, support services, and overall institutional performance. An enhanced Office of Institutional Research and Planning has played an essential and increasingly important role in supporting these efforts. The collection and use of various indicators of academic quality and institutional performance reflect and have contributed to a focus on common and unique aspects of the roles faculty, staff, and students play in support of the university’s mission. Examples include:

Common and Unique Indicators: The Institutional Scorecard and College Quality Indicators. Based on the Academic Plan goals, the university has developed a time series of common and unique performance indicators at the institutional and college levels. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning, which reports directly to the provost, is responsible for tracking and reporting Ohio State’s performance relative to its strategic indicators. The Institutional Scorecard and Strategic Indicators outline trends and patterns as a means to gauge where improvement is occurring and where additional effort is required (see Figure 3, which shows trends over the six-year period that the plan has been in effect). For each college, the College Quality Indicators serve the same purpose and help to pinpoint progress and change at the college level.

Strategic Biennial Dialogues: Moving from Reporting to Collaborative Action. The Office of Academic Affairs and the colleges have moved beyond static annual reporting to enhanced collaboration and action. The university recently completed the first year of biennial dialogues, which occur between the provost and key leaders from the Office of Academic Affairs and the dean and the dean’s leadership from the college. The dialogues center on a discussion and analysis of data elements and indicators aligned with the Academic Plan and result in a short-term action plan by the college, as well as specific collaborations with central administration to take these steps over a two-year period.

Academic Program Review: A Local Perspective for Improvement. A new round of academic program review began in 2004. The Academic Program Review is directly aligned with and advances the goals and strategic focus of the Academic Plan. Academic Program Review provides a focused, program-level analysis that engages faculty, students, and staff with college and institutional leadership. The process features the expert insights of strong, external review teams who make high-impact recommendations based on team visits and unit self-studies.

Support Unit Program Review: Contributing to and Advancing Institutional Goals. Support Unit Review was initiated in 2003 and, like Academic Program Review, occurs on a rolling basis. Support Unit Review allows individuals to examine how the unit advances the goals of the Academic Plan and ways in which the units might improve services based on users’ needs. As is the case with Academic Program Review, Support Unit Reviews involve site visits by a team of prominent external experts, who are able to provide direction to the unit based on the unit self-studies and the experts’ awareness of national trends and innovations.

Council on Academic Affairs: Facilitating Academic Innovation and Progress. The Council on Academic Affairs, a standing committee of the University Senate, facilitates and supports the innovation and development of programs, academic centers, and changes in organizational structure through proposals that emerge from faculty in programs across departments and colleges at the university.
The Office of Student Affairs: Enhancing Student Growth and Development. The Office of Student Affairs, including the Council on Student Affairs—an arm of the University Senate—has an active assessment program that is used to plan and document the outcomes of programs designed to enhance student growth and development.

Institutional Assessment: Providing Support to Gauge Progress and Inform Change. In addition to the array of assessment plans and processes established and developing across the campuses, the university provides extensive data and analytic support to planning. Institutional Research and Planning (IR&P)—following a distributive model—coordinates and provides institutional analyses and information for strategic planning and evaluation. Examples of recent projects include: data collection and analyses for the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the HERI Faculty Survey; dissemination of data to colleges to support the biennial dialogue process; support for the committees, which examined the funding of graduate education at Ohio State; and coordination of the National Research Council (NRC) Data Collection—with our director of institutional research and planning serving as a member of the NRC Data Panel.

Assessment of Learning Outcomes: Measuring and Improving the Impact of Academic Programs. Key components of the university's assessment and improvement activities are related to measuring student learning outcomes. These activities are detailed in the discussion of Criterion Three. In brief, they involve university-wide initiatives as well as assessment activities targeted specifically at the General Education Curriculum (GEC) and major programs. Notably, Ohio State is one of only a very few public research universities in the entire nation participating in these national initiatives designed to better assess and improve student learning, as well as integrate practices and experiences to enhance student success. The university also plays key roles in the State of Ohio's Student Success Plan Initiative and the Ohio Learning Network (both discussed in Chapter 3). In combination, all of these strategies reflect the use of diverse methods and support the exploration and understanding of various dimensions of student learning and development. This multi-dimensional, multi-method approach and our analysis of this growing array of learning-centered assessment information reflects and builds upon our culture of research and critical inquiry as the surest means to improve. This puts Ohio State in a unique position to accelerate student success for years to come.

FULFILLING THE MISSION THROUGH STRATEGIC PLANNING (Core Component 2d)

The development and implementation of the Academic Plan and the overall planning process occur via shared governance. As mentioned previously, the university has adopted a “cascading indicators” scorecard approach to collecting, reporting, and using quality indicators. The institutional and college indicators demonstrate the linkage and alignment of strategic goals across levels of leadership and operations within the university. Examples include the following.

- Academic units are required to draft and adopt explicit organizational and procedural guidelines in the form of a Pattern of Administration (POA) as well as standards and guidelines for promotion and tenure (P&T). These documents support the Academic Plan and reflect a commitment to the teaching, research, and service dimensions of the university’s mission. Some examples of these documents include:

  Ohio State Lima Campus
College of Pharmacy
College of Humanities (includes promotion and tenure guidelines)
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

- Alignment of mission and goals is evident in college and regional campus strategic plans and other planning documents and activities. Increasingly, curriculum, program, and course proposals refer to their place within the Academic Plan and how the proposal is aligned with or supports the university’s mission. Examples include:
  - College of the Arts
  - College of Engineering (institute proposal)
  - Fisher College of Business
  - Marion Regional Campus
  - Office of Student Affairs

- The Leadership Agenda outlines specific action steps aligned with the Academic Plan. Recently, these foci include providing a distinctive undergraduate education to our students, developing cutting-edge interdisciplinary research, and achieving excellence in graduate education.

- Academic program reviews, college annual reports, and the new biennial dialogues are framed by the Academic Plan goals and utilize common data sources and information.

**FULFILLING THE MISSION AND PLANNING THROUGH EFFECTIVE AND COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE**
(Core Component 1d)

The administrative structure is quite similar to what existed at the time of our last re-accreditation in 1997. It continues to be characterized by a high level of decentralization in routine programmatic and financial decision making. The new budgeting process has only served to reinforce that characteristic.

**University Leadership**

- **The Board of Trustees.** The Ohio State University is governed by a 17-member Board of Trustees who is responsible for oversight of academic programs, budgets and general administration, and employment of faculty and staff. Fifteen of the trustees are voting members and are appointed for nine-year terms by the Governor, after approval of the Ohio Senate. The other two members are non-voting student members, appointed for two-year terms by the Governor. The Ohio Revised Code gives final authority and responsibility for the overall direction and policies of The Ohio State University to the Board of Trustees. It should be noted that the 15-member board reflects a recent increase from a nine-member board. The decision to increase the number of trustees from nine to 15 was made at the state level; the newly structured board is currently examining its governance and operations.

- **President** Karen A. Holbrook is the chief executive officer for the university. Her responsibilities include development, implementation, and oversight
Executive Vice President and Provost Barbara R. Snyder serves as the chief academic officer for the university. In that capacity she is responsible for the administration, coordination, and development of all academic functions. Assisting Provost Snyder in the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) are six vice provosts, each with specific functional responsibilities (a more detailed listing of the roles and responsibilities of each of the OAA officers can be found at “About the Office of Academic Affairs”). In January 2007, Provost Snyder accepted the position of president at Case Western Reserve University effective July 1, 2007.

Eight vice presidents oversee focused areas of university operations. Each of these vice presidents is responsible for major operational units and is assisted by one or more assistant/associate vice presidents.

- The Senior Vice President for Business and Finance, Mr. William J. Shkurti, is the senior administrator for the Office of Business and Finance. His office is responsible for numerous units that support Ohio State’s financial and business operations, as well as the infrastructure and facility maintenance services that serve the nearly 100,000 students, faculty, and staff who are part of The Ohio State University community.

- The Senior Vice President for Research, Dr. Robert McGrath, is the senior administrator for the Office of Research. His office has oversight for numerous major research centers located across campus as well as offices associated with facilitating the research activities of faculty, staff, and students.

- The Senior Vice President for University Relations, Mr. Curt Steiner, is the leading administrator for University Relations. Mr. Steiner’s office oversees the functions associated with internal communications as well as the federal, state, and local government relations functions of the university.

- Two of the vice presidents—the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences (Dr. Fred Sanfilippo) and the Vice President for Agricultural Administration and University Outreach (Dr. Bobby Moser) oversee large academic areas (the Medical Center and the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences, and Outreach, respectively). These vice presidents report directly to the president; however, because of their academic responsibilities, they also interact regularly with the executive vice president and provost.

- The Vice President for Student Affairs is the senior administrator for the Office of Student Affairs. Mr. Richard Hollingsworth is currently serving a one-year appointment in this position. The Office of Student Affairs is responsible for many of the “outside-the-classroom” aspects of the student experience.

- The Vice President for Development, Dr. James Schroeder, is the senior administrator for the Office of Development. The development office organizes and coordinates all fund-raising programs for the university. Development funds represent an increasingly important component of both the central budget and the budgets of individual academic departments; therefore, the vice president works closely with the university president and the college deans.

of policies and planning for all academic and academic support units. Dr. Holbrook became Ohio State’s 13th president in October 2002. She will retire in June 2007. Her May 2006 Letter to the Board of Trustees provides data that supports her many important accomplishments to date.
• The Vice President for Legal Affairs and General Counsel, Mr. Christopher Culley, is the senior administrator for the Office of Legal Affairs. The Office of Legal Affairs seeks to advance the mission of the university by providing counsel toward sound decision making in all areas of instruction, research, and service.

Each of the 18 academic colleges and the four regional campuses is under the direction of a dean who is typically supported by one or more assistant/associate deans and fiscal officers. They are organized into four clusters—the arts and sciences colleges (Arts; Biological Sciences; Humanities; Mathematical and Physical Sciences; Social and Behavioral Sciences) the professional colleges (Business; Education and Human Ecology; Engineering; Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences; Law; and Social Work) the health sciences colleges (Dentistry; Medicine; Nursing; Optometry; Pharmacy; Public Health; and Veterinary Medicine) and the regional campuses (Lima; Mansfield; Marion; and Newark). Each cluster has an executive dean, in all but two cases (arts and sciences and health sciences), drawn from the deans in the cluster.

Each college and regional campus has responsibility for its own routine personnel, academic program, and financial decisions, and each reports to the senior vice president and provost. The academic support units have their leadership, who report to the relevant vice president. They also have responsibility for their own routine personnel and financial decisions.

Faculty, Staff, and Student Governance

Ohio State has a long tradition of faculty, student, and staff governance. The faculty and students delegate responsibility for their input to university-wide policy and planning issues to their elected representatives on the University Senate—the main legislative body in the university. Students and staff members have additional governance structures. Each of these structures is briefly outlined below; further information is available from the corresponding web sites.

• The University Senate is a body of 135 members representing three constituencies: faculty (who hold the voting majority), administration, and students. The 70 faculty members, comprising the Faculty Council, represent faculty of the 18 colleges, the University Libraries, the Military Sciences, and the four regional campuses. These senators are elected by their colleagues to serve a three-year term. The 24 members of the administration include the president, who serves as presiding officer of the Senate, the 18 college deans, the executive vice president and provost, senior vice president for business and finance, senior vice president for research, vice provost and dean of the Graduate School, and the director of University Libraries. The 41 student representatives include 26 from the Undergraduate Student Government, 10 from the Council of Graduate Students, and five from the Inter-Professional Council. Students serve one-year terms and can be re-elected.

The faculty has delegated to the Senate the power to establish educational and academic policies and to establish, abolish, and alter educational units and programs of study. The Senate may also review and react to issues relating to the rights, responsibilities, and concerns of faculty, students, and staff. Most Senate actions are subject to the authority of the Board of Trustees. The Senate functions through its 20 committees and councils, subject to university rules. All faculty members of the Senate (the Faculty Council) are on
at least one Senate committee. Typically, one or more senior administrators work closely with each committee. Regular meetings of the entire Senate are scheduled at least seven times during the academic year and are open to all members of the university community.

- **Undergraduate Student Government (USG)** is an organization consisting of elected and appointed students who represent the undergraduate student body. USG works to create and improve university policies, events, and activities that benefit students. It also has a keen interest in developing and improving off-campus areas in order to provide a cleaner and safer living area for students. As with the other student government organizations, USG students serve on multiple committees and councils throughout the university and hold regular meetings, which are open to all students.

- **The Council of Graduate Students (CGS)** is the representative student body for the approximately 10,000 students enrolled in graduate programs. The council directly serves and supports graduate students and the university community in a number of ways, including: representing graduate student interests in governance through the appointment of over 200 graduate students to university committees; working closely with the Graduate School on areas of mutual interest; providing a forum for graduate student research; providing travel funds for professional development; seeking competitive compensation and benefits for graduate students; and planning special events for graduate students. The CGS holds monthly meetings, which are open to all graduate students.

- **The Inter-Professional Council (IPC)** is the representative body for the approximately 3,000 professional students in the Colleges of Dentistry, Law, Medicine, Optometry, Pharmacy, and Veterinary Medicine. IPC works within the university as the voice for professional students by appointing representatives to more than two dozen committees (University Senate, Student Health Insurance, and the Judicial Panel) and awards funding for groups, individuals, and events through its Professional Development Fund and through its Discretionary Fund. The IPC holds a general meeting each month, which is open to all students.

- **University Staff Advisory Committee (USAC)** was established in 1986 as an advisory body to the university president. Its mission is to maintain an active and participatory line of communication with the university community and to provide a forum through which university staff can raise, discuss, and make recommendations on non-academic issues. USAC is comprised of 30 Classified Civil Service, Unclassified Administrative & Professional, and Senior Administrative & Professional staff members. Since its inception, many changes have been made to better integrate USAC into the university governance operations. Today, staff members sit on 17 university committees and the USAC chair serves as a member of the president’s leadership team, is an ex-officio member of the University Senate, and has an honorary seat at the Board of Trustees meetings.

Numerous councils and committees, made up of faculty, students, and sometimes staff, exist both within and outside the University Senate governance structure. These councils and committees share responsibility for the fulfillment of the Academic Plan and assist administrators in their day-to-day activities and their collaborative work with faculty, staff, and students. This continuing effort is commonly referred to as “shared governance.” A number of these bodies focus on curricular issues, an area in which
faculty play an essential role. Examples of these other university committees and councils include:

- **College Curriculum Committees**
- **Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee**
- **Arts and Sciences Senate**
- **Council on Academic Affairs** (University Senate)
- **Committee on Academic Misconduct** (University Senate)
- **Council on Enrollment and Student Progress** (University Senate)

**Collaborative Communication**

The large size and decentralization of Ohio State necessitates an active and systematic communication process through designated reporting lines. Typical reporting lines in academic units extend from the faculty to the department/school chair (via regular faculty meetings), from the department/school chair to the college dean (via regular executive committee meetings), from the deans to the provost (via the Council of Deans), and from the provost to the president (via the President’s Cabinet). Likewise, typical reporting lines in academic support units proceed from staff members to the unit director, from the unit director to the relevant vice president, and from the vice president to the executive vice president and provost and/or to the president, as appropriate.

Active avenues for communication are well utilized between faculty, staff, and student governance groups and university leaders. Examples include the following.

- The president holds bi-weekly meetings with her cabinet.
- The executive vice president and provost meets monthly with the Council of Deans.
- University leaders hold open meetings with department chairs/school directors once per quarter in order to brief the chairs on university business and to hear concerns that they may have.
- University leaders hold quarterly open meetings for staff members to update them on university activities and to hear concerns that they may have.
- Leaders from the regional campuses participate in university governance—USG has student representatives from the regional campuses, regional campus deans are members of the Council of Deans, regional campus deans meet regularly with each other and with the vice provost for academic administration, and the executive dean of the regional campuses sits on the President’s Cabinet;
- The senior vice president for business and finance works closely with the Senate Fiscal Committee.
- The senior vice president for research has a formal linkage to the University Research Committee, which is a joint committee of the University Senate and the Council on Research and Graduate Studies of the Graduate School.
- The senior vice president for university relations has a formal linkage to the University Senate through the Government Affairs Committee.
- The University Senate’s Council on Student Affairs advises the vice president for student affairs on issues related to the quality of student life.
• Representatives from each of the student governance groups (USG, IPC, and CGS) sit on Senate committees.
• The University Staff Advisory Committee (USAC) chair is an ex-officio, non-voting member of the University Senate.
• The Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees has regular updates on the activities of the Council on Academic Affairs and the Council on Student Affairs.
• The Fiscal Committee of the Board of Trustees receives regular reports from the Senate Fiscal Committee.
• Faculty leaders from the University Senate meet regularly with members of the Board of Trustees about issues of concern to the campus.

As might be expected in an institution of this size, some faculty members can feel disconnected from the governance process. Data from the 2004-2005 Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) survey indicated that 42% of faculty either agreed or strongly agreed that “faculty are sufficiently involved in campus decision making.” Along similar lines, 53% of faculty reported that relationships with administration were either satisfactory or very satisfactory. At the same time, less than 12% of faculty reported that the statement, “faculty are typically at odds with administrators” was descriptive or very descriptive of Ohio State. In short, for those who have the interest and desire to participate more deeply in institutional governance, the university provides a number of opportunities to shape policies and strategic direction. As an important step, in the summer of 2006 the faculty leadership of the Senate began meeting with several vice presidents to identify key forthcoming issues and determine the process for senate engagement.

STRATEGIC ACTIVITIES: AN ENVIRONMENT OF INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT
(Core Components 2a, 2b, 2c, and 2d)

The following represent institutional and college-level examples of how the university moves from planning to action in a way that considers broader cultural and economic trends.

Targeted Investments in Excellence (TIE). Continuing and expanding the past success of Academic Enrichment and Selective Investment, which the 1997 accreditation team recognized and applauded, the university completed a new round of strategic funding of creative proposals called Targeted Investments in Excellence (TIE) in 2006. Outlined under Chapter 4, the TIE process was distinctive in a number of respects, including:

• flexibility in the form and kind of proposals considered, including a premium placed on interdisciplinary initiatives and cutting-edge research questions and societal issues;
• a commitment on the part of colleges and those submitting proposals to proceed with the projects whether or not they received some portion of the additional central funds designed to make projects move farther at a faster rate; and
• a proposal and presentation process that included evaluation by the Council of Deans and a vetting process by the President’s and Provost’s Advisory Committee.
Without question, all proposals reflect a concern for external issues and a course of action designed to pull from the strengths of the university to address a variety of challenges and issues facing modern society. These investments represent a bold course of action to accelerate our progress and leverage additional external resources in support of the university’s mission for years to come.

Creating a Diverse University Community: Enhancing Educational Access, Opportunity, and Success. As a public, land-grant university, Ohio State has a strong history of and commitment to providing access and opportunity to students, staff, and faculty. This commitment is more important than ever given the changing economic and social environment. Examples of the kinds of work being done to enhance diversity and success for all individuals and groups include the following.

- Regional campuses of The Ohio State University in Lima, Mansfield, Marion, and Newark offer open admission to high school graduates, allowing access for students who would like to attend school closer to home or who are not admissible to the Columbus campus. Once enrolled on a regional campus, a student may request a campus change to Columbus after acquiring 45 quarter hours and a minimum 2.0 cumulative grade point average. Interest in regional campuses is growing, both as a destination and as a beginning to an education culminating in Columbus. Overall enrollment on the regional campuses has increased by 15% over the past 10 years. Success as measured by graduation rates is also impressive. Seventy-one percent of Columbus campus freshmen graduate in six years compared to 58% for students who begin at a regional and then move to Columbus within two years. While the rates are quite different due to the competitive admissions process on the Columbus campus, both exceed the national six-year graduation rate of 53% for public institutions.

- The Office of Minority Affairs provides leadership and guidance on diversity issues at Ohio State for faculty, staff, and students. The office develops and coordinates programs that engage a wide range of diversity issues and topics across the university.

- The Young Scholars Program was founded in 1988 to enhance postsecondary access. The program engages students in a comprehensive program at their home schools and a summer institute with a guaranteed aid package that covers college expenses if academic achievement standards are maintained.

- The Bell Resource Center on the African American Male was established in 2006 to provide support and leadership for the success of African American male students at Ohio State. The center emerged from the Black Male Initiative and seeks to enhance the satisfaction, performance, and persistence of African American male students.

- Additional examples of programs and initiatives that support improved access and opportunity include:
  - Land-Grant Opportunity Scholarship
  - Freshman Foundation Program
  - Morrill Scholars Program
  - College Assistance Migrant Program
  - Program 60 (for seniors)
  - Office for Disability Services—Columbus Campus
    - Agricultural and Technical Institute

---

1 Data obtained from Gail Stephenoff, Director of Enrollment Management Analysis
• Lima Regional Campus
• Mansfield Regional Campus
• Marion Regional Campus
• Newark Regional Campus
• Kirwan Institute on Race and Ethnicity
• The Women’s Place
• President and Provost’s Diversity Series

Innovation to Enhance Learning. Given the growing importance of technology, the university participates in a number of locally developed and national initiatives. These initiatives are designed to leverage our expertise and capacity to use technology in innovative ways, maximize the use of limited resources, and support various facets of our educational mission. The following initiatives and developments demonstrate the cultivation of continuous, long-term benefits for the university.

• Technology Enhanced Learning and Research (TELIR) provides support for Carmen, the university’s web-based course management system, as well as consultation for innovative teaching and instructional design. The Office of Faculty and TA Development and the Younkin Student Success Center also support the enhancement of teaching and learning in ways that consider the implications of diversity, learning styles, and technology.

• Institutional infrastructure to support computing and database development via the Office of Information Technology (OIT) has led to a number of key initiatives. The Data Warehouse and eReports projects provide a growing resource for faculty, staff, and academic leaders to access information in customized formats from various temporal and organizational perspectives. Some examples include Faculty Analytics, Student Analytics, and Course Analytics, as well as resource indicators and ratios to assist planning and decision making.

• The Program in Course Redesign reflects innovative linkages between technological and pedagogical advances and leverages those sources of knowledge to redesign instruction in ways that enhance student learning and academic performance at a lower cost.

• The Knowledge Bank, Center for Knowledge Management, and OSUpro represent distinct, yet connected institutional initiatives to enhance knowledge-sharing and information exchange across traditional inter- and intra-university boundaries to foster innovation and improvement.

OPERATING WITH ACCOUNTABILITY AND INTEGRITY
(Core Component 1e)

The university strives to ensure integrity in every aspect of its operations. The sections below highlight some of the ways that accountability and integrity are ensured in our policies, programs, and relationships with others.

Integrity and Accountability through Internal Policies and Procedures. The university has numerous formal rules and policies for internal operations, including the following: university rules; faculty and student rules; rules regarding academic misconduct; rules concerning ethical research practices; operating procedures; formal statements
and practices relating to academic freedom, conflict of interest, affirmative action, and nondiscrimination; and formal policies and procedures with regard to both subsidiary businesses within the university and contractual arrangements with other organizations. Links to many of these documents are provided below.

- Bylaws of the Board of Trustees
- University Rules
- General Human Resources Policies
- Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook
- Academic Organization and Curriculum Handbook
- Rules of Governance Organizations
  - University Senate
  - Undergraduate Student Government
  - Council of Graduate Students
  - Inter-Professional Council
- Rules of the University Faculty
- Code of Student Conduct
- Graduate School Handbook
- Committee on Academic Misconduct
- Policies Related to Integrity in Research
  - Conflict of Interest or Commitment
  - Research with Human Subjects
  - Animal Care and Use
- Highlighted Formal Policies and Procedures
  - Academic Rights and Responsibilities
  - Affirmative Action, Equal Employment Opportunity, and Non-Discrimination/Harassment
  - Sexual Harassment
  - FERPA Guidelines
  - Whistleblower Policy
  - Anonymous Reporting Line

Integrity through Internal and External Review of Fiscal Operations, Academic Units, and Support Units

- Financial Oversight

As a public entity, Ohio State sets high standards of integrity for its financial oversight. These standards often exceed state and federal requirements. Over the past several years, the university has embarked on a major review of its financial practices. This review has included updating existing financial policies and financial controls, creating new policies and controls, and clarifying financial responsibilities. An example of the latter is the addition of a statement of financial responsibility in every dean’s position description.
The university continuously checks its policy compliance through audits conducted by its own internal audit team. This team reports directly to the University Board of Trustees Audit Committee. In addition, an independent firm conducts an external audit of the university each year with a formal public statement filed each year with the Attorney General and Auditor of State. The three most recent statements (2004, 2005, 2006), will be available for review in the resource room.

- **Auxiliaries**
  
  “Auxiliary” units within the university derive income from sources other than subsidy and tuition and fees. This occurs through the sale of products to the university community. These units must conform to all university policies and financial controls and are audited regularly for compliance by the university’s internal audit team.

- **Contracts**
  
  To ensure integrity in terms of contracts with any external entity, the university has established processes for reviewing and entering into any agreement. Contract specialists in the Office of Legal Affairs are available to review contracts and assist the university community on contractual matters. Signature authority is set by state statute and University Board of Trustee resolution with all large external contracts signed by the senior vice president for business and finance.

- **Academic and Support Unit Review**
  
  Ohio State’s process of academic and support unit review was detailed earlier in this chapter. It should also be noted that the university undergoes regular review of many of its units by external specialized accrediting agencies. Currently all (51) such units are fully accredited.

**REFLECTIONS AND NEXT STEPS**

The preceding analyses clearly demonstrate Ohio State’s compliance with Criterion One, Mission and Integrity, and Criterion Two, Preparing for the Future. As the university continues to grow in quality and stature, we believe additional attention should be given to the following three opportunities for improvement—the Academic Plan, the fiscal environment, and governance and decision making. In each of these areas, we provide our analysis of the current situation and seek the consultant-evaluators’ advice for moving forward.

1. **Updating the Academic Plan**

   The university has made tremendous progress in articulating its mission and in explicitly using its mission as the foundation for all that it seeks to accomplish. Nonetheless, factors such as the upcoming changes in university leadership, the evolving internal and external environments, and an increased understanding of the use of strategic indicators, indicate that the time is right to revisit the Academic Plan.
Questions

Should the university consider any revisions, additions, new emphases, or updates to the Academic Plan and the Diversity Plan in light of current progress across the plan goals and other internal and external developments?

Does the team have suggestions regarding particular indicators that can be used that would allow Ohio State to better measure the things that it truly values?

Can the team suggest strategies that could be used to enhance a broad sense of participation among all faculty and staff in the achievement of the goals of an Academic Plan?

Given Ohio State’s public, land-grant, research-extensive history and mission, what ideas, recommendations, or strategies does the team have that might enhance Ohio State’s external communication of its mission?

2. Strengthening Sources of Support and Resource Allocation Processes

In the face of decreased state support for instruction and facilities, the university has continued to expand its resource base and has also become increasingly strategic in its use of its resources as demonstrated by measurable progress on a variety of strategic priorities. To maximize our effectiveness in the current fiscal environment, Ohio State will continue to diversify its revenue base through development, extramural funding, and cost containment; monitor the effects of the new budgeting model and revise the system as needed; increase transparency in the budgeting process for faculty, staff, and students; and work with state officials and the citizens of Ohio to increase their understanding of the university’s role in developing Ohio’s economy.

Questions

Does the team have suggestions regarding the organizational structure and operations of the university that might enhance efficiency and institutional effectiveness, particularly successful strategies to enhance revenues and reduce costs?

How might the university further ensure that the benefits and intended effects of the budget system are enhanced and any unintended consequences and effects are mitigated?

Can the team suggest additional strategies that could be used to enhance the Ohio Legislature’s understanding of the role of a Carnegie RU/VU university in the state’s economy?

3. Improving Governance and Decision Making

Overall, our governance and decision making processes appear to be working well. Many faculty, staff, and students are involved at various stages of the university’s planning and decision making processes. Although serious issues regarding the university’s governance structure did not arise during the self-study process, areas to be considered include: some faculty and staff do not feel sufficiently involved in campus decision making; the University Senate is interested in further clarifying the role of faculty and how “faculty” are defined, and in how best to establish an appropriate reward structure for faculty participation; and the Board of Trustees recently increased in size and is currently examining its own governance, likely leading to adjustments to the ways in
which it relates to the university as a whole. The university will continue to evaluate and enhance these aspects of governance and decision making.

**Questions**

How are “faculty” defined for governance purposes at other institutions across the country? Are the team members aware of potential problems that can arise with evolving definitions of “faculty”?

Are the team members aware of mechanisms that can be used to encourage faculty participation in the university’s governance system? Are other public, research-extensive universities recognizing and rewarding participation in faculty governance?

As Ohio State continues to evaluate its communication systems, can the team suggest additional strategies that could be used so that faculty, and particularly staff, feel more connected with university governance and the decisions that are made?
Chapter Three  Criterion Three:  
Student Learning and Effective Teaching
Beginning in the mid-1980s and increasingly over the past decade, Ohio State has shown remarkable progress in enhancing the academic experience for an increasingly well prepared undergraduate student body. The result has been a dramatic improvement in freshman to sophomore retention rates and in graduation rates. The information in this chapter documents those changes, examines the ways in which the university is using assessment to improve student learning and teaching effectiveness, and outlines the ways in which it supports and values effective teaching. Given the university’s focus on providing distinctive educational opportunities for its students, the chapter also describes many of the unique educational opportunities Ohio State has developed for students and provides evidence to show that these experiences enhance student learning and the quality of the educational experience.
Perhaps no other component of the institution’s mission has received as much continuous attention as undergraduate education. For two decades, with the support of every president, the Office of Academic Affairs, and the many units that report to it—admissions, registrar, financial aid, First Year Experience—have addressed this issue through a variety of initiatives.

Until the mid-1980s, the university had completely open admissions—any Ohio resident who graduated from high school could attend. The limited “number” of admissions was achieved through a first-come, first-served process. In the mid-1980s, it then established admission “conditions.” Those without a complete college preparatory curriculum were required to make up deficiencies, at the university, without receiving credit toward graduation.

In 1988 two major steps were taken. “Competitive admissions” was implemented for autumn quarter. This meant that students who seemed qualified were immediately admitted; others were held on an internal wait list and then admitted by strength of high school record. The regional campuses remained open admissions, as were “off-quarters” (winter, spring, summer). In addition, the university established the Young Scholars Program, recruiting promising but underprivileged sixth-grade urban students, providing support toward ultimate admission to and success at Ohio State.

In the early 1990s, the university strengthened honors recruitment by putting institutional resources toward merit scholarships, especially for students who had qualified as National Merit, National Achievement, or National Hispanic winners.

In 1995, the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of Student Affairs partnered to establish the Committee on the Undergraduate Experience (CUE). One outcome of CUE was a program of strategic recruitment that leveraged financial aid and personalized messages for targeted students. Institutional resources were committed to the Office of Admissions (for recruitment) and the Office of Financial Aid (for strategic aid funding) to enhance the academic strength and diversity of the entering class. That same year the university began considering standardized test scores in admission criteria.

In 2002, competitive admissions was adopted in all academic quarters. In 2005, the university adopted the “Ohio State 2008 Plan,” setting aggressive profile goals for the class admitted in 2008—goals that are likely to be met in 2007.

Regional campuses remain open admissions. Students may pursue a campus change to Columbus after earning 45 credit hours and maintaining a 2.0 grade point average on the regional campus.

The results of these efforts have been dramatic. For the freshman class (typically 5,700-6,000 students), comparisons of the autumn 1997 class with the autumn 2006 class reveal:

- average ACT: 23.9 / 26.4
- average SAT: 1132 / 1198
- cumulative percentage in the top 10% of the high school class: 26 / 43
- cumulative percentage in the top 25% of the high school class: 57 / 80
• freshman to sophomore retention rate:
  all students: 79.1% / 92.0%
  African American students: 70.0% / 89.0%
  Hispanic students: 72.2% / 89.0%

• six-year graduation rate:
  all students: 57.0% / 71.0%
  African American students: 40.6% / 57.0%
  Hispanic students: 38.4% / 57.0%

Today the Office of Enrollment Services and Undergraduate Education is one of the most dynamic within the institution. It collaborates with, and has the full support of, the 18 academic colleges, the four regional campuses, and the Office of Student Affairs. Recent activities include: enhancement of the University Honors and Scholars Center; development of “learning communities” and “Scholars Programs” for students not quite eligible for honors; the establishment of the Collegium, which supports the very strongest students competing for prestigious postgraduate fellowships, graduate schools, or professional programs; and the creation of the nationally recognized First Year Experience Program and Undergraduate Research Office.

THE ACADEMIC PLAN: SETTING THE STAGE FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

Given the long-term commitment to various dimensions of undergraduate education, two of the six strategies within the Academic Plan directly address Ohio State’s continuing commitment to fulfilling its educational mission:

• Improve the quality of the teaching and learning environment
• Enhance and better serve the student body

Examples of the types of data collected and analyzed include:

• Indicators specific to improving the quality of the teaching and learning environment. For instance, undergraduate satisfaction with academic advising; the quality of relationships with faculty; quality of instruction; class size; and the entire educational experience is routinely measured, as is graduate student satisfaction with program quality, campus facilities, and student support services.

• Indicators specific to enhancing and better serving the student body such as the qualifications of undergraduate students, student retention, student success, and student safety.

To communicate progress on its strategic indicators, an Academic Plan Update is published to highlight year-by-year progress. This update is available online and is announced to the university community in various ways, including:

• OnCampus, a twice-monthly faculty and staff newspaper that is sent to more than 20,000 full- and part-time employees and 4,600 select graduate students via campus mail and is also available on the Web.

• OSU Today, a daily e-mail and web news headline service used to provide timely information to all faculty and staff with active e-mail accounts.
• Buckeye Net News, a weekly e-mail and web news service for the more than 55,000 undergraduate, graduate, and professional students on the Columbus and regional campuses.

Other efforts to disseminate information include:

• The provost’s quarterly newsletter, KeyNotes.
• The provost’s speeches to the University Senate and presentations to the Board of Trustees.
• The president’s speeches and remarks to internal and external constituencies.
• Reports from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning.

In addition, the University Senate Council on Enrollment and Student Progress receives regular updates on these activities and serves in an advisory role to the Office of Academic Affairs.

• The quality of teaching is monitored in several ways. Teaching is evaluated for all instructors in all courses, most typically through an instrument developed internally to evaluate overall instructor effectiveness, the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI). Such indicators are used routinely in annual review of faculty and graduate teaching associates (GTAs) and are an expected part of a promotion and tenure dossier. Since the last re-accreditation, the university has also instituted a requirement that all GTAs receive training and are supported during their instructional activities (see 2003 message from the Office of Academic Affairs). Course enrollment and instructor type is monitored by the Office of Academic Affairs and is used as part of the data set provided to departments in the program review process and to colleges for the biennial dialogues.

• Ongoing assessment of student learning is expected of every program and overseen through the Office of Academic Affairs. Specialized accreditation in the institution’s 13 professional and health sciences colleges provide evidence that students have achieved program-specific learning goals (see, for example, College of Engineering). Within the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences (ASC), reports from the major programs provide documentation that students are successfully achieving what is intended in their programs of study.

USING ASSESSMENT TO IMPROVE TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS (Core Components 3a and 3d)

“Public research universities like Ohio State must have institutional cohesion and develop a common culture that puts learning first. Accountability is at the heart of everything we do. We are in the business of accountability—that’s what
tests and grades and dissertation defenses are all about. We have worked for years to refine our methods of demonstrating accountability. We must become engaged in the entire educational enterprise to prepare students for school and work, foster lifelong learning, be inclusive, and connect knowledge and action.”

Ohio State is committed to effective assessment of student learning consistent with the Higher Learning Commission’s 2003 Statement on Assessment of Student Learning. Assessment is a broad-based activity that occurs at a number of levels across the university. Some assessment activities are carried out at the institutional level, others are specific to the success of our general education curriculum (GEC), and still others are specific to major program goals. Regardless of the level, assessment is viewed as an ongoing process whereby outcomes and core values are identified, evidence is collected and evaluated, and modifications are made to improve student learning (Figure 1). Examples of the types of evidence collected, the ways in which it may be evaluated, and the types of changes that might be made in order to improve student outcomes, are also shown.

**Figure 1**
University-Wide Activities Related to Student Learning. Institutionally, Ohio State has purposefully participated in three initiatives to enhance the organization’s capacity to evaluate student success and ensure that students have innovative undergraduate educational experiences that augment their learning. Examples include:

- **Formal and continuing involvement with The National Center for Academic Transformation.** Ohio State has been an active participant in initiatives of the National Center for Academic Transformation (NCAT) on course redesign. Under the guidance of Professor Dennis Pearl, introductory statistics (Statistics 135) was **redesigned** to offer students a choice of interchangeable options, or a “buffet menu,” to learn a well-defined set of course objectives. The instructional delivery options include lectures, laboratories, small group study sessions, large group active problem solving sessions, videos, individual and group projects, and various review and grading (self- or GTA-assisted) practices. Students select options based on an assessment of their learning style. Results show improved retention, lower failure rates, improved scores, and cost savings. Keys to the success of this project are the use of research-based strategies to improve objective driven learning and innovative approaches for using educational resources, including faculty and staff time and technology.

More recently (August 2006), Dr. Carolyn Jarmon, senior associate at NCAT, spoke with the academic leadership at Ohio State about “Lessons Learned” from these initiatives and discussed institutional participation in another series of course redesign projects. The university, a founding member in the **“Redesign Alliance,”** will participate in the next series of projects. Using Statistics 135 as a lead model, Ohio State plans to focus on undergraduate course redesign in science and mathematics, leveraging other ongoing science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) activities, as well as selected large enrollment courses in the social sciences, arts, and humanities.

The university’s support for course redesign is clear from its commitment to the Redesign Alliance and its work to share the success of course redesign through workshops offered by the Office of Faculty and TA Development and the Arts and Sciences Assessment Office.

- **The Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) Project.** Ohio State is an invited participant in the **CLA longitudinal study**, sponsored in part by the Lumina Foundation. This study is designed to evaluate the gains students make in their learning while at Ohio State. The CLA is an assessment instrument designed to evaluate whether students can apply knowledge and skills to “real world” problems and was developed to evaluate analytic reasoning, critical thinking, and writing. Because these skills are embedded in Ohio State’s general education learning goals and objectives, information from the study can provide an institutional-level assessment of student achievement in our General Education Curriculum.

In this pilot study, a sample of entering new first-quarter freshmen was administered the CLA autumn 2005 and will be tracked and retested two additional times during their tenure. In addition, a sample of seniors was administered the CLA spring 2006 to provide a cross-sectional comparison. The results for the cross-sectional comparison indicate Ohio State students not only had improved in the areas tested, but performed above expected levels.
after controlling for high-level entering ability. The findings provide evidence that the institution is successfully meeting its educational mission and indicate student success in achieving the learning goals and objectives for general education.

- Participation in the Ohio Board of Regents Workshops on Higher Learning Accountability Performance in Higher Education. Recently the board has endorsed outcomes-based assessment initiatives for all Ohio students and is asking that institutions statewide develop “Student Success Plans.” Critical components of these plans directly mirror those of the Higher Learning Commission’s requirements for assessment: define learning outcomes, assess student achievement, set and exceed standards, and ensure continuous improvement for general education and major programs of study. Ohio State has participated in a series of statewide workshops on assessment with presentations by the university president on “Accountability” and the Ohio State Technology Enhanced Learning Research (TELR) director of the TELR e-portfolio project. The institution showcased e-portfolios at the workshops to illustrate one approach to assessment. E-portfolio projects are guided by clearly defined learning objects or objectives in participating programs and make use of authentic assessment. Some examples of TERL ongoing e-portfolios projects include course and program evaluations in writing, design, statistics, dentistry, health sciences, and a graduate school psychology program. The increasing use of this methodology across the university provides another indication of our commitment to ensuring and improving student learning through assessment.

These examples illustrate institutional and financial commitment to ongoing assessment and improved student learning. It should also be noted that the university has strategically targeted substantial resources for programs identified in the previous re-accreditation visit as needing to make progress on assessment. These included the program of general education and major programs housed in three of the five Colleges of the Arts and Sciences (ASC): College of Biological Sciences, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, and Social and Behavioral Sciences. As noted in the statement on “Progress on Recommendations Identified in the 1997 Site Visit Team Report,” substantial progress has been made, including the establishment of an ASC Assessment Office and intranet site available to faculty, staff, and students (password protected).

Assessment of the General Education Curriculum (GEC). Consistent with the Higher Learning Commission’s Statement on General Education, Ohio State articulated a program of general education in the Arts and Sciences colleges (College of the Arts, College of Biological Sciences, College of Humanities, College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, and College of Social and Behavioral Sciences) in 1988 that has been adopted, with minor modifications, by the remaining professional and health sciences colleges with undergraduates. The program of study requires undergraduates to distribute course work across eight categories and includes learning goals and objectives related to students’ abilities to understand and appreciate diverse cultures, master multiple modes of inquiry, analyze and communicate information, and demonstrate a breadth of knowledge across the natural and social sciences, humanities, and arts (see complete category listing with related goals and objectives). The GEC has been overseen by the faculty members of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences (ASC) Committee on Curriculum and Instruction. The GEC has undergone only minor modifications through reviews in 1996 and 2003 since it was established.
In 2005, the executive vice president and provost appointed the Committee for University-Wide Review of Undergraduate Education; that committee issued a report endorsing the existing GEC goals and objectives with only minor modifications. The committee further recommended a reframed distribution approach to general education with additional distinctive educational experiences, such as cluster programs, to meet general education requirements. Discussions of specific aspects of the recommendations for curricular reform are ongoing; however, the identification of learning objectives as necessary for these experiences to be included as part of the GEC is noteworthy. The review process itself demonstrates a commitment to ongoing assessment, and the recommendations from the report support learning-based outcomes assessment as a critical component of curriculum oversight.

Two significant changes since the last re-accreditation visit (1997) and progress report (1999) have led to considerable progress in general education assessment. First, the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences were reorganized into a federation. That resulted in a revitalized and stronger ASC Committee on Curriculum and Instruction (ASC CCI), with oversight for assessment assigned to this committee. A student representative was included as were representatives from selected professional and health sciences areas. Second, the Office of Academic Affairs invested substantial resources in ASC, expressly for the purpose of assessment. Funding from the federation augmented these resources and made them permanent. This investment led to the hiring of a part-time faculty ASC assessment coordinator and the support of assessment-related activities (such as guest speakers, faculty programs). The confluence of these events led to a vigorous, more centralized approach to assessment of the general education program through the arts and sciences colleges, which deliver about 90% of the GEC.

In 2004-05 a sub-committee of the ASC CCI, constituted as an Assessment Sub-Committee, revised the 1999 General Education Plan. Goals and objectives for each GEC category were articulated for the purpose of assessment and are now required on all GEC syllabi. The statements were made public through inclusion of rationale statements on advising sheets and publicized on curriculum and advising web sites. The revised plan maintained a category review approach, but also incorporated course review based on student learning outcomes as well as use of institutional data to provide multiple levels of analyses. The chart below illustrates both the approach and types of evidence that are used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Analyses</th>
<th>Types of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall General Education Program</td>
<td>CLA (direct; value added)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(general abilities; lifelong learning)</td>
<td>NSSE (indirect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories of the GEC (category-specific learning goals)</td>
<td>ASC Exit Survey (indirect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Across courses (direct and indirect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses within GEC categories (category goals contextualized by course)</td>
<td>Various direct and indirect methods such as embedded testing and surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Assessment Subcommittee has begun implementation of course review by focusing on approximately 40 large enrollment (>1,000 students per year) GEC courses. These courses were chosen because, out of the almost 800 GEC courses available, most students choose from among these to fulfill their requirements. A few examples from the **course review process** illustrate the diversity of our assessment practices and the ways in which information is used to improve student learning.

- **Introductory Statistics 135 (Quantitative and Logical Skills category).** This course was described earlier as part of the NCAT course redesign project and is a recipient of a 2006 Effective Practice Award from the Sloan Consortium.
- **Introductory Psychology 100 (Social Science and Social Diversity categories).** This instructional program used embedded testing, rubric-based grading of reflection papers, and student opinion surveys to assess learning related to GEC goals and objectives. Students indicated they had learned relevant goals and objectives for both the Social Sciences and Social Diversity categories, but more so for the Social Science category. As a result of the findings, the curriculum was revised using a customized text to highlight areas related to social diversity, and GTAs were provided additional workshops on assessment related to social diversity. One year later, student responses indicated improved learning for goals in the Social Diversity category; direct measures of learning confirmed these observations.
- **Introductory Biology 101 (Natural Sciences category).** Instructional research by Professor Steve Rissing has shown inquiry-based methods in laboratory settings result in notable gains in student learning compared with traditional “cookbook” methods. The findings have led to changes in instructional practices to improve learning.
- **Chemistry 121-122 (Natural Sciences category).** Within the chemistry department, assessment methods in introductory courses include both embedded questions and surveys. In addition, the department is participating in the Research Experiences to Enhance Learning (REEL) National Science Foundation (NSF) sponsored project. The university will be part of a 15-member Ohio educational institution consortium to redesign chemistry courses into research-intensive programs designed to: increase student appreciation of science and entry into the discipline; increase retention in STEM fields; and generate new knowledge through student-faculty collaborative research. Extensive assessment comparing students taking or not taking the redesigned laboratory modules will occur, using multiple measures. Not only will outcomes be assessed, but new distinctive learning experiences will be offered.
- **Spanish 101-103 (Foreign Language category).** Through a sequence of courses, students are given placement tests and subsequent standardized and local proficiency tests linked to national Standards for Foreign Language Learning to demonstrate language proficiency. With placement, outcomes show 50% of the students complete their language requirements in two quarters or less. Students demonstrate learning and report positive experiences in this well-recognized instructional program. Faculty routinely review results for ongoing improvements, such as increasing inclusion of relevant cultural concepts throughout the language sequence.

Following a review of large enrollment and other representative courses across the eight categories of the GEC, courses within a category will be reviewed as a group to assess learning. In addition, student opinion information is being obtained from a newly
piloted ASC exit survey focused on learning outcomes. Results from the spring 2006 ASC exit survey indicated that only slightly more than half of graduating students were familiar with GEC goals and objectives. These goals were less well publicized when this cohort entered Ohio State, so responses to this question are expected to improve over time, concomitant with the institution’s efforts to make the goals more public. Students agreed the GEC helped contribute to their lifelong learning; however, there were notable variations regarding effectiveness across the different categories in meeting GEC goals and objectives. Faculty teaching within these distinct categories will be convened to discuss the findings and make recommendations for improving learning, as well as the appropriateness of goals and objectives.

As previously noted, the university routinely administers the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and has participated in a pilot project for the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA). These assessment mechanisms provide rich sources of information focused on student learning; findings from these assessments, along with other indicators, will be included in ongoing discussions within the ASC Assessment Subcommittee.

The assessment activities within the program of general education document a comprehensive assessment plan for general education using multiple measures with multiple levels of analyses and demonstrate that outcomes information is being collected, analyzed, and used. There is every expectation that assessment will provide an increasingly effective strategy to improve student outcomes, and new curricular reforms will be founded upon stated goals to improve student success.

Most importantly perhaps, in response to a recommendation from the recent review of undergraduate education, a new university-wide advisory committee on the GEC was established in January 2007. With nine faculty and two students drawn from across the university, this committee will report directly to the University Senate’s Council on Academic Affairs, and will conduct continuous data driven, outcomes-based review of the categories of the GEC.

Assessment of Major Programs. Assessment in major programs is decentralized, with assessment practices in the professional and health sciences colleges guided in large part by specialized accreditation (such as the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology—ABET, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education—NCATE, Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education—CCNE). The approach over the past several years has therefore been to focus on programs identified in the last re-accreditation as needing special attention—those in the Colleges of Biological Sciences, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, and Social and Behavioral Sciences. Programs in the Arts and the Humanities have also been monitored.

As is the case for assessment of the general education curriculum, assessment of major programs has been aided by the reorganization of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences into a federation and the infusion of resources targeted for assessment by the Office of Academic Affairs. Within ASC, oversight for major program assessment remains with the Arts and Sciences Colleges Committee on Curriculum and Instruction (ASC CCI). The ASC assessment coordinator helps administer cross-college activities in consultation with the chair of the ASC CCI and vice provost for academic programs. Associate deans in each of the five Arts and Sciences colleges coordinate assessment for programs within their respective colleges.

Over the last three years, the more than 70 major programs in ASC developed or revised formal assessment plans. They include statements of learning goals and objectives, methods of assessment, and a plan to use outcomes information to improve student
learning. Programs are required to submit annual reports, which include summaries of their annual assessment activities, evidence collected, how the evidence was used including resulting actions, and future planning. The first set of annual reports indicates that assessment plans are being implemented, programs have incorporated both direct and indirect measures of student learning, and many programs have used or plan to use outcomes information to inform curricular change. These results demonstrate significant strides since the last re-accreditation. As might be expected in an institution of this size, there is some variability across colleges as to their level of engagement with assessment and stage of implementation. However, Ohio State is on a clear trajectory with increasing commitment to more transparent evaluation of student outcomes for all programs. Examples include:

- **Industrial, Interior, and Visual Communication Design (College of the Arts).** This program is reviewed and accredited by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design every 10 years and Foundation for Interior Design Education Research every seven years. Assessment is a critical component of these accreditation reviews. E-portfolios are the centerpiece of assessment in a program that is based on the creation of designed artifacts, objects, spaces, and interrelated systems. As part of the culture of ongoing assessment, the faculty have begun a review and redesign of foundation courses based on qualitative assessment, created a faculty foundation coordinator position, and developed a seminar and data base to improve instruction.

- **Biology (College of Biological Sciences).** In one of the largest undergraduate programs, the faculty have reviewed the major and proposed curricular changes aligned with the National Research Council Bio 2010 Report. Assessment has been embedded in the proposed changes to monitor effects on student learning, with baseline major field testing currently underway.

- **Physics (College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences).** In this smaller major, faculty conduct exit interviews and focus groups to evaluate their program and students’ perceptions of learning. As a result, faculty have responded to student concerns regarding preparation for entering graduate school. The faculty also monitor student placement and will add major field testing to their assessment practices.

- **Women’s Studies (College of Humanities).** Outcomes assessment in this major employs both direct (review of capstone course papers) and indirect (exit survey) methods. Findings were used as a component of a department-wide program review. In this process, faculty were also interviewed and an external team provided feedback.

- **Psychology (College of Social and Behavioral Sciences).** Psychology faculty routinely monitor student outcomes in one of the university’s largest majors. Assessment methods include surveys in which students report growth in research skills and knowledge, and major field testing in which students score in the 96th percentile among seniors nationally. The program plans to add embedded testing to its methods and use results to evaluate proposed major program changes.

Within ASC, assessment strategies and activities have been and will continue to be guided by ongoing advisory discussions with the ASC CCI, the Assessment Subcommittee, and with input from the university leadership and assessment experts found across the institution (for example, in offices of Faculty and TA Development—FTAD, Technology Enhanced Learning and Research—TELR, and Institutional Research
Examples of emerging strategies and initiatives to facilitate assessment and help ensure it continues to become a more routine part of the academic culture include:

- embedding use of outcome information in ongoing and central university activities, such as Program Review, the GEC course approval process, and approval processes for new and revised major programs;
- making outcomes information available for program use through development of college-wide surveys;
- providing support through training workshops, presentations, and consultations by national experts (Virginia Anderson, March 3, 2006); and
- facilitating communication among faculty regarding assessment and outcomes evidence through discussions in established college curriculum committees.

Assessment of Graduate and Post-Baccalaureate Professional Programs. Student learning in our graduate and post-baccalaureate professional programs has been measured using traditional practices—individualized candidacy and dissertation examinations for Ph.D. students and measures required by specialized accreditation (national certification and licensing exams, for instance) for professional students. These practices were affirmed in our 1997 re-accreditation visit.

While such measures continue to serve the university well, Ohio State has begun to focus more attention on the enhancement of its graduate and post-baccalaureate professional programs, realizing that they must be exemplary if we are to achieve our overarching goal of becoming the nation’s premier land-grant university. Examples include:

- The Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate. Six of Ohio State’s graduate programs participated in the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (CID)—an action project designed to improve the quality of graduate programs. Ohio State was the only institution in the country to have program representation in each of the six disciplines: chemistry, education, English, history, mathematics, and neuroscience. Participation provided the opportunity to examine and improve the quality of these Ph.D. programs. Summary reports for four of these six programs are showcased in the CID’s gallery collection of examples, and document program assessment with stated student goals, evidence, and next steps.

- The Appointment of Two Committees to Examine Graduate Education at Ohio State. In 2004, the executive vice president and provost charged two committees, the Committee on Graduate Education, chaired by Dean Richard Freeman, and the Committee to Review the Graduate School, chaired by Dean Paul Beck, to review graduate education at Ohio State. Included in the provost’s charges were requests to determine a process for assessing the quality of the graduate programs and to recommend an appropriate structure and function of the Graduate School to help programs achieve success. The university’s response to these reports and their recommendations serves as an important component of our Special Emphasis Self-Study on Graduate and Professional Education.
In summary, great progress is being made in using assessment information to improve learning outcomes. Learning outcomes are increasingly incorporated into program review and curriculum committee dialogues to determine if instructional practices or curriculum content should be modified. Professional programs regularly revise their curricula based on specialized accreditation reviews to create more effective educational experiences. Annual assessment reports in 2006 from programs in ASC indicated that approximately half of all programs are making or intend to make curricular revisions based on this information.

It is also important to stress that curricular change is ongoing. The Council on Academic Affairs’ (CAA) current Activities Report illustrates the range of formal programmatic curricular changes made each year to enhance the learning environment. In 2004-2005 for example, CAA approved five new undergraduate major programs or tracks and six new minors; nine major programs and one minor were revised. In graduate and professional studies, two new combined doctoral-level programs, four master’s-level programs, one new minor, and 11 new specialization distinctions were approved. And, data from the 2004-2005 HERI faculty survey indicated that 56% of the respondents reported that they had developed a new course in the last two years. Each of these examples illustrates how curriculum and teaching practices change to meet changing student needs.

SUPPORTING AND VALUING EFFECTIVE TEACHING  
(Core Components 3b and 3d)

As President Holbrook stated in her essay on Teaching and Learning at Ohio State:

“The university values and recognizes the richness, commitment, and innovation of teaching through various awards given at the department, college, and university levels. We emphasize the importance of quality teaching through programs that target faculty at all levels of development as well as graduate teaching associates, and by promoting innovative teaching....”

Quality faculty, who bring both their expertise and excitement to the classroom, are a strength at Ohio State. It is these uniquely qualified faculty members who, through participation in departmental and college curriculum committees, determine curricular content for undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs of study and determine the appropriate strategies and delivery practices for instruction.

Evidence that Ohio State values and supports teaching takes many forms. Examples are noted below.

Evaluation and Recognition of Teaching

Teaching is evaluated for all instructors (non-tenured and tenured regular faculty, lecturers, and graduate teaching associates) in all courses, most typically through an instrument developed internally to evaluate overall instructor effectiveness, the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI). Such indicators are used routinely in the annual review of instructors, are an expected part of a promotion and tenure dossier, and are used as a basis for annual merit increases.
Special Recognition for Exemplary Teachers

Aside from systematic review of teaching, two prestigious awards are used to recognize outstanding teaching on a university-wide level.

- **Alumni Award for Distinguished Teaching.** Each year up to 10 faculty members are presented with the institution’s most prestigious teaching award, the Alumni Award for Distinguished Teaching. Award recipients are inducted annually into Ohio State’s [Academy of Teaching](#), which, among other activities, was established to “foster excellence in teaching, promote the importance of teaching, and help improve the rewards for teaching.”

- **Graduate Associate Teaching Award.** Each year up to 10 graduate teaching associates are awarded the Graduate Associate Teaching Award, the university’s highest teaching award for exceptional teaching by graduate students.

Several other awards are offered at the college or department level. Examples include the following.

- The College of Dentistry offers the Postle Teaching Award annually to recognize a college faculty member for quality classroom teaching skills, educational program development, and/or educational materials.

- The College of Education and Human Ecology Distinguished Teaching Award honors up to four individuals (one faculty member, one staff member, one student, and one part-time instructor) who excel in teaching in the College of Education and Human Ecology.

- The Ohio State University at Mansfield Teaching Award recognizes the outstanding performance of a faculty member on the Mansfield campus.

- Many departments (Computer Science and Engineering, English, Political Science, and others) offer annual teaching awards to outstanding faculty members and graduate teaching associates.

A web site created by the Office of Faculty and TA Development (FTAD) lists teaching awards, encourages acknowledgment of superior teaching, and publicly recognizes the university’s numerous local and national award-winning teachers.

Resources to Support Innovation and Improved Pedagogy

The university is dedicated to assisting instructors at all levels (graduate associates, beginning assistant professors, and senior faculty) improve their teaching effectiveness. Some examples of programs and services offered include:

- **Consultation** services for individuals and departments through the Office of Faculty and TA Development (FTAD)

- **FTAD events** on teaching, including sessions, workshops, and presentations on topics as varied as portfolio development, effective grading, responses to student writing, and student engagement with digital resources

- **FTAD’s GTA program enhancement initiatives**, such as departmental seed grants and awards for exemplary GTA programs, GTA Fellows programs, and professional development grants for GTA coordinators

- **FTAD teaching enhancement programs** for mid-career and senior faculty, bringing tenured faculty together for a year-long opportunity to focus on their teaching as part of a community of peers

On the most recent Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Survey (2004-2005), 78% of Ohio State faculty reported that their teaching is valued in their departments.
• An FTAD web site that links Ohio State instructors to other local, regional, and national groups that support the scholarship of teaching

• The Ohio State University Association for Scholarship and Teaching (TOAST)

Participation in FTAD activities is voluntary for faculty and instructional staff; however, specific recommendations for involvement can come from department chairs based on performance evaluations. In its 2005 annual report, FTAD reported that it consulted with 186 instructors from 72 units across campus and that 1,145 different instructors participated in 149 teaching events (for a total of 3,759 attendances). Since the last re-accreditation, the university has instituted a requirement that all GTAs receive training and are supported during their instructional activities as outlined in a 2003 message from the Office of Academic Affairs. FTAD also reported that 425 new GTAs attended the FTAD orientation conference and that the staff of FTAD produced 10 custom workshops and programs specifically for the GTAs of academic units, guest taught in 25 courses, and consulted with 21 units on their GTA teaching enhancement efforts.

“We have promised our students a high-quality educational experience at Ohio State, and our faculty members deliver on that promise every day in classrooms, studios, and laboratories through their commitment to students and to new ways of engaging them in learning.”

Karen A. Holbrook
President
State of the University Address
September 29, 2005

Preparing the Next Generation of University Teachers

The university also believes that it is important to help prepare the next generation of college and university teachers. Examples include the following.

• The Interdisciplinary Specialization in University Teaching is collaboratively offered between the School of Education Policy and Leadership, FTAD, and the Graduate School. The specialization, designed for those who intend or are considering careers as college or university faculty, allows graduate students to engage in a rigorous, structured exploration of the theories and practice of university-level teaching, both in general and in their own discipline.

• The Preparing Future Faculty (PPF) Program offers Ohio State graduate students the opportunity to experience firsthand the unique challenges and rewards of an academic career at a smaller college or university. The signature feature of the PPF Program is an arranged mentorship with a faculty member at one of Ohio’s leading liberal arts colleges or state universities.
ENHANCING STUDENT LEARNING THROUGH STUDENT SUPPORT, INNOVATIVE INSTRUCTION, AND UNIQUE LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS  (Core Components 3c and 3d)

“We must continue to improve the quality of the teaching and learning experience for our students both inside and outside the classroom.”

Ed Ray  
Executive Vice President and Provost  
Speech to the University Senate  
January 16, 2003

Examples of the types of actions that the university has taken to improve facilities, enhance student support, facilitate the use of emerging technologies, and create stimulating learning environments are noted below.

Distinctive Facilities to Enable Outstanding Educational Experiences

**Physical Operations and Development** (Physical Facilities) oversees the maintenance of current facilities and grounds as well as the planning, design, and construction of new facilities. Aside from the regular upkeep and maintenance performed by the operations unit (building audits provide an example of the systematic approach to building upkeep and deferred maintenance), the university has devoted substantial resources to renovation, construction of new buildings, and acquisitions in the area. Since our last re-accreditation the university has invested $1,500,200,000¹ in such projects. Examples include:

- new buildings in the medical complex, such as the Biomedical Research Tower, the Davis Heart and Lung Research Institute, and the Ross Heart Hospital, as well as the addition of three floors in Fry Hall for the College of Optometry;
- new buildings in the central campus area such as the Physics Research Building and the Psychology Building, as well as renovations to buildings including Hagerty Hall (Humanities), Page Hall (John Glenn School of Public Affairs), and McPherson Chemical Laboratories;
- regional campus buildings such as the residence hall at Newark, the Student Services Center at Marion, Riedl Hall at Mansfield, the Agriculture Building at Lima, and the Piketon Training and Development Center at the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center;
- improvements to athletic facilities such as the Ohio Stadium renovation, the Schottenstein Center, the Jesse Owens Memorial Stadium, and the Recreation and Physical Activity Center; and
- three new parking garages and one parking garage renovation.

¹ Source: David Horstman, Office of Business and Finance, Resource Planning Analyst
President Holbrook, in her 2006 State of the University Address, noted that such projects have produced significant benefits for our students, including:

- new classroom space—32 new classrooms, 21 teaching laboratories, and two large lecture halls; and
- new research space—more than 150,000 assignable square feet added in the last four years from new building construction or expansions and the newly opened Biomedical Research Tower, adding another 180,000 square feet, contributing significantly to both undergraduate and graduate learning.

Support Mechanisms to Improve Student Success

Ohio State has made many improvements beyond the physical environment to provide distinctive services that enhance student success. Examples include:

Student Affairs. The Office of Student Affairs is responsible for many of the outside-the-classroom aspects of student life at Ohio State. Among these are student housing; food service; health, wellness, and counseling; activities, organizations, and leadership development; recreation and intramurals; ResNet; and BuckID. Student Affairs is a partner in the Multicultural Center, learning communities, the Younkin Success Center, and the Student Housing Legal Clinic. Student Affairs also operates the Schottenstein Center, the Fawcett Center, the Blackwell Inn, the Ohio Union, and the Drake Performance & Event Center. Links to the organizational chart and to each Student Affairs unit can be found here. The mission of Student Affairs is fostering student learning and development by providing highest-quality programs and services that enhance students’ educational experiences and that prepare students to be contributing members of a diverse society.

Academic Advising. Ten years ago, most students were admitted to University College (UVC) and advised by graduate student advisors. Today, over 90% are admitted directly into a college and are assigned to professional academic advisors located within the college (or within ASC for the colleges in Arts and Sciences). These advisors are trained and receive continuing education through advising workshops and other off-campus professional development activities. College advisors are responsible for helping students explore major program options, the general education curriculum, and degree and graduation planning. Students are also assigned an advisor within their major programs (faculty members, staff members, or graduate students). They continue to shepherd students toward graduation and subsequent career planning with an emphasis on the mastery of skills students will need in discipline specific areas of study.

As shown in Figure 3 in Chapter 2, data from the 2004 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) indicated that 63% of seniors were satisfied with the quality of academic advising that they received at Ohio State. Although room for improvement exists, this number compares favorably to the national average of 64%, which includes results from students attending smaller public and private institutions.

Libraries. University Libraries, the Moritz Law Library, and the Prior Health Sciences Library have a combined collection size of nearly 5.8 million volumes and regularly receive approximately 35,000 serial titles. A more complete statistical profile, an organization chart, a variety of administrative reports, and presentations of the director of Libraries are available. University Libraries consists of the Thompson (Main) Library and a number of department libraries and other specialized collections. University Libraries is also a member of OhioLINK, a statewide library and information network.
linking the major academic and community college libraries in Ohio, plus the State Library. Department libraries support the course work and research of faculty, graduate students, and upper-division undergraduate students in various fields of study. There are collections in agriculture, art, life and physical sciences, economics, education, engineering, human ecology, journalism, music, psychology, pharmacy, social work, and more. Each library provides access to the Libraries’ online catalog/circulation system (OSCAR), as well as to indexes, abstracts, and bibliographies pertinent to its subject area(s). Librarians familiar with the subject areas and expert in associated research techniques are available for consultation.

The Thompson Library is currently under renovation and is scheduled to reopen by fall quarter 2009. A web page identifying the temporary locations of Thompson Library services and collections is available. The renovated Thompson Library will provide materials and services related to the humanities and social sciences. The collection includes major reference materials, government documents, and some special collections. During the renovation, the circulating collection and government documents are located at the Ackerman Library, and major reference materials and public services are to be found at the Sullivant Library.

Programs and Services for the Student Community at Large. Across the campuses, centers have been created to ensure student success in key academic areas:

- The Center for the Study and Teaching of Writing is designed to foster excellence among writers and teachers of writers. Within the center, the Writing Across the Curriculum program enables faculty to help their students effectively communicate knowledge in their fields.
- The Math & Statistics Learning Center provides free tutoring, review materials, and workshops for students in mathematics and statistics.
- The Younkin Success Center was created through a unique collaborative effort among the Offices of Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Department of Athletics, and the College of Education and Human Ecology to enhance student learning and effective teaching by co-locating services that address both academic and student life concerns. The center offers tutoring services in math and writing as well as financial aid and personal finance counseling. It also houses:
  - Counseling and Consultation Service
  - Career Connection
  - Faculty and TA Development
  - Student Athlete Support Services Office
  - The Walter E. Dennis Learning Center
- The four regional campuses offer a variety of services to ensure student success on the those campuses as well:
  - The Conard Learning Center on the Mansfield Campus houses Academic Skills Enrichment programs, the Math Lab, and the Office for Disability Services.
  - The Philip A. Heath Center for Teaching and Learning at Lima includes the Writing Center, the Math Center, Spanish tutorials, and chemistry and physics tutorials.
• The Learning Assistance Center at Newark offers study skills workshops, a tutoring program, and a learning skills program.

• The Academic Enrichment Center on the Marion Campus provides professional math and writing tutors as well as student-peer tutors.

Mechanisms that Support Diversity. Ohio State is committed to ensuring that all learners are supported and that the excellence that arises from diversity is valued. Some examples of specific support services are listed below.

• The Office of Minority Affairs coordinates and oversees numerous programs and support services for minority students, including:

  • The Frank W. Hale Jr. Black Cultural Center

  • The Todd Anthony Bell National Resource Center for the African American Male

  • Academic Advancement Services, which sponsors a bridge program to help transition students from high school to college, minority advising, mentoring, and tutoring

• The Multicultural Center helps create an environment that recognizes and respects cultural differences and uniqueness, and focuses on academics, student services, and outreach.

• The Commitment to Success Program is a collaborative diversity initiative among the Offices of Academic Affairs, Minority Affairs, and FTAD designed to enhance the retention and success for minority students through climate assessment, networking, and programming. The initiative is a central component of the university’s Academic and Diversity Action Plans.

• The Office of International Education supports the approximately 3,800 international students enrolled on the main campus, making Ohio State the 10th ranked university in number of international students.

• The Office for Disability Services (on the Columbus campus and each of the regional campuses) provides study skills counseling, testing, examination accommodations, alternative media, and assistive technology training to support students with disabilities.

• The Office of Continuing Education is committed to offering quality programs and services that encourage lifelong learning, including Program 60, which allows individuals over age 60 to take courses on a space-available, non-credit basis.

• The Student Athlete Support Services Office, which now reports to the Office of Academic Affairs rather than to the Athletic Department, fosters student commitment to comprehensive life skills, quality educational experiences, and student athlete success.

• Each regional campus has mechanisms that support diversity on its campus. Specific examples include:

  • Lima: Diversity efforts are led by the director of student life and multicultural affairs who plans diversity awareness events and engages in outreach efforts. A campus Diversity Council provides guidance and advice. A half-time admissions counselor/minority recruitment coordinator extends outreach into area middle schools.

  • Mansfield: The Office of Multicultural Affairs addresses the needs of minority and underrepresented students through targeted program-
ming and services. Several student organizations focus on diversity and the campus Diversity Committee oversees the implementation of the campus Diversity Plan. A search is currently taking place to hire a full-time multicultural coordinator.

- **Marion:** A full-time diversity coordinator carries a variety of responsibilities related to diversity. In addition, an admission counselor has responsibility for the recruitment of non-traditional and minority students. The campus has developed a wide range of diversity activities both on campus and as outreach and engagement efforts.

- **Newark:** The Office of Multicultural Affairs promotes cultural diversity and awareness by encouraging interaction among students, faculty, and staff and plans and hosts a multitude of programs, services, and activities to encourage cooperative relations among diverse groups. There is also a campus Diversity Committee.

Evidence is mounting that services such as these increase the success of diverse students across campus. In 2002, national and local research studies about the performance of African American male students in college led concerned administrators at our university to implement an experimental effort to better understand and, if possible, to improve retention and graduation rates for this subpopulation of undergraduates. The resulting program, which came to be known as the Black Male Initiative, employed regular group meetings, frequent personal interaction with individual undergraduates, invited guest speakers, and academic support services for the campus’ African American male students. Significant improvements in student satisfaction, performance, and retention to graduation were quantitative measures of the program’s success. So that the campus as a whole might benefit from the lessons learned through the Black Male Initiative, the Office of Minority Affairs established the Todd Anthony Bell National Resource Center on the African American Male. Continued evidence of the success of this initiative can be seen in the fact that the freshman to sophomore retention of African American males has risen from 69.4% in the 1998 cohort to over 89% for the 2005 cohort, essentially closing the gap between this group of at-risk students and students at large.

### Campus Practices to Facilitate the Use of Emerging Technologies and Enhance Student Learning

New technologies have been introduced across the campuses to enhance learning environments. Many of these technology improvements are offered by and coordinated through Ohio State’s [Office of Information Technology](#) (OIT). Examples include the following.

- **Carmen**, a new online course management system based on Desire to Learn, was implemented in 2005.

- **Wireless** access is being increased across campus. Ohio State is the first CIC institution to have wireless access in all its residence halls. Currently more than 2,300 students are using such access, and that number grows by about 100 students every week. Currently, the university has 1,800 wireless access points. To broaden that scope, the university signed an agreement with Aruba Networks for a wireless plan that will include more than 400 buildings and 25 million square feet. Once completed in 2011, Aruba officials said it will be the largest wireless LAN network in the world.
A new Student Information System (SIS) is being developed to create an authoritative data source and to coordinate and integrate systems on which students rely for their success throughout their experience at Ohio State.

The Digital Union was established to enrich the technology environment for learning and teaching.

Data warehouses, containing course, student, and faculty information, are available for reporting, planning, and decision making.

OIT services, which assist faculty, staff, and students in using technology, have been enhanced, including:

- the help-desk;
- workshops that cover a range of topics from web design to podcasting; and
- various grant opportunities, such as student-faculty e-partnerships, to extend faculty research into the undergraduate learning environment.

Technology also plays a central role within University Libraries:

- The William Oxley Thompson (Main) Library is undergoing a complete renovation, one of the largest academic building projects ever undertaken. Scheduled to re-open for autumn quarter 2009, $79 million in capital and other funds have been allocated for this project. An additional $30 million in private support is being raised. As stated by the director of University Libraries, “Our challenge is to design a library for the 21st century that is beautiful, functional, and flexible enough to bring paper- and digital-based information services together. We want our library to be a place that pays tribute to the enduring value of books and human interaction in the creation of knowledge, while also being an exciting place to use new digital information technology in support of learning, teaching, and research.”

- The Knowledge Bank at OSU is a joint initiative between University Libraries and the Office of the Chief Information Officer to create a knowledge management system that collects, stores, and manages the institution’s digital information assets, and which can be used for a variety of purposes, including teaching and learning.

**Unique Learning Environments to Challenge Our Students**

Ohio State strives to support and encourage an intellectually engaging atmosphere for all learners. As noted in the introduction to this chapter, the undergraduate student body has become significantly stronger academically over the last decade. New and distinctive learning environments have been created to offer these better-prepared students, as well as all Ohio State students, a high-quality education for the 21st century. Examples include:

- Learning communities offer programs for students to extend their studies beyond the classroom.

- Honors and Scholars programs provide communities for high-ability students to experience enriched academic curricular and co-curricular integrated programs.
The Honors Collegium supports and helps exceptionally talented and graduate school-bound undergraduates gain acceptance into premier graduate programs, high-profile internships, and prestigious fellowships and scholarships.

First Year Experience, nationally recognized by U.S. News and World Report, focuses on giving first-year students the support and resources they need to make a successful transition to college.

Freshman Seminars were cultivated in a 2003 initiative by President Holbrooke to introduce new students to distinguished faculty involved in a wide range of topics and research activities in small dynamic seminar settings. The program has grown from 230 students enrolled in 24 seminars in 2004 to almost 1,000 students for the 2006-2007 academic year.

The Office of Undergraduate Research was created in 2006 to help educate students about research opportunities and how best to incorporate those opportunities in their academic planning, leveraging Ohio State's world-class research environment to enhance undergraduate learning.

The Denman Undergraduate Research Forum, in which students can showcase their many and varied research and creative experiences, has grown from about 60 presentations 10 years ago to over 300 this past year.

Service learning and undergraduate opportunities to participate in internships have been supported and will be discussed more fully in Chapter 5 (Engagement and Service).

Growth in interdisciplinary majors and minors has been initiated at the undergraduate level with the re-organization of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences and at the graduate level through awards made to support their development.

Study abroad provides another means for students to enrich their learning. About 16% of our students participate in this international experience. This is one area identified for growth, with a long-term ambitious goal stated by the president to have half of Ohio State students study abroad for some period of time.

**REFLECTIONS AND NEXT STEPS**

The preceding analyses clearly demonstrate the university’s compliance with Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching and confirm that significant progress has been made to more systematically evaluate and assess student learning at the institutional, program, and course levels. Progress and achievement in this area is most notable within the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences (ASC) where efforts have been strategically targeted. The university also excels in providing support services for teaching and learning to serve a large and diverse student body, as well as providing an array of distinctive opportunities and experiences that enhance student learning. As Ohio State continues to advance in its systematic evaluation and assessment of student learning and to leverage its expertise and resources to facilitate student achievement and growth, we believe our next steps should be to: sustain excellence in our teaching and learning support services; improve university-level coordination and oversight of outcomes assessment; continue to expand the use of assessment as a strategy to improve educational programs and student outcomes; and make assessment efforts, resources, and results more visible.

On the 2004-2005 HERI faculty survey, 58% of Ohio State faculty reported that they had worked with undergraduates on a research project in the last two years.
1. Reorganizing for Institutional Effectiveness

As an institution that is learning-centered, research-focused, and increasingly analytic in its approach, Ohio State has a history of gathering information to inform decision making. More recently, the external environment requires greater accountability and transparency in the institution’s decision processes, particularly with respect to student learning outcomes. To manage these changes, a coordinating team from several areas, including assessment, accreditation, program review, and institutional research, meets informally to discuss various types of information the institution collects or needs, institutional effectiveness, and external accountability issues. It now seems timely to formalize these administrative efforts and relationships to better coordinate activities across the various offices, make more efficient use of the university’s assessment and student learning resources, enhance the use of information for formative assessment and summative evaluation purposes, and increase our capacity to provide support and expertise for programs, departments, and colleges on all of these issues.

Questions

What advantages and disadvantages are there to an organizational alignment broadly centered on institutional effectiveness and accountability?

What models from other institutions might the team be familiar with that appear to work well for coordination of the above areas?

What steps might the university take to maximize the use of various resources and expertise across the institution to enhance improvement and accountability efforts?

To what extent should assessment in co-curricular programs and student affairs be integrated with those occurring in major and general education programs of study?

2. Enhancing Oversight, Coordination, and the Expansion of Learning Outcomes Assessment

The university is considering ways to model ASC approaches to assessment oversight and coordination at the institutional level. As a first step, a new university-level Advisory Committee to the Council on Academic Affairs (CAA) will be established to advise CAA on the General Education Curriculum and general education outcomes assessment.

Questions

What feedback does the team have about our ideas and plans to embed assessment in the established curricular process at the university level?

What concerns should we be aware of in increasing the coordination of assessment across colleges that have specialized accreditation (i.e., health sciences and professional colleges), and those in the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences?

To what extent should graduate program assessment be coordinated similarly to our current approach for undergraduate programs?
3. Raising the Visibility of Assessment Activities and Initiatives

The university plans to develop an institution-level web site for assessment housed in the Office of Academic Affairs. The site will contain information about all of our academic programs with respect to expected outcomes, evaluation practices, and accomplishments.

Questions

What additional kinds of information or links should such a web site have to enhance visibility and transparency to promote internal improvement as well as engage external constituencies?

What additional recommendations does the team have for maintaining and moving assessment forward at Ohio State?

What models from other institutions should we consider adapting for the coordination of assessment activities across different campus locations?
Chapter Four  **Criterion Four:**
Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge
For The Ohio State University, this criterion is most strongly related to research and scholarship. Much of the material presented focuses on our unique feature as a research-extensive university—a university that promotes a life of learning through research and creative activities, and where dramatic accomplishments have occurred over the past decade.
THE ACADEMIC PLAN: SETTING THE STAGE FOR RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

In keeping with the university’s role as a research-extensive university, many of the Core Values delineated in the Academic Plan acknowledge the weight that the institution places on acquiring, discovering, and applying knowledge for the benefit of society as well as the emphasis given to preparing students for lifelong learning in a diverse and changing world.

- Pursue knowledge for its own sake.
- Ignite in our students a lifelong love of learning.
- Produce discoveries that make the world a better place.
- Celebrate and learn from our diversity.
- Open the world to our students.

The importance of research and scholarship to our land-grant heritage is also evident in the specific strategies outlined in the Academic Plan, particularly in Strategy Two, Develop Academic Programs that Define Ohio State as the Nation’s Leading Public Land-Grant University, and Strategy Six, Help Build Ohio’s Future.

PROMOTING A LIFE OF LEARNING THROUGH RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (core component 4a)

Faculty, staff, and students invigorated by a life of learning through the conduct of research and creative activities are at the core of knowledge generation and its related economic and lifestyle benefits. The primary focus of the information presented for Core Component 4a will describe the Ohio State research and creative enterprise.

Setting Goals for the University

The Ohio State University Research Commission was formed by the president and senior vice president and provost in January 1997. Implementation of the commission’s 1998 recommendations laid the groundwork for the impressive research accomplishments over the last nine years. The Research Commission Report recommended accelerated emphasis on excellent faculty and students, competitive research infrastructure, increased emphasis on interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research, and a stronger national voice and visibility. The report also called for ingenuity, increased accountability, and bold strategies. The following measurable results speak for themselves.

Since the last re-accreditation, the university's annual research expenditures have more than doubled to $652 million (FY 2006). As a single agency measure, funding from the National Institutes of Health kept pace with the doubling of NIH funding from 1998 to 2003. Our NIH awards climbed during that period from $50 million to $129 million. Ten-year data on specific programs is available for review.

“For centuries, civilization has depended upon universities for a rich flow of ideas, innovation, and graduates from a wide variety of disciplines—from the humanities and social sciences to the physical sciences, technology, and the professions. These intellectual and human resources have long been vital to Ohio’s social, economic, and civic success. They remain so today, when the need for ideas, innovation, and graduates is greater than ever.” (Academic Plan)
Figure 1. Research expenditures from 1997 through 2006

Figure 2. FY2006 research awards by sponsor and by unit
In government rankings over the past 10 years, the university has climbed to 8th from 14th among public research universities and to 12th from 21st among all institutions, public and private, surpassing the University of California-Berkeley, Cornell, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in the last year (see February 2, 2007 press release). In the most recent government report, Ohio State moved to 3rd from 6th place in industry-sponsored research for both public and private universities during a period when this type of funding was declining. Our faculty efforts in materials (materials science engineering by category) were ranked 3rd nationally among all research institutions.

**R&D Expenditures at U.S. Universities and Colleges**

*Source: Most recent (2005) federal government statistics published on university research expenditures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2005 Rank Public</th>
<th>2005 Public and Private</th>
<th>Research Dollar Totals (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Michigan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. California, San Francisco</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. California, San Diego</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Washington</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA State U.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Ohio State University</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>609</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass. Institute of Technology</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. California, Berkeley</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Minnesota</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. California, Davis</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia U in New York City</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Univ., St. Louis</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Florida</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Federal government statistics (2005) on university research expenditures
Ohio State Among the Best Places to Work in Academia

A survey in the October 2006 issue of The Scientist magazine ranked Ohio State as one of the best places to work in academia. The university was 3rd nationally in the magazine’s top 15 list of U.S. academic institutions and 1st among all colleges and universities. Ohio State followed St. Jude’s Children’s Research Hospital and The J. David Gladstone Institute, respectively, on the listing.

Leadership for the Research Enterprise

At the university level, the unit with primary responsibility for support of research is the Office of Research under the direction of the senior vice president, Robert T. McGrath—appointed in July 2004. The organizational chart for the office can be found at “About the Office of Research.” This office provides infrastructure and administrative support systems for faculty, staff, and students engaged in research. Faculty service units reporting to the Office of Research include the following.

The Research Foundation (RF) has significantly improved and increased services to the university research community during the past 10 years. Highlights include:

- A number of web-based applications that service all stages of the grants process from finding RFP’s to setting up awards to closing out contracts. One highly effective example is the PI-Portal, which provides up-to-date proposal, award, and expenditure data. This dynamic tool displays current and historical information accessible at many different levels and can generate custom reports. Faculty, staff, and university officers now employ the PI-Portal as the source of strategic management information about sponsored research activity.

- In 2004 RF implemented the People Soft Grants Management Financial System, including the Grants Management software that is designed specifically for the financial processing and oversight of sponsored research. It provides a seamless interface with the university’s accounting system so that RF does not need to operate, maintain, and reconcile a separate financial system. In addition to overall efficiency, this system also improves our compliance and accountability.

- RF established a number of satellite operations physically located in the major research colleges in order to provide faculty with convenient, easy, and personal grants support.

- Because of the growing importance of university-industry collaborations, RF established the Office for Business and Industry Contracts. This office focuses solely on the efficient and effective negotiation and management of industry-sponsored contracts for research.

- RF has dramatically increased the amount and quality of sponsored research training and education courses offered to faculty and staff. It established the Office of Human Resources Training and Communication to coordinate this effort. This office currently facilitates more than 200 training events per year and strongly supports the university’s diversity goals through the Building Respect in the Workplace Community workshops. These workshops have become a model for the entire institution.

- Technology Licensing and Commercialization offers assistance in moving research from the laboratory to the marketplace. Following years of educational effort, Ohio law was changed in the fall of 2000 to allow faculty at public universities to participate in startup companies. This leveled the playing field between public and private institutions in the state. Ohio State’s licensing revenues were up 36 percent in 2006 and the benchmarks for the last five years are shown in Figure 4.
The Office of Responsible Research Practice (ORRP) provides administrative support to the university research community seeking committee approvals to conduct human subject and animal research, provides educational programming in support of the responsible conduct of research, and supports the operations of the university’s Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee and Institutional Review Boards. Initial steps are underway to obtain accreditation from the Association for the Accreditation of Human Research Protection Programs (AAHRPP).

The University Laboratory Animal Resources (ULAR) provides fiscal, personnel, and facilities management for all laboratory animal research and facilities and has regulatory responsibility for biomedical research agricultural animals. The program has over 140,000 square feet of research space supporting 11 colleges, seven schools, the Graduate School, and the Comprehensive Cancer Center with 400 principal investigators and 1,500 active projects. The university received AAALAC (Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care) accreditation in 1993.

A new Office of Regulatory Affairs was launched in 2006. It coordinates compliance activities across the Office of Research units and assumes responsibility for developing and implementing programs to meet overall federal sponsor requirements as well those specifically requested by the Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General (IG). The IG programs call for implementation of policies, designating a compliance officer and committee, training, internal monitoring and auditing, enforcement, creatively responding to defective programs, defining roles and responsibilities, and assigning oversight responsibility for compliance.

As shown on the Organizational Chart, several other offices, centers, programs, and networks report to the Office of Research. Examples include the following:

- The Office of Responsible Research Practices (ORRP) provides administrative support to the university research community seeking committee approvals to conduct human subject and animal research, provides educational programming in support of the responsible conduct of research, and supports the operations of the university’s Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee and Institutional Review Boards. Initial steps are underway to obtain accreditation from the Association for the Accreditation of Human Research Protection Programs (AAHRPP).

- University Laboratory Animal Resources (ULAR) provides fiscal, personnel, and facilities management for all laboratory animal research and facilities and has regulatory responsibility for biomedical research agricultural animals. The program has over 140,000 square feet of research space supporting 11 colleges, seven schools, the Graduate School, and the Comprehensive Cancer Center with 400 principal investigators and 1,500 active projects. The university received AAALAC (Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care) accreditation in 1993.

- A new Office of Regulatory Affairs was launched in 2006. It coordinates compliance activities across the Office of Research units and assumes responsibility for developing and implementing programs to meet overall federal sponsor requirements as well those specifically requested by the Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General (IG). The IG programs call for implementation of policies, designating a compliance officer and committee, training, internal monitoring and auditing, enforcement, creatively responding to defective programs, defining roles and responsibilities, and assigning oversight responsibility for compliance.

As shown on the Organizational Chart, several other offices, centers, programs, and networks report to the Office of Research. Examples include the following:

- The university’s Program for International and Homeland Security was established in April 2002, just seven months after the events of 9/11. It promotes and supports research, study, and technology development, leading to practical, affordable solutions to current and future security challenges facing America at home and around the world. President George W. Bush recently nominated Dr. Todd Stewart, the program’s director, to serve a four-year appointment as a member of the National Security Advisory Board. This 13-member board includes the secretaries of Defense, State, Education, Energy, and Commerce, as well as the director of the Central Intelligence Agency and chair of the National Endowment for the Humanities.
• Interdisciplinary work has a long history at Ohio State. One of the early programs is the Byrd Polar Research Center, which began collecting polar data in 1957 and brought together polar-related scientists from a variety of disciplines. In 1985, the center obtained the first set of papers from polar explorer Admiral Richard E. Byrd and adopted his name in 1987. Scientists associated with Byrd Polar have developed the use of tropical ice cores to study climate changes and are among the world leaders in the science related to global warming.

• Another interdisciplinary initiative is the Ohio Supercomputer Center (OSC)—a state initiative of the Ohio Board of Regents—housed at Ohio State and created in 1987. OSC provides a reliable, high-performance computing and communications infrastructure for a diverse statewide and regional community including education, academic research, industry, and state government. The center acts as a key enabler for the state’s aspirations in advanced technology, information systems, and advanced industries. One of its significant resources for a broad cross-section of Ohio citizens is OSCnet—previously known as the Third Frontier Network—a 1,600-mile, high-bandwidth fiber network connecting over 100 university, hospital, federal lab, and K-12 schools in Ohio. OSCnet is the most advanced, highest capacity, statewide fiber-optic network in the nation. In its present configuration the system can transmit the entire contents of the Library of Congress in 2.5 seconds.

Support for Faculty

In addition to supporting the research enterprise through its administrative units, the Office of Research joins with departments and colleges in startup and retention packages for faculty, matching funding for equipment and on external proposals. This includes partnerships through the various State of Ohio programs in support of academic research. Two examples of initiatives involving the Office of Research are the following.

• The Project to Support Grants for Research Outreach (Project GRO) was launched in 2006 and offers a sustained and coordinated resource for faculty who include an outreach and engagement component in external proposals. More and more funding sources require a list of ways in which the research benefits society. Project GRO draws on the resources and expertise of the Office of University Outreach and Engagement, the Office of Research, and other outreach and engagement personnel across the university.

• Because creative expression through the arts and humanities represents an important core of the research enterprise, the Office of Research joined with the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences in 2004 to launch the Arts and Humanities Grants. This program offers seed grants of up to $10,000 to individual faculty members or small groups of faculty and innovation grants of up to $50,000 (including a 20% match from Arts and Sciences) for major projects and multidisciplinary initiatives. These grants may, but are not required to, be linked to extramural funding.
Recognizing Faculty Excellence

Faculty members across the university are routinely recognized with prestigious awards for their research and scholarship via internal university awards and awards from external agencies. Examples of a few prominent awards include the following.

- Internally, three highly prestigious awards are offered annually. The **Distinguished Scholar Award** recognizes exceptional scholarly accomplishments by senior professors who have compiled a substantial body of research, as well as the work of younger faculty members who demonstrate great scholarly potential. The **University Distinguished Lecture Series** annually recognizes two senior faculty members for their outstanding academic achievement, particularly, but not exclusively, in research, scholarship, or creative activity. Each recipient presents a scholarly lecture, open to the university community and to the public, followed by a reception. The **Distinguished University Professor** title is awarded permanently to no more than three exceptional faculty per year. The title recognizes accomplishments in research, scholarly or creative work, teaching, and service that are both distinguished and distinctive.

- From 2003 to 2005, Ohio State led the United States in the number of faculty named as fellows of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) annually. Seventeen Ohio State researchers were among the 2006 class of fellows; only the University of California-Riverside surpassed our 2006 total. With the new honorees, Ohio State boasts 127 faculty members who have earned the honor, now one of the largest contingents in the nation.

- Over the past 10 years, six faculty have been elected to the National Academy of Sciences, bringing the total to nine. Two of the three members of the Institute of Medicine were also named during this period, along with five of our 10 members of the National Academy of Engineering.

- Ohio State professor William Mitsch (Environment and Natural Resources) and Danish professor Sven Erik Jorgensen received the 2004 Stockholm Water Prize from King Carl Gustaf XVI. Professor Mitsch was recognized for his work on sustaining lakes and wetlands.

- The 2004 National Book Award for nonfiction was awarded to Professor Kevin Boyle (History) for *Arc of Justice: A Saga of Race, Civil Rights and Murder in the Jazz Age*, an account of the story of an African American physician and his wife who were indicted for murder in Detroit in 1925. The NAACP and Clarence Darrow, the trial lawyer best remembered for the Scopes trial that dealt with evolution, provided the couple’s defense.

- Professor Lonnie Thompson (Earth Sciences), an expert on the effects of global climate change and a pioneer in the related study of the shrinking tropical glaciers and ice fields, was the winner of the 2005 Tyler Prize for Environmental Achievement—the premier award in environmental science, energy, and medicine.

- The 2005 Norman Borlaug Award was presented to Professor Rattan Lal (Environment and Natural Resources) for his work in carbon sequestration and global food security. Carbon sequestration refers to the redirecting of carbon dioxide produced from burning fossil fuels into permanent entrapment in plants, soils, and deep geologic formations.
Undergraduate, graduate, and professional students are regularly recognized for their research and scholarship as well—both internally via opportunities at Ohio State and nationally via awards from external agencies.

- Denman Research Forum
- Hayes Research Forum
- Presidential Fellowships
- Ohio State Newark Undergraduate Research Forum
- Ray Travel Award

Our students regularly receive prestigious state, national, and international awards for their scholarly activities. In 2006, 16 students were recognized for their excellence in the following competitions:

- Fulbright Scholars
- Goldwater Scholars
- Truman Scholars
- National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellows
- Ohio Board of Regents Fellows
- Udall Scholars
- Beinecke Scholars

One of the most exciting ways the university recognizes students is via its Internet homepage. The main image area of our front door (or “splash feature”) is a constantly changing reflection of the broad array of people and events that make up Ohio State. Because the area is designed to promote stories and events related to the university’s key initiatives of diversity, outreach, research, and academic excellence, students are often recognized for their scholarly activities. Examples include:

- **Liz Miller** who conducts research (and blogs) from Antarctica;
- **Jeremiah Glascock** who sees Mars Rover images before anyone else;
- **Genna Duberstein** who created a documentary about Japanese internment;
- **Sarah Weinstock** who paints murals for a South Campus Gateway business; and
- **Kristin Stanford** who researches endangered Lake Erie water snakes.

**New Buildings in Support of Research**

The university has devoted substantial resources to the construction and renovation of campus buildings. Three recent projects specific to research infrastructure are the following.

- The nearly 234,000-square-foot Physics Research Building was dedicated in November 2005 and provides 210 state-of-the-art laboratories. The building’s design features an atrium that joins the office and research wings. Its large and small meeting spaces facilitate enhanced faculty-student interaction and include the university’s most high-tech, high-bandwidth video conference center. The center provides real time dialogue for scientists and students around the globe.
• The $72.5 million Peter L. and Clara M. Scott Laboratory for Mechanical Engineering was dedicated in October 2006. It features a lab building, a classroom building, and a student services and administration building, which provides a large student lounge, lockers, auditorium, and distance learning.

• The $151 million, 400,000-square-foot Biomedical Research Tower (BRT) is the largest research facility on campus and opened in late 2006. With approximately 180,000 square feet of new labs, the 14-story BRT has nearly doubled the lab space for biomedical research.

Selected Examples of Research

It would be impossible to adequately cover all of the outstanding research accomplishments over the past decade. Instead, this next section provides an overview of recent programs of excellence from across the campuses.

• The OSU Comprehensive Cancer Center, home to Arthur G. James Cancer Hospital and Solove Research Institute, is a network of seven interdisciplinary programs comprising more than 240 members from 14 of the 18 colleges as well as affiliated institutions including the Columbus Children’s Hospital and the Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center. It is one of only 39 institutions in the United States designated by the National Cancer Institute (NCI) as a “comprehensive” cancer center. During its most recent evaluation in 2004, the OSU Comprehensive Cancer Center received a score of “outstanding,” which is the highest possible rating given as part of a scientific peer review by NCI.

• When NASA launched the two Mars rovers, Spirit and Opportunity, for the 300-million-mile journey to Mars, they anticipated a useful rover lifetime of 90 days. The vehicles are still functioning. Ohio State professor Ron Li and his team have synthesized more than 31,000 images to construct detailed topographical maps and three-dimensional images of the planet’s terrain required for rover navigation over the Martian surface. The director of NASA presented Professor Li and his collaborators with a Group Achievement Award.

• Professor Richard Sayre is leading the $7.5 million, 11-institution, five-year research program to improve cassava. This starchy root is the food staple for 250 million people in Africa and a substantial portion of the diet of nearly 600 million people worldwide. The team will work to genetically redirect cassava’s natural cyanide-making process to make more protein so that the root is more nutritious, less toxic, and can be stored longer. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation selected the BioCassava project for one of the foundation’s “Grand Challenges in Global Health” program grants.

• Ohio State dance professor Bebe Miller and her team of dancers and computer animation experts were honored with a Bessie (New York Dance and Performance) Award September 2006. The annual awards recognize outstanding creative work by independent artists in the fields of dance and related New York City performances and are on par with the coveted Tony awards in theatre. Miller and her team won a Choreographer/Creator award for Landing/Place at Danspace Project; Landing/Place was developed, in part, at Ohio State.

• Despite the gains women have made in the workplace, new research suggests one group of women employees still faces negative stereotypes—mothers. A study conducted by Kathleen Fuegen, coauthor of the study and assistant professor of psychology at Ohio State’s Lima campus, found that young adults
held mothers to stricter employment standards than childless women. Fathers, on the other hand, were held to more lenient standards than both women and childless men.

- From more than 24 million light years away, the $120 million **Large Binocular Telescope** (LBT) high atop Mount Graham near Tucson, Arizona, captured its first image in October 2005. The “first light” was an edge-on spiral galaxy known as NGC891 in the constellation Andromeda. As a major partner in the LBT international consortium, Ohio State owns one-sixth of the observing time. Working together, LBT’s two mirrors (each 8.4 meters in diameter) will allow astronomers to peer deeper than ever into the universe. The telescope will collect light that has traveled for nearly 14 billion years to reach the earth, thereby giving an unprecedented look back in time to the very beginning of our universe.

- For the first time, **sociologists have mapped** the romantic and sexual relationships of an entire high school over 18 months, providing evidence that these adolescent networks may be structured differently than researchers previously thought. The results showed that, unlike many adult networks, there was no core group of very sexually active people at the high school. While many students were connected to much larger networks, they probably didn’t see it that way. As sociology professor James Moody notes, “Many of the students had only one partner. They certainly weren’t being promiscuous. But they couldn’t see all the way down the chain.” The results have implications for designing policies to stop the spread of sexually transmitted diseases among adolescents.

- Ohio State is a leader in the emerging field of **robotic prostate surgery** under the leadership of Dr. Vipul Patel, who is one of only two individuals worldwide to have performed more than 1,000 of these robot-assisted operations. The OSU Medical Center is one of the first hospitals in the United States using the system and now has two of the refrigerator-sized robots with arms of steel. The few tiny keyhole incisions made by the robot allow patients with prostate, kidney, and bladder cancer to experience less blood loss, shorter hospital stays, faster recoveries, minimal scarring, less pain, reduced need for narcotics during recovery, and the same success rate as traditional surgery. Most patients are up and walking in four hours and return to daily activities in a week versus four to six weeks for traditional surgery.

- When two business people are negotiating against each other to secure an important deal, just how far can they ethically go to get the results they want? A **new study** suggests that MBA students have clear ideas of which tactics are ethically proper and improper in the course of bargaining. But the students’ views about ethical practices are shaped by their gender, nationality, age, work experience, and perhaps even the university they attend.

- **Honeybees** in the wild in North America have been virtually wiped out by an unusually harsh winter, a soggy spring, and two blood-sucking mites, according to James E. Tew, an associate professor of entomology at Ohio State and honeybee researcher with the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center (OARD) in Wooster, Ohio. Backyard gardeners will feel the impact in smaller yields and smaller, lower-quality fruits and vegetables. Other insect pollinators, such as bumblebees and other wild bees, will step in for the absent feral honeybees and pick up a portion of their pollination duties. However, culturing bumblebees or wild bees in great numbers or importing foreign bees are not easy solutions to the honeybee shortage.
Ohio State’s Center for Automotive Research (CAR) advanced its ongoing research in fuel cell and alternative power train technologies with the May 2006 opening of the state’s first hydrogen refueling station. The station is currently supplied by a hydrogen service company; however, Ohio State researchers are working to produce their own hydrogen. The refueling station (one of 15 nationwide) will allow CAR to participate in demonstration programs working with prototype fuel cell vehicles (FCVs) or cars that run on hydrogen directly. During the summer of 2006, the center conducted a road test of its hydrogen-powered Ford Focus in the Columbus area.

Targeted Investments in Excellence

For more than 10 years, Ohio State has used central funds to invest selectively in programs of excellence. The Academic Enrichment Program, initiated in 1995, was used to ensure that, even during periods of fiscal restraint, funds would be made available on a competitive basis to enhance the quality of selected research and instructional programs that units themselves deemed most important in their reinvestment planning. The Selective Investment initiative, begun in 1997, identified some of our strongest departments and programs and gave them the resources they needed to move to the very top of their fields. Expanding on the success of those two programs, in 2006 the university completed a new round of strategic funding of creative proposals called Targeted Investment in Excellence (TIE). For this program, the university focused on some of society’s most pressing challenges with a major investment in programs with a potential for a significant impact in their fields. Over the next five years a total of $110 million will be invested in the 10 programs listed below. Half of the resources will come from central funds and the other half will come from the colleges.

- Climate, Water, and Carbon
- Mathematical Biosciences
- Public Health Preparedness
- Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics
- Clean Sustainable Energy
- Advanced Materials
- Population Health
- Translational Plant Biosciences
- Music and Industry
- Micro RNA

Ohio’s Third Frontier Support for Research

At the state level, Ohio Governor Robert Taft unveiled the Third Frontier Project in 2002. This project is the state’s largest-ever commitment to expanding Ohio’s high-tech research capabilities and promoting innovation and company formation that will create high-paying jobs for generations to come. The 10-year initiative is designed to:

- Build world-class research capacity.
- Support early-stage capital formation and the development of new products.
- Finance advanced manufacturing technologies to help existing industries become more productive.
These awards require applied outcomes—patents, licenses, startup companies, and job creation in Ohio. Two examples include:

- In 2005, a $22.5 million Third Frontier grant for the Ohio Center for Multifunctional Polymer Nanomaterials and Devices was awarded to link nanotechnology to the economically important polymer manufacturing companies in Ohio. In collaboration with five other state universities and 50 industry partners who contribute an additional $52 million, the center will develop manufacturing protocols for industrial polymeric nanocomposites, photonic systems, and biomedical devices. An interdisciplinary research and training program helps students and industrial researchers develop the unique skills required for the rapidly developing field of nanotechnology. This Third Frontier grant complements the $12.9 million National Science Foundation (NSF) Nanoscale Science and Engineering Center for Affordable Nanoengineering of Polymer Biomedical Devices awarded to this team in 2004.

Figure 6. Map illustrating the location of Ohio State Third Frontier industrial partners and suppliers and indicating its economic impact throughout the state of Ohio.
• Jobs and high-tech, potentially lifesaving equipment are part of an Ohio State Third Frontier grant in medical imaging. The new 7 Tesla MRI system was developed by Ohio State and industrial partners Phillips Medical, Rexon, and Cardinal Health. The highly detailed images produced by the Achieva MRI system will improve diagnoses, treatment, and health outcomes. The new system will also minimize patient stress by reducing the time required to obtain a diagnostic image. Philips Medical anticipates sales of the Achieva system at $50 million annually and the University of Nottingham in the U.K., Vanderbilt University, and the Swiss ETH Technical Institute have placed orders for the system. This project’s Third Frontier funding totals $25 million and industrial partners have provided an additional $52 million.

Knowledge as a Driver of Economic Opportunity

Basic and applied research programs, such as those outlined above, prompted Small Times magazine to rank Ohio as one of the nation’s top 10 nanotechnology “hot spots” in 2005. Popular Science ranked Columbus 7th among top technology cities in America during that same time frame. Other tech projects of note include:

• The launch of the Science and Technology campus, Scitech, in 1998. Scitech is located on 53 acres adjacent to the university’s Columbus campus. With a payroll of $21 million and 42 tenant companies, Scitech has $36 million in active research grants involving 61 cooperative development projects and 24 Ohio State research sponsorships. Scitech is an integral part of TechColumbus, the umbrella organization formed in 2006 to be the moving force for technology driven economic development in the region. TechColumbus provides venture capital, management training, business incubators, and all of the tools needed to transfer knowledge produced by the university.

• Support for the complementary 315 Research and Development Corridor program. The territory along the state route for which it is named covers 10,000 acres, with more than $1 billion in managed research and 50,000 jobs. The goal of the corridor is to generate a minimum of 50,000 additional jobs in the next 20 years while providing the technical researchers and companies who are attracted to the area with unique urban neighborhoods including a mix of residential, retail, commercial and light manufacturing, clean transportation, and pedestrian and bike pathways.

• Battelle Memorial Institute, located adjacent to the Ohio State campus, is an important partner in these economic development initiatives as well as in joint research collaborations. During the past 10 years, the Ohio State-Battelle relationship has broadened and deepened significantly. Ohio State-Battelle shared facilities and research collaborations have grown among faculty in the Colleges of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences; Arts; Business; Education and Human Ecology; Engineering; Mathematical and Physical Sciences; Medicine; and Veterinary Medicine. Joint research includes the study of fuel cells, bioproducts, and cardiovascular and cancer therapies, as well as efforts in joint recruiting, public policy development, product innovation, entrepreneurship, and improving STEM education.
Student Role in the Knowledge Economy

Undergraduate and graduate students are heavily involved in Ohio State’s contribution to the knowledge economy—as current participants and future drivers of the economy. A few examples of projects or programs that involve students include:

- One of the university’s most exciting collaborations with Battelle and the Columbus Educational Council is the new public high school that emphasizes courses in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). In the fall of 2006 more than 100 ninth graders began classes at the *Metro High School* located on the Ohio State Science and Technology campus. Phased enrollment over four years will increase the capacity to 400 students with juniors and seniors participating in hands-on, self-directed learning with community mentors. Faculty and students will conduct research on best educational practices and develop methods to train scientists also to serve as educators.

- A second groundbreaking STEM initiative was launched with a $4 million Battelle gift for the Battelle Center for Mathematics and Science Education Policy. The center, housed in the John Glenn School of Public Affairs, will bring together leaders in higher education, K-12, business, technology, and government to develop policies and practices that will increase the number of students who are energized and prepared to become leaders in these fields.

- An additional program that emphasizes STEM education, started in the fall of 2006, focuses on undergraduate students creating open-ended chemistry experiments as part of an Ohio State-led 15-institution statewide consortium. Lab instructors provide guidance, but students form their own strategies to answer questions that relate to real-world scientific and industrial problems. This new type of course will be the centerpiece of the Undergraduate Research Center, funded by a $3 million grant from the National Science Foundation.

- “Wonders of Our World” (WOW) is a program that draws on a corps of more than 400 students and faculty to staff a science outreach program. WOW enhances elementary and middle school programs by providing 125 hands-on science experiments in 15 subject areas. Since its inception in 1999, nearly 10,000 students from 11 schools have participated. Each month an average of 150,000 people from around the world access the WOW web site.

- Among many undergraduate student projects, one of the most memorable is the Buckeye Bullet. In the fall of 2004, racing at 315 miles per hour on Utah’s Bonneville Salt Flats, Ohio State’s student-designed, built, and maintained race car set a national land speed record for an electric vehicle. The *Buckeye Bullet* was the first electric car to exceed 300 mph. The 400+ horsepower electric traction engine is powered by a 900-volt rechargeable battery system. Student fund raising of $1.5 million dollars is now underway to race the fuel cell driven Buckeye Bullet II in 2007.
Accelerating STEM education and emphasizing fundamental research are part of the recommendations to strengthen America’s competitive position as outlined in the National Academies report “Rising Above the Gathering Storm.” This document emerged from a yearlong study of global competitiveness by industry, academic, and government leaders. Its recommendations included:

- Increasing America’s talent pool by vastly improving K-12 science and mathematics education
- Sustaining and strengthening the nation’s traditional commitment to long-term basic research that has the potential to be transformational to maintain the flow of new ideas that fuel the economy, provide security, and enhance the quality of life
- Making the United States the most attractive setting in which to study and perform research so that we can develop, recruit, and retain the best and brightest students, scientists, and engineers from within the United States and throughout the world

University representatives attended the National Academies Convocation in September 2006. In addition to the numerous STEM programs currently at the university, plans are underway to organize and host a regional competitiveness meeting in Columbus during the spring of 2006. The meeting will be offered in collaboration with the national Council on Competitiveness.

Clearly, intellectual inquiry is central to all of our programs. The university continues to attract an ever-growing proportion of federally funded and industry-sponsored research programs. Our science, math, and engineering students learn alongside highly regarded researchers in newly built or renovated laboratories using the most advanced research equipment in the world. Our humanities and arts students work alongside highly regarded scholars in world-class facilities. Moreover, our research and scholarship provide significant economic benefit for Columbus and all of Ohio. As stated by President Karen Holbrook and Senior Vice-President for Research Robert McGrath in the 2006 Office of Research Annual Report,

“Collectively, these research activities bring an excitement and vitality to the educational experience that we offer to our students, which contribute to making Ohio State one of the very best public research institutions in the nation.”
PROMOTING A LIFE OF LEARNING THROUGH PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR ADMINISTRATORS, FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENTS
(Core Component 4a)

Promoting a life of learning also means that the university provides professional development opportunities for its faculty, staff, and administrators. There are numerous opportunities—many of which focus on support for women and minorities. Examples include:

Career Development Opportunities for Staff

- Critical Difference for Women program
- Tuition assistance
- Bryn Mawr Summer Institute for Women in Higher Education Administration
- The Women’s Place Staff Leadership Series
- Organization and Human Resource consulting
  - Consulting
  - Leadership development
  - Training

Career Development Opportunities for Faculty

- President and Provost’s Leadership Institute
- Bryn Mawr Summer Institute for Women in Higher Education Administration
- Academic Leader Development seminars
- ACE Fellows program
- Faculty professional leave
- Special research assignments
- Organization and Human Resource consulting
  - Consulting
  - Leadership development
  - Training

Leadership and Professional Development Opportunities for Students

- The Women Empowered to Lead (WEL) program
- Professional development opportunities through the Graduate School

Overall, although the university has many development opportunities in place, some individuals within the university, particularly staff members, are not able to take advantage of the programs. In particular, the 2006-2007 University Staff Advisory Committee Staff Compensation and Benefits Report indicates that only 52% of staff report being encouraged to pursue professional development activities and 32% of staff do not feel supported with time and/or funds for professional development.
GENERAL EDUCATION AND MAJOR PROGRAMS OF STUDY: A BASIS FOR LIFELONG LEARNING IN A DIVERSE SOCIETY (Core Components 4b and 4c)

The university strives to strike a balance between the discipline-specific knowledge required in a major, the body of knowledge that all undergraduate students should be expected to master prior to graduation (the General Education Curriculum—or GEC), and a range of additional opportunities intended to challenge the very brightest students, broaden our students’ experience with the world, and provide educational opportunities that go beyond the classroom. The following section provides a brief description of Ohio State’s GEC, major program curricula, and additional opportunities for academic enhancement.

• General Education Curriculum

Ohio State has designed a comprehensive General Education Curriculum that all undergraduate students must complete in addition to their major program. The details of the GEC are described under Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching. In brief, it includes learning goals and objectives related to students’ abilities to understand and appreciate diverse cultures, master multiple modes of inquiry, analyze and communicate information, and demonstrate a breadth of knowledge across the natural and social sciences, humanities, and arts (see complete category listing with related goals and objectives).

• Major Programs

The major embodies a student’s central field of learning and often leads directly to a career or further academic preparation (graduate or professional school) for that career. At Ohio State the major constitutes, at minimum, 40 credit hours. However, there is substantial structural diversity among the university’s 170+ majors. Some majors, enrolling approximately half of the student body (the biological sciences, engineering, foreign language, and music) are highly structured, with the combined requirements in the major itself and the prerequisite work necessary to get ready for the major using up a large proportion of the hours needed for graduation. The other half of the undergraduate student body, on the other hand, is enrolled in majors (history, psychology, business, human development) with more modest credit hour requirements for the major. These fields leave students with more electives in their curricula.

The work of the Committee for the University-Wide Review of Undergraduate Education (2005) focused on revising the general education curriculum so that it would better meet the needs of students in both types of majors. For students in the highly structured fields, the committee believed it was important to provide flexibility and freedom for the construction of programs better suited to the individual’s needs. For students in less structured programs, they believed it was valuable to provide guidance to help students enrich their experience in systematic ways (such as through double majors, minors or even multiple minors, or to undertake other enriching experiences, such as internships or study abroad). The committee’s recommendations are being discussed by relevant academic and curricular committees with implementation expected to begin as early as autumn of 2007.

“One strategy identified in the Academic Plan is to enhance and better serve the student body. In the core values, we stated that we want to ‘ignite a lifelong love of learning’ and ‘open the world to our students.’ Ohio State’s breadth and depth allow us to attract top students and offer them distinctive educational experiences and opportunities. We want every student to leave Ohio State with a degree, a sense of intellectual accomplishment and cultural curiosity, a lifelong engagement with learning, and having had direct and significant interactions with faculty members.” (2004 Leadership Agenda)
• Additional Opportunities for Enhanced Academic Experiences

As discussed in relation to Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching, the university strives to provide distinctive opportunities (both within and outside the classroom) to prepare students for lifelong learning in a diverse and changing world. Examples include:

- Undergraduate Honors, Scholars, and Collegium communities
- Service-learning opportunities
- Freshman Seminars
- Study abroad opportunities
- Development of interdisciplinary majors and minors at the graduate and undergraduate levels

**ACQUIRING, DISCOVERING, AND APPLYING KNOWLEDGE RESPONSIBLY (Core Component 4d)**

The university has numerous formal rules and policies related to acquiring, discovering, and applying knowledge responsibly. Some policies, such as those listed below, are general rules related to faculty and student behavior and complement prior examples in this chapter. Examples include:

- Code of Student Conduct
- Rules of the University Faculty
- Academic Rights and Responsibilities
- Ten Suggestions for Preserving Academic Integrity
- Ten Principles of Academic Integrity for Faculty Computer Use

Other rules and policies relate more specifically to the ethical conduct of research and the protection of research participants (both human and animal). Examples include:

- Graduate Student Code of Research and Scholarly Conduct
- Misconduct in Research or Scholarly Activities
- Animal Care and Use
- Human Subjects
- Biosafety
- IRB Training for OSU Students
- Whistle Blower Policy

Still others relate to policies and practices regarding intellectual property rights and conflict of interest. Examples include:

- Conflict of Interest
- Classified Research
- Technology Licensing & Commercialization - Policy On Patents and Copyrights
- Authorization to Seek Off-Campus Funding
REFLECTIONS AND NEXT STEPS

The preceding analyses clearly demonstrate the university’s compliance with Criterion 4: Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge. Ohio State has made remarkable progress during the last 10 years and will continue to move its research and scholarship enterprise forward. For the following opportunities, we would welcome the team’s input.

1. Increasing Ohio State’s Federal Funding for Research

Ohio State has been successful in growing research expenditures at a rate slightly in excess of our closest ranked peers. Nonetheless, we perceive that with improved strategies and further leverage on our State of Ohio funding, we may be able to grow our market share of funding from several key federal agencies.

In particular, we wish to expand funding from the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation. Working in partnership with our nearby colleagues from Battelle, the Air Force Research Lab, and NASA Glenn Research Center, we seek to increase our funding respectively from DOE, DOD, and NASA.

Question

Can the team suggest additional initiatives, economies, or strategies that we might pursue to continue increasing our research programs?

2. Regulations and Costs for Research Using Human Subjects and Animals

We wish to ensure that our human subjects’ protection program provides optimal safeguards for all involved. Like other universities, Ohio State has experienced considerable additional costs associated with increasingly complex federal compliance regulations. We anticipate that this trend will only increase in the future.

On an operational level, we are moving forward with plans to automate our compliance systems. Importantly too, we are planning for accreditation from the Association for the Accreditation of Human Research Protection Programs (AAHRPP). The President’s Cabinet and the Council of Deans have endorsed our AAHRPP accreditation initiative and we hope to achieve accreditation within three years.

Question

Is the team aware of strategies that other institutions are using to fund and manage compliance programs, while safeguarding the health and well-being of all subjects?

3. Intellectual Property Management

Ohio State is in the process of revitalizing its Technology Licensing and Commercialization program. With $91 million in industry-sponsored research in 2006, Ohio State ranks 3rd in the nation in industry-funded programs. Unfortunately, revenues from property licensing are modest at best (less than $1 million dollars per year) while patenting costs continue to soar. For the years ahead, we will continue stimulating industry-sponsored research, while simultaneously increasing licensing revenue and minimizing uncompensated patenting costs.
**Question**

Can the team suggest methods to simplify the commercialization of knowledge and to optimize the associated net revenue?

**4. Staff Development**

Career development opportunities are important to staff members, and the university is committed to providing advancement opportunities to them. Policies (6.10 and 2.3.5) are in place to support alternative work arrangements and flexible work schedules. However, staff and supervisors are not always aware of these options. In cases in which they are aware, there is not consistent support for flexible working arrangements. USAC recommends that the university more aggressively communicate its policies and guidelines to university employees, and that university leaders stress the importance of being flexible with and supportive of employees who wish to use compensatory time-off. In addition, the University’s Action Plan for Work/Life recommends an increased focus on professional development and career advancement, more resources and direction for career development opportunities, and internships and formal mentoring programs.

**Questions**

Do these steps seem appropriate in light of our goal to enhance opportunities for staff at all levels of the university?

What other suggestions might the team have related to professional development opportunities for university staff members?
Chapter Five  

Criterion Five:  
Engagement and Service
This chapter focuses on the unique role that The Ohio State University plays with its community partners in shaping Ohio’s future. Our commitment to “Engagement and Service,” or “Outreach and Engagement,” is evident in the work of our faculty, staff, and students and has strong national and international dimensions. It is through the outreach and engagement aspects of teaching, research, and service that the work of the university has a broader societal impact. Equally important, the work of the university is enriched and informed by the co-creation and sharing of knowledge between the university and its community partners. This chapter describes Ohio State’s vision for outreach and engagement, its definition of what it means to be engaged, and the integration of outreach and engagement across the university.
THE ACADEMIC PLAN: SETTING THE STAGE FOR OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT (Core Components 5b and 5c)

“Since our founding in 1870 as a land-grant college, Ohio State has proudly and effectively served Ohio and its people—educating hundreds of thousands of Ohioans and applying our base of knowledge and skills to economic and societal needs. Our proactive outreach and engagement initiatives integrate teaching, scholarship, and research. They also connect our research results to community needs and to the global marketplace—a dynamic aspect of academic excellence. And while few would contest Ohio State’s past and present success, economic and social trends have changed contemporary community needs. In response, we must expand our land-grant mission.”

The Ohio State University Academic Plan
October, 2000

The sixth strategy within the Academic Plan is to “Help build Ohio’s future.” As a land-grant institution, the university has a long tradition associated with, and values its role in, building the future of Ohio—the nation, and the world.

Well established and respected examples of this activity include:

- **Ohio State University Extension.** This department in the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences has thrived for more than a century as the outreach and engagement arm of the university. Today it has offices in all 88 counties and has expanded partnerships beyond the traditional agricultural, veterinary medicine, and human ecology sciences. Partnerships now include those that help shape economic development, expand appreciation of the arts, tackle issues of community health, and address the needs of small businesses. In 2005 OSU Extension had 758,318 direct contacts with Ohioans. More than 34,000 volunteers, who work with Extension faculty and staff, contributed 1,480,709 hours to delivering educational programs.
• **Continuing Education and Professional Development.** Both are distinctive features of the university’s history and continue to be essential parts of outreach and engagement. The university offers credit and non-credit courses through the **Office of Continuing Education.** For example, the most recent data reveal that 3,300 undergraduates were enrolled in credit courses with 2,000 in non-credit courses, and 8,400 people participated in workshops and conferences offered through this office. There are specialized professional development and credit courses for working professionals through college units, notably in the Fisher College of Business M.B.A. tracks and the College of Medicine’s Center for Continuing Medical Education that has 47 subscriber hospitals in eight states. Over the past three years the number of continuing education courses offered by distance learning technology has grown to almost to 250.

• **Health Sciences.** The university’s comprehensive facilities, including the Ohio State Medical Center, the James Cancer Hospital, the Richard M. Ross Heart Hospital, and its many clinics and mobile units offer a vast array of health services. In fiscal year 2004, Ohio State affiliated hospitals provided 366,037 days of inpatient care and had 1,363,422 outpatient visits. In addition, $107.4 million in uncompensated care was provided. These patients come from every part of the state and many parts of the world.

These important activities continue. Given its size, research reputation, programmatic diversity, long history of successful partnerships with external constituents, alumni contacts, and its location in a large urban area in the center of the state, Ohio State is well-positioned to build upon its previous successes as an “engaged university”—and is doing so. Recent examples include:

• **John Glenn School of Public Affairs.** In July, 2006 the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy (established in 1999) merged with the School of Public Policy and Management (established in 1970) to form the John Glenn School of Public Affairs. This new entity builds upon the strengths of its predecessors by combining the academic strength of the School of Public Policy and Management with the policy outreach, scholarship, and service excellence of the institute. It continues to offer master’s and doctoral degree programs, internships for high school students and undergraduates, training programs for mid-career journalists and for public service professionals, co-curricular activities for undergraduates with an interest in public service, and public events such as headline lectures and conferences to engage the community around current policy issues. The new school features programs to inspire citizenship and develop leadership among people from all walks of life.

• **Activities to Address Urban Issues.** The Ohio State University is an urban institution located in a rapidly growing metropolitan area. Indeed, Ohio is approximately 80% urban. Cities are the locations of some of the most complex issues facing society. In response:
  
  • In 2001, the university established a **Center for Urban and Regional Analysis** with an emphasis on theoretical and applied research on urban issues. Much of its activity has focused on Columbus and other Ohio urban areas, and also extends well beyond those areas.
  
  • The **Campus Partners** initiative is addressing issues of urban blight and economic development in a very densely populated region next to the campus.
• Through the **P-12 Project**, the units across the campus are working in partnership with local urban schools to address issues affecting their student population.

• OSU Extension’s programs are as strong and innovative in the urban centers of the state as in any of the other counties they serve.

• *Research Partnerships.* Research is central to the university’s mission and a vital component of innovative community partnerships.

  • Faculty, staff, and students are partners in 24 Third Frontier grants that focus on research and industry collaborations to move research innovation into industry to expand Ohio’s economic well-being.

  • Through partnerships such as those with Battelle and COSI, Ohio State is working to create the local 315 Research + Technology Corridor.

  • Through its 11 outlying Agricultural Research Stations throughout the state, the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center supports and fosters advances in agriculture that affect food production and innovation.

### DEFINING OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT

(*Core Components 5a and 5b*)

Outreach and engagement is not a new or unique feature of the work undertaken at this university. However, over the past decade, considerable activity has occurred to integrate outreach and engagement into the work of the administrative, academic, and academic support units. The university is building on its traditional outreach and engagement efforts and expanding new and creative partnerships to meet the needs of 21st-century society.

Given these developments, a distinctive definition was needed. In 1996, the President’s Council for Outreach and Engagement defined it in the following way:

*Meaningful and mutually beneficial collaborations with partners outside the academic community.* This may include partners such as those in education, business, and public and social service. It is:

  • that aspect of *teaching* that enables learning beyond the campus walls;

  • that aspect of *research* that makes what we discover useful beyond the academic community; and

  • that aspect of *service* that directly benefits the public.

With this definition, outreach and engagement is not equivalent to the third part of the institution’s mission—service. Nor is it a fourth activity of the academy. With this definition, it is a fundamental part of the teaching, research, and service that is done. It is a partnership between the university and the communities it serves. It is to be infused into the role of not only a few units, but all units within the university, as they:

  • Enable citizens and students to learn through such means as service learning, internships, clinical training, continuing education, and professional development.

  • Collaborate on research with community and industry partners in order to make our discoveries useful to the public.
• Serve the community through consulting and mentoring on projects that directly benefit the public.

Today the university is committed to:

• Embedding outreach and engagement more deeply into the university culture.
• Seeing “mutually beneficial” partnerships as a key to the success and livelihood of all partners (both the institution and the communities it serves).
• Shaping its outreach and engagement work in a global context.
• Documenting the impact of its outreach and engagement partnerships.

Organizational and Structural Changes Made to Facilitate Outreach and Engagement

With this new definition of outreach and engagement, and with a goal to position itself as a 21st-century land-grant institution, the university took the following steps.

• In 2000, an Outreach and Engagement Steering Committee met to help shape the outreach and engagement component of the university’s Academic Plan. Its leadership led one of the six strategies and initiatives of the Academic Plan, Build Ohio’s future, and called for the development of three focus areas: P-12 education, health and safety, and economic development. Subsequently, these programs have shaped the university’s outreach and engagement initiatives.

• Early in 2001, the university president created the position of vice president for university outreach. The Office of University Outreach and Engagement was created and staffed to support and foster the integration of outreach and engagement into campus units. The reporting line for the Office of Continuing Education was changed to the vice president for university outreach, and a closer partnership between OSU Extension and the Office of Continuing Education was established, creating new programs for continuing professional development, certification, and academic credit throughout the state.

• Since 2001, leadership committees have provided insight and guidance to the Office of University Outreach and Engagement. They include deans, administrative heads of outreach and engagement units, and outreach and engagement contacts in each college. In winter 2007, these committees were restructured to include the Outreach and Engagement Steering Committee and the College/Vice President Outreach and Engagement Contacts Council.

• In 2003 the university completed internal and external reviews of its outreach and engagement efforts. The recommendations helped outline a roadmap for Ohio State’s integration of outreach and engagement into the institution’s mission.

A particularly important step that colleges and other academic and academic support units have taken is to identify outreach and engagement contacts for their particular units. Those contacts hold different titles and provide differing levels of leadership and oversight; however, each serves as a liaison for communication and coordination of outreach and engagement efforts. Examples include the following.

• The Office of Outreach and Engagement in the College of Education and Human Ecology is led by an associate dean for outreach and engagement. This office connects the college to the larger community, its schools, neighborhoods, and families through four work groups: schools, extension,
partnerships and entrepreneurship, and external relations.

- The Colleges of the Arts and Sciences (ASC) has recently created a new Outreach and Engagement Office staffed by a program manager. The primary goals are: a) to build relationships with people and organizations outside the university, b) to help grow partnerships among ASC faculty, staff, and students and people and organizations outside the university, and c) to identify and develop resources for effective partnerships.

- The College of Dentistry has a Community Outreach and Engagement Office with leadership provided by the director of the Geriatric Dentistry Program. Today the college has over 47 outreach and engagement projects.

- In February 2006, WOSU Public Media hired a director of community outreach to specifically address engagement with local constituencies. This hiring coincided with the opening of WOSU@COSI, a partnership with the Center for Science and Industry (COSI), bringing a high definition television and radio studio facility to the science center and demonstrating a commitment to personnel (including the director of community outreach), facility space, time, and resources to community outreach activities.

INTEGRATING OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT INTO UNITS AND THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE
(Core Components 5b and 5c)

Regardless of the overall organizational structure, from the outset, planning for outreach and engagement stressed the importance of letting the individual units determine how best to proceed. Thus, recent development of such activities by faculty, staff, and students has occurred in many different ways, depending upon the particular unit’s mission and vision, its academic expertise, and its infrastructure to support outreach and engagement activities.

Examples (drawn from each of the college clusters) include:

**College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences.** This professional college has a long and distinguished history of integrating outreach and engagement into its research, teaching, and service. The college states as its core purpose, “We bring knowledge to life.” The vision statement for the college indicates that progress is being made toward its goal when:

- Integrated teaching, research, and extension focus on economic, environmental, social, and production issues.
- Faculty, staff, students, and external partners operate as co-learners.
- We are the model for extending to people the latest research-based information.

This college has developed an organizational infrastructure to support the achievement of this mission and the integration of outreach and engagement into its work. **OSU Extension**, a department within the college, collaborates across the college and across the institution to help improve the lives of Ohioans through educational programs based on scientific knowledge and focused on critical issues and needs. Extension professionals and more than 34,000 trained volunteers provide research-based information in communities through educational programs that expand research discoveries to local communities. In return these partnerships with local communities
help inform research implemented by university faculty and staff. Examples of extension programs in four focus areas—a) the environment, b) family, individuals, and youth development, c) leadership, and d) the economy—are presented below:

- Agriculture and Natural Resources
- Family and Consumer Sciences
- 4-H Youth Development
- Community Development

*College of the Arts.* This college has identified in its mission statement that, “Through its teaching, research, and outreach programs, the college aspires to build on its history as a vital force for change and innovation in and through the arts…..”

Examples include:

- Via more than 500 performances, exhibitions, and public lectures each year, College of the Arts students and faculty have the opportunity to practice their art while audiences gain cultural enrichment. WOSU-FM programming extends the college’s reach across the state.
- Students in the visual, performing, or literary arts work in an after school program, “Children of the Future,” at Indianola Middle School and also serve as interns at Fort Hayes and Columbus Alternative high schools.
- Arts faculty recently worked with Ohio visual and performing arts teachers to create new model lessons that meet state guidelines and are advising the Columbus City Council on the creation of a new cultural plan.
- Design faculty’s research projects with business and industry give students the opportunity to see how the design professional/client relationship works, and business partners frequently implement the students’ recommendations.
- Faculty and graduate students lead movement skills classes for persons in the Association for Retarded Citizens (ARC), effectively building their socialization and self-awareness skills.

The College of the Arts Community Outreach web page highlights some other ways the college implements its work with the community. Individual units and programs (examples provided below) also have web pages that highlight their unique contributions.

- What’s Happening?
- Arts and Design Technology Mentoring Program for Young Women
- Art Education Partnerships
- Art Education Conferences
- History of Art GILD Events
  - design.osu.edu/gallery_collab.html
  - music.osu.edu/2_news_events/youth_camps.php
  - theatre.osu.edu/1_academics/level_3_academics/international_programs.html

*College of Pharmacy.* The college’s mission for outreach and engagement is, “To identify community needs that would benefit from the knowledge and skills unique to pharmaceutical sciences and the profession of pharmacy. Once identified, these needs can serve as a foundation for the establishment of appropriate community/College
of Pharmacy partnerships where congruent missions and goals exist. In this way reciprocal relationships can be formed to serve both community and college interests.”

A partnership between College of Pharmacy professional students and Hilliard Public Schools provides just one example of the implementation of the college’s mission. Since the creation in January 2005 of an interactive diabetes education program, over 750 central Ohio sixth-grade students have engaged in that program. Sixth-graders’ post-test results show vast improvements compared to pre-test results; students consistently answer more questions correctly regarding both type-1 and type-2 diabetes.

**Ohio State University at Mansfield.** The Ohio State University at Mansfield highlights outreach and engagement in its **Statement of Values.** Here it is evident that the campus values involvement in the life of the community and works in partnership with the region to improve economic development, access to the arts and cultures, and in support of local schools. Many faculty and staff contribute time, money, and expertise for the good of the community. In turn, community leaders help the campus assess community needs, and the community has contributed generously to campus campaigns.

In a recent **community kick-off** to Black History Month, a faculty member in Anthropology worked with the Mansfield Senior High School symphonic choir and Step Afrika to produce an evening of traditional African dance and gospel singing. The event was sponsored by the Ohio State Mansfield and North Central State College (the co-located institution) Arts & Lecture Series in cooperation with OSU Richland County Alumni Club and the Black History Month Committee.

**Support for Outreach and Engagement**

Stated simply, embedding outreach and engagement into university units is central to the institution’s philosophy of engagement and is based on recommendations by various advisory committees. Indeed the Office of Outreach and Engagement’s structure and facilitating actions are designed to support and enhance activities embedded across the university. This approach fosters a university-wide culture and leads to sustainability because the work is integrated into existing teaching, research, and service functions. It utilizes existing resources and staff to move projects forward. Therefore, it is not the “responsibility” of an outreach and engagement unit. However, a decentralized approach does make it more difficult to track funds allocated to support outreach and engagement activities.

When the Office of University Outreach and Engagement was established, three university-wide initiatives became affiliate programs of the office, working collaboratively to enhance the integration of engagement work into the missions of the institution. The Office of University Outreach and Engagement, and these three affiliate programs, receive over $300,000 in annual rate to support development of broader university engagement. Grants and cash provide additional support for the units.

- **OSU CARES (Community Access to Resources and Educational Services)** serves as a catalyst to activate teams of university professionals to address anticipated critical issues that face Ohioans. These teams have created new partnerships between OSU Extension and colleges, departments, and units of the university. Through the work of these teams and partnerships, new or enhanced outreach/engagement efforts connect the resources and educational services of the university with the communities it serves. Through OSU CARES, Extension has partnered with 14 colleges, over 40 departments, and three regional campuses in recent history.
• Created in 2000, the Service-Learning Initiative (SLI) leads efforts to integrate outreach and engagement into the curriculum. To support course development, SLI offers grants, faculty development workshops, web-based training modules, and a resource collection.
  • More than 60 courses incorporating service learning are offered one or more times per year.
  • More than 2,000 Ohio State students participate in service-learning courses, providing more than 4,500 hours of community service.
  • In partnership with Ohio State’s Project Community and P-12 Project, SLI supports Community Connection, an online database of community service opportunities that faculty use to manage service-learning courses.

• Project GRO (The Project to Support Grants for Research Outreach) is a collaborative initiative established in 2006 between the Office of University Outreach and Engagement and the Office of Research to create a sustained and coordinated resource for faculty who include an outreach and engagement component in their grant proposals for research funding. Project GRO works with Ohio State researchers to develop outreach and engagement plans for research proposals, facilitates collaborations between researchers and those who provide outreach within Ohio State and the community, and assists with the evaluation and accountability aspects of outreach components.

These programs strive to prevent any duplication of efforts. Offices and other outreach and engagement projects across campus communicate regularly through collaborative meetings, newsletters, committees, joint projects, and regular conversation. By working together, a minimal central structure can support the broad outreach and engagement being led by units.

These and other university-wide projects are designed to be catalysts for this work via supporting initiatives, consulting with project leaders, and bringing partners together around specific efforts. Key to their role is fostering communication and connections related to outreach and engagement.

Examples of the grant programs and other supported activities that the Office of University Outreach and Engagement and its affiliate programs and partners (OSU Extension and the Office of Continuing Education) are able to provide to the university community include:

• Seed Grant Programs. Since 1996, a number of competitive seed grant programs have been initiated to support the development of outreach and engagement activities. The following five grants programs have awarded 227 seed grants worth over $2.1 million. These grants have been instrumental in providing seed dollars for the development of innovative outreach and engagement programs.

  • Office of University Outreach and Engagement Excellence in Engagement Grants
  • Service-Learning Initiative Interdisciplinary University/Community Service-Learning Teams Grants
  • OSU CARES/OSU Extension Seed Grants
  • OSU CARES Faculty Support Grants
  • P-12 Scholars Grants
• **Office of Continuing Education Course Development Grants.** The Office of Continuing Education offers grants to faculty seeking to develop or adapt courses to be delivered using nontraditional teaching and learning formats, such as web-based courseware, interactive video, synchronous and asynchronous web casting, self-instructional DVD or CD-ROM packages, one-way video or audio conferencing, etc.

• **OSU Extension Professional Development.** OSU Extension offers professional development training for its 1,100+ employees and also offers university-wide professional development opportunities, as appropriate. For example, OSU Extension and the Office of University Outreach and Engagement have collaborated to create an online program evaluation resource, Successful Assessment Methods and Measurements in Evaluation (SAMMIE), which is available for use across the university. As a second example, OSU Extension recently provided workshops on building effective teams that drew participants from across campus. The success of these workshops and the feedback from evaluations support OSU Extension’s ability to offer programs to the broader community.

• **Roads Scholars Tour.** Since 1996, newly hired and newly tenured faculty have been invited to participate in this annual two-day tour showcasing Ohio State’s partnerships with communities throughout the state. To date over 600 faculty, staff, and student leaders have participated in the event. Based on evaluations, participants report that the tour helps them 1) get acquainted with faculty from across campus, 2) learn about Ohio State’s outreach and engagement mission, and 3) learn more about Ohio and its citizens.

• **James F. Patterson Land-Grant University Lecture.** Begun in 2004, this annual lecture honors James F. Patterson, past chair of The Ohio State University Board of Trustees and a champion of the role of land-grant universities. Open to the university community, the lecture features a prominent national land-grant university leader and draws 150 to 200 participants from across the university. At this event the recipients of outreach and engagement grants are recognized.

• **University-Wide Outreach and Engagement Conferences.** Since our last re-accreditation, three all-day events have been held on campus to focus on pertinent issues related to outreach and engagement. A 1997 conference focused on developing an understanding of the definition for outreach and engagement. A 2001 conference occurred shortly after the vice president for university outreach was named and focused on the outreach and engagement theme areas of P-12 education, health and safety, and economic development. A conference held in 2004 focused on the skills needed to implement outreach and engagement work.

• **Outreach Scholarship National Conference.** This annual conference is the result of a partnership begun in 2001 between The Ohio State University, Pennsylvania State University, University of Wisconsin-Extension, and University of Georgia. These institutions have partnered to advance outreach and engagement on their campuses and to advance the national conversation on outreach scholarship. The primary product of the partnership is the annual conference, which focuses on the scholarship of engagement and provides an opportunity to faculty, staff, students, and community partners to share papers on the subject as well as hear from nationally known leaders and experts.
The conference draws 350-450 participants each year from over 35 states, 80 institutions, and three countries. Ohio State hosted the conference in 2002 and 2006.

• **Lunch and Learn Seminars.** For about the last 10 years, the Office of University Outreach and Engagement has sponsored a series of one- to two-hour seminars to serve as networking venues for colleagues across the institution. Topics have varied, depending on the changing needs of the audience. In the late 1990s, these sessions created awareness about engagement and provided venues for networking. In the early 2000s, the programs focused on the University District and were held at Campus Partners. In winter 2006 and 2007, the programs focused on developing grant applications for various outreach and engagement grant opportunities.

### Integrating Outreach and Engagement into the Student Experience

The university is committed to providing students with opportunities for outreach and engagement throughout their university experience. Examples include:

*Outreach and Engagement in the Curriculum.* Outreach and engagement includes “that aspect of teaching that enables learning beyond the campus walls.” It takes a variety of forms: service learning, internships, and clinical rotations.

Professional students have been heavily involved in internships and clinical rotations for many years. One example of particular growth for the student body as a whole is found in new opportunities for service learning. The **Service-Learning Initiative** provides enhanced learning experiences for students through service-learning courses in 11 colleges. It provides students the opportunity to participate in a structured learning experience that connects service to the community with the learning objectives of the course. Students provide service in areas of need identified by the community; learn about the context in which the service is provided; practice application of academic concepts in community settings; and gain experience as active, participatory citizens.

Faculty from the Service-Learning Scholars Roundtable, a forum for discussion and development of service learning, recently developed a proposal for university-level criteria to evaluate courses designated as service learning. The addition of a course suffix, “S,” will clearly identify designated service-learning courses in the University Course Bulletin and course offering schedules. A common definition for and identification of service-learning courses will help to ensure quality across courses and assist students in finding them. This proposal is in the final stages of approval.

*Opportunities for Outreach and Engagement in Student Research.* Outreach and engagement includes “that aspect of research that makes what we discover useful beyond the academic community.” As members of a major research university, our students are involved in many different research programs, including research conducted in partnership with the community and research that has direct impact on the community. Research was detailed under Chapter 4; however, a few additional examples that demonstrate ways in which student researchers can see outreach and engagement applied are:

• Collaboration between Ohio State’s Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center and OSU Extension to extend the research of OARDC to the people of Ohio through Extension’s outreach and engagement network.
• Third Frontier grants that join academic and industry partners to integrate research discoveries with business opportunities.

• Ohio State’s Targeted Investments in Excellence put together interdisciplinary teams to focus on issues that have an impact on society.

• Ohio Sea Grant statewide program, including its Research Experience for Undergraduate Program, supports greater knowledge and stewardship of Lake Erie and the Great Lakes through research, education, and outreach.

Opportunities for Community Involvement through Service. Community service opportunities provide another way to extend student learning beyond the classroom for the mutual benefit of the student and the community. For the 2005-06 academic year, more than 7,000 university students participated in community service projects, with almost 2,800 students contributing an average of more than 20 hours per term. Examples include:

• Community Based Work-Study Opportunities. For the 2005-2006 academic year, 399 Columbus campus and regional campus students were placed at off-campus community service jobs for their federal work-study financial aid assignments. These students contributed 88,372 hours of work ($835,464.00) to the community.\footnote{Data provided by Marilyn K. Lee, Assistant Director, Office of Student Financial Aid}

• Community Commitment is one of the largest single-day community service events on a college campus in the country. Each year, the day before classes start for autumn quarter, approximately 1,500 Ohio State students, faculty, and staff participate in this one-day community service event. In 2006 there was participation in volunteer projects with over 90 community organizations.

• After the 2005 Gulf Coast hurricanes, an estimated 4,400 students provided approximately 20,000 hours of volunteer support for the region via university-related activities. In addition, $210,000 in cash and in-kind contributions were raised for the region.

• Students in the Academy of Student Pharmacists in the College of Pharmacy hold a Chili Cook-off each November to benefit the Muscular Dystrophy Association. Over the past 10 years, this service activity has raised over $64,000 for a community partner.

The Community Connection web-based tool allows students on each of the campuses to search for volunteer opportunities, access training modules, log service hours, and create a service portfolio.
MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL PARTNERSHIPS
(Core Components 5a, 5c, and 5d)

“Great universities are connected with their communities through strategic partnerships and outreach programs that strengthen economic and social foundations locally, nationally, and globally.”

President Karen A. Holbrook
State of the University Address
October 2006

“Mutually beneficial collaborations” between members of the university community and constituencies outside the institution are key to Ohio State’s definition of outreach and engagement. It is through the sharing of knowledge, collaborative identification of issues, and the co-creation and implementation of projects that this work becomes “mutually beneficial.” The members of the university learn from the community, the community learns from the university, and together they “bring knowledge to life.” It is through these strategically focused partnerships that Ohio State has become and will continue to grow as a truly great university.

As a land-grant university, Ohio State has long established partnerships for outreach and engagement that take a variety of forms—from focused, short-term partnerships to address immediate local needs to broader, long-term partnerships to address far-reaching state, national, or global concerns. Because societal issues are interdisciplinary by nature, these initiatives typically involve a diverse team of disciplines, faculty, staff, and students. Examples of partnerships include:

Community Partnerships. Partners are as diverse as the communities served. These communities may be across the street from the campus or may be thousands of miles away. The following examples highlight two of the recent partnerships developed in “local” communities to connect the resources of the university to the needs of citizens.

- **Campus Partners** has spearheaded community-based planning for the urban neighborhoods surrounding the Columbus campus, building trust among the stakeholders and consensus for action. Campus Partners regularly convenes stakeholders to seek improvements to municipal services and to neighborhood quality of life. It has also undertaken strategic projects to implement neighborhood planning, such as construction of the $150 million mixed-use redevelopment project, South Campus Gateway. This project involved the acquisition and renovation of the nation’s largest scattered-site, project-based Section 8 housing portfolio, and the redevelopment of a major industrial “brownfield” site (Columbus Coated Fabrics) in the university area’s most impoverished neighborhood.

- Partnerships extend beyond the state of Ohio. In response to the impact of Hurricane Katrina, a faculty member in the Division of City and Regional Planning (Knowlton School of Architecture, College of Engineering) and 24
graduate students from Planning, Architecture, and Public Policy worked during the 2005-2006 academic year to rebuild two communities, Socier (pop. 12,000) and DeLisle (pop. 1,300) in Harrison County, Mississippi. The process engaged local economic developers, citizens, elected officials, businesses, and the Southern Mississippi Planning and Development District. The plans they developed will help guide the long-term investment in new infrastructure, public facilities, and land use. The project was initially supported by a special grant from the Service-Learning Initiative (made possible by a Higher Education Grant from Learn and Serve America), funding from University Outreach and Engagement, and support from the college. The project has received additional funding through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Universities Rebuilding America Partnership to continue efforts over the next two years. In recognition of their work, students on the project team received the 2006 Excellence in Economic Development Planning Award from the Economic Development Division of the American Planning Association.

Partnering with Other Institutions and Industries. Ohio State works collaboratively with government entities and private businesses in ways that enrich both the community and the university learning environment. Examples include the following.

- Continuing Education has partnerships with numerous institutions and industries, including General Motors, the National Association of Home Builders, Time-Warner, South Florida Water Management District, Ohio Speech and Hearing Association, Ohio Department of Human Services, Lorain County Community College, State of Ohio School for the Blind, Stanton Music Company, Honda, the Ohio Departments of Education and Public Health, and the Proyecto Lingüístico Francisco Marroquín (PLFM) in Antigua, Guatemala. These partnerships are designed to extend credit and non-credit course opportunities to employees, clients, and students.

- The Ohio State University and Battelle Memorial Institute. The Battelle Memorial Institute is a global science and technology institute that conducts over $3.4 billion in annual research and development. This renowned institute, adjacent to the university, has not always been a close partner with the university. During the past four years, in a conscious effort to make that partnership stronger, more than 40 joint research projects and numerous high-profile initiatives have been developed. Examples include:
  - Lazarus Urban Arts Space in downtown Columbus, scheduled for completion in fall 2007, builds on the College of the Arts’ initiative to bring some of its performances and exhibitions downtown. This partnership will allow the university to contribute to the revitalization of downtown as our students benefit from the experience and mentoring they receive through participation in the project.
  - Battelle Center for Mathematics and Science Education Policy, housed at the John Glenn School of Public Affairs, was established in 2006 with a $4 million gift from Battelle. The center will address global competitiveness by developing policies and practices that will increase the number of students in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields.
  - Metro High School involves a partnership between Ohio State, Battelle, 16 public school districts, and the Franklin County Educational Council...
in a project to create a new public high school to serve as a hub of innovation for teachers and learners, while providing researchers across campus with opportunities to improve education nationwide. This school, located adjacent to the campus and within a few minutes of Battelle, opened in August 2006 with 100 freshmen.

- The Ohio State University and COSI. The Center of Science and Industry (COSI) has been a public resource in central Ohio for 40 years. COSI’s mission is to promote an increased understanding of science and industry through its exhibits and educational activities. The center has a rich history of partnering with Ohio State to achieve that mission, and new, innovative, and mutually beneficial partnerships have been and continue to be developed. Two examples include:
  - **WOSU@COSI** is a new digital media center developed through an innovative partnership between Ohio State’s public broadcast stations and COSI; it is the only public broadcast/major science center partnership of its kind in the country.
  - The **Center for Family Research** is housed at COSI. The center brings together researchers from different disciplines to collaborate with community partners on youth and family policy issues. Ultimately, the goal of the Center for Family Research is to create a research program that will provide practical knowledge about families to citizens in Ohio and beyond, concurrently increasing Ohio State’s competitiveness for federal funding among the community of scholars.

- Public School Partnerships. As stated in the Academic Plan, one strategy for building Ohio’s future is to “significantly strengthen the scope and effectiveness of our commitment to P-12 public education, with a special focus on the education of underserved children and youth.” To that end, numerous new interdisciplinary partnerships with public schools throughout Ohio have developed. Examples include the following.
  - The **P-12 Project** (developed in 2001) is a university-wide partnership created to assist in improving Ohio’s schools with a special emphasis on the education of Ohio’s underserved children and youth. The project’s primary goal is simple: increase success for all students, with a focus on preschool through 12th grade. The project serves to develop and sustain relationships with 13 university-area schools and to initiate and support projects closely aligned with school improvement and increased student performance.
  - Each regional campus is involved with local area school systems. For example, the Lima Campus mission for Education Outreach is “to improve the quality of life for youth (K-12) in our 10-county service area.”
  - The creation of the new Metro High School, as well as other initiatives such as the **Early Childhood Development Center** in Columbus’ Weinland Park neighborhood, directly benefit the community’s children and provide research and educational opportunities for faculty and students.
  - Special continuing education opportunities for teachers, such as the **endorsement program for TESOL** (Teaching English to Speakers of
Other Languages); local schools have more than 130 TESOL-endorsed teachers who earned their endorsements through this program, and approximately 70 more teachers are currently involved.

- The History Teaching Institute in the Department of History provides professional development and training to Ohio’s public school teachers through a combination of summer institutes, faculty initiatives, and Teaching American History grant collaborations. The History Teaching Institute links one of the nation’s leading academic history departments to the shifting landscape of K-12 education in Ohio.

**SHAPING OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT IN A GLOBAL CONTEXT (Core Components 5a and 5c)**

The university strives to ensure that its outreach and engagement initiatives reach broadly across society. The sections below illustrate the ways in which Ohio State partners with diverse populations to address the issues that are being faced by an increasingly diverse state and nation.

**Structures that Support Outreach and Engagement in Diverse Communities**

Ohio State has established community centers in locations with high minority populations to make the university more accessible. The following are examples of such centers.

- The **African American African Studies Community Extension Center** provides community outreach and education programs designed to enhance the educational opportunities of students and improve the quality of life for people who live and work in the urban neighborhoods near the center.

- OSU Extension and the Five Rivers Metro Parks in Dayton, Ohio, have partnered to provide programming to youth in inner city Dayton. The mission of the **Adventure Center** is to promote positive youth development, education, and leadership skills in a welcoming, safe, fun, and active setting.

- The **Godman Guild—OSU Extension Learning Center** is located in the University District in partnership with the guild, a local community service organization. This **learning center** is one of three in the state established by OSU Extension. The center offers a variety of computer classes and opportunities for workforce development.

**Outreach and Engagement Initiatives Targeted to Reach Specific Populations**

The university has developed several outreach and engagement initiatives to meet the needs of specific population groups, including the 40,000 foreign born individuals residing in Franklin County, the region’s growing Hispanic population, and the individuals living and working in the Appalachian region of Ohio. Examples include the following.

- The **Young Scholars Program**, housed in the Office of Minority Affairs, offers services and programs to assist minority student success.

- Ohio’s nursery and landscape industry produces over $2.78 billion in sales annually, and Hispanic individuals make up at least 65% of the green industry’s workforce in Ohio. To meet the needs of this population, **OSU Extension and**
the Department of Horticulture and Crop Sciences have created programs that focus on learning more about the Latino workforce in Ohio and empowering that workforce through education.

- Several colleges have initiated programs that help to prepare and recruit women and minority students. The Women in Engineering (WiE) Program is designed to increase the pipeline of future engineers. During the 2005-2006 academic year, more than 425 students participated in programs hosted by WiE. An additional 250 students participated in outreach programs that were partially supported by WiE. As another example, through the OHIO (Oral Health Improvement through Outreach) Project, The Ohio State University College of Dentistry trains culturally competent dental practitioners while working to recruit minority students to the profession.

International Outreach and Engagement Activities

Ohio State is an internationally known university with 3,800 international students. It is also a university that has among its stated core values, “produce discoveries that make the world a better place,” “celebrate and learn from our diversity,” and “open the world to our students.” Examples include the following.

- As part of its outreach efforts, the Office of International Affairs provides services to P-12 educators, business, state and local governments, civic organizations, and the community at large. The Area Studies Libraries house resources including: video loan libraries, lecture programs, a speakers bureau, seminars for business persons, translation and interpreting referrals, teaching materials, artifact boxes, and workshops for P-12 educators.

- The Office of Continuing Education through its partnerships with General Motors, the Taiwanese government, the Edna Manley College of Visual and Performing Arts in Jamaica, and the National Association of Home Builders, offers certificate and degree programs to students from Canada, Mexico, Luxembourg, Australia, Taiwan, and nearly every state in the United States.

- The John C. and Susan L. Huntington Photographic Archive of Buddhist and Related Art is a unique resource serving the university’s Asian teaching and research programs, visiting scholars, and the international research and museum community. The archive was created with funding from the Battelle Endowment for Technology and Human Affairs (BETHA), the Preservation and Access Division of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), the Web Media Collective (WMC), and College of the Arts at The Ohio State University.

- Academic centers, such as the Byrd Polar Research Center, provide an interdisciplinary network to advance scholarship. The center, an internationally recognized leader in studies of polar regions and global change, has an active education and outreach component that has a vision for enhancing the knowledge and awareness of earth sciences for learners of all ages. This center brings a global perspective to the P-12 classroom.

- University faculty are developing models for international service-learning courses. For example, students in the Colleges of Engineering and Education and Human Ecology participate in a week-long experience in Honduras. Prior to the experience, the students enroll in a quarter-long course that addresses the skills the students need to complete the project. It introduces them to the cultural, economic, and political context in which their Honduran experience will be based.
While in Honduras, engineering students work on projects related to agriculture, computers, electricity, and water quality. Education and Human Ecology students work with local teachers to develop and implement curricula.

**EVALUATING AND REPORTING IMPACT AS AN ENGAGED INSTITUTION** *(Core Components 5a and 5d)*

The university is heavily involved in the national conversation related to assessing the impact of outreach and engagement work. Finding appropriate benchmarks and assessment tools that institutions and units can use to assess their work is a current focus of that conversation. The Engagement Committee of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), with The Ohio State University as an active participant, developed draft guidelines and indicators of engagement. These guidelines were forwarded to and are currently being considered by subcommittees reporting to the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) with this university, the CIC, and other land-grant institutions as active participants. Additionally, extension systems across the country are looking at the same issue. The university has played a leadership role in that work as well. Improved identification and assessment of the impact of outreach and engagement activities will be possible once valid indicators and appropriate benchmarks are identified. As this process evolves, we currently use several methods to evaluate and report outreach and engagement.

**The Academic Plan Scorecard**

One of the initiatives for achieving the sixth strategy of the Academic Plan, “Help build Ohio’s future,” is to increase collaborations with the private sector to enhance research and successfully transfer university technology. The Academic Plan Scorecard annually tracks that initiative by reporting on factors (the number of invention disclosures, the number of awarded patents, the number of start-up companies, and the amount of revenue obtained from income generating licenses) that contribute to increased collaborations in this arena. We assess our progress by evaluating our results in light of comparable data from our benchmark institutions.

**Partnering with Communities to Assess Needs and Identify Outreach and Engagement Opportunities**

The university strives to work jointly with the community to identify needs that might be addressed by partnering with faculty, staff, and students. Examples include:

- **Regional Campus Board of Trustees.** The Ohio State University Board of Trustees has established a local Board of Trustees for each regional campus. One of the duties of these boards is to “advise the dean/director concerning the local service area’s educational needs and the perception of university programs.”

- **County Extension Reviews.** OSU Extension periodically reviews program offerings within each of the counties to determine current relevance. When one county lost two full-time Extension educators due to budget reductions and retirements, the County Extension Advisory Committee conducted a needs assessment with the help of county residents. As a result, a full-time educator now focuses on agriculture and natural resources, and the commissioners are considering funding another full-time educator position.
- **Identifying New Program Opportunities.** With the vision of incorporating the 4-H experience into an urban park environment, staff from OSU Extension and staff from Five Rivers MetroParks in Dayton, Ohio, worked together to create a facility and a program reflecting the unique needs of the community. The needs assessment process included: a) gathering national program examples; b) collecting local demographics, existing data, and reports; and c) conducting focus groups and interviews with key stakeholders in the community as well as staff at other youth program facilities and recreation centers. Results from the needs assessment ultimately shaped the direction for *Adventure Central* and supported the need for funding to build a facility, create programming, and cover new OSU Extension positions.

**Integrating Outreach and Engagement into the University Reporting System**

Because outreach and engagement activities are intentionally decentralized and embedded in a vast array of teaching, research, and service activities across the university, it is challenging to document the full scope of outreach and engagement activities. However, it has been integrated into reporting systems of the university in a number of ways. Examples include:

- **Outreach and Engagement Project Database.** In 1999, University Outreach and Engagement, the P-12 Project, and University Relations developed an online database to capture the outreach and engagement projects implemented by units and to help the general public search for projects based on key words. This database has catalogued over 900 projects, with more than 400 active at any point in time. To prepare for the future, the database has been integrated into the development of a new university-wide reporting system.

- **Columbus Public Schools Partnership Guide.** This guide was first created in 2005 to capture a broad sampling of the shared programs and projects of The Ohio State University and the Columbus Public Schools District. A 2006 edition focuses on our partnership with schools throughout the state.

- **Tracking Outreach and Engagement in Faculty Reviews and the Promotion and Tenure Process.** Because Ohio State defines outreach and engagement as an aspect of teaching, research, and service, it can be documented in dossiers for annual performance reviews and promotion and tenure reviews. The College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences revised its promotion and tenure guidelines and serves as an example of how a college can incorporate outreach and engagement reporting. OSU Extension is one tenure-initiating unit in the college. It works with its faculty to specifically include extension (or outreach and engagement) teaching, research, and service in the promotion and/or tenure dossier.

- **Local Tracking Mechanisms.** Colleges and departments may use additional means to capture the scope of outreach and engagement occurring in their units. The College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences, for instance, uses a web-based Unified Reporting System (URS) to capture annually the scope of faculty and staff work. OSU Extension produces annual reports to stakeholders and the Fisher College of Business’ 2006 annual report featured a section on its Executive Education program and the Research and Business Partnership Centers.
Unit Assessment of Outreach and Engagement Work

As discussed earlier, nationally recognized benchmarks for outreach and engagement do not exist at this time. Consequently, units use a variety of methods to assess the value and impact of their outreach and engagement activities. Examples include:

- **Third-Party Assessment.** OSU Extension recently commissioned Battelle Memorial Institute to conduct a study of the impact of its programs. This assessment found OSU Extension to be “purposely designed to produce positive economic and social impacts.” A few examples of the positive economic and social impacts are noted below. Further examples can be found in the report itself:
  
  - An increase in income ($29 million) and jobs (2,712) occurs when agricultural output is improved by just 1% through Extension programming.
  
  - Readers of Extension newsletters report increased profits and savings. In 2003, readers of CORN saved $11.3 million in pesticides/herbicides, and readers of GRAIN gained $3.8 million with marketing advice.
  
  - Thousands of families receive information on healthy eating habits from Extension—more than 90% report a positive change in eating habits and 98% report an increased knowledge of nutrition.
  
  - In 2003, Extension’s Family and Consumer Sciences program area reached 9,931 FNP recipients and 6,160 EFNEP recipients with food safety workshops—each 1% reduction of food-born illnesses in Ohio results in a $2.6 to $5.3 million cost savings.
  
  - 4-H Youth Development reaches 11.7% of the youth in Ohio. If 5% of those youth go on to receive a bachelor’s degree, the increased annual earnings for the group would be $220 million.
  
  - The Business Retention and Expansion Initiative has assisted more than 120 Ohio communities. In Putnam County alone, the program encouraged a company with more than 2,000 employees to commit to staying in the community for 10 more years.

- **Academic Program Review.** The new program review process includes a separate section for outreach and engagement activity. This is an analytic process; therefore, units assess their current status and comment on future directions.

- **Project-Specific Reports and Reviews.** Annually, each County Extension Office reports on its highlights for the year, and the reports are published in print and online to share with stakeholders.

Awards that Recognize Ohio State’s Outreach and Engagement Initiatives

University faculty, staff, and students may be recognized through their disciplines, community organizations, and other means for their outreach and engagement efforts. Examples include the following.

- The Women in Engineering Program won the 2006 Women in Engineering Imitative Award from the Women in Engineering Programs and Advocates Network (WEPAN). This national award is presented to advocacy programs that serve as a model for other programs.
The Geriatric Dental Program in the College of Dentistry won the 2006 Geriatric Oral Health Care Award from the American Dental Association for its work with OSU Extension and southern Ohio dental societies to provide dental care to geriatric patients in the Appalachian area of Ohio.

The Service-Learning Initiative annually recognizes outstanding community-university partnerships, faculty contributions, and student commitment to service.

OSU Extension annually recognizes excellence in outreach and engagement through the Excellence in Extension award that is given to an outstanding Extension employee.

In 2006, NASULGC, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, and the Outreach Scholarship Partnership (of which The Ohio State University is a founding partner) established a national annual award to recognize outstanding achievement in outreach and engagement. The C. Peter Magrath/W.K. Kellogg Foundation Engagement Awards recognize five regional winners from which one national winner is selected. Because each university can submit no more than two applications per year, Ohio State will create a process to select and recognize nominees as another way to support and recognize outstanding outreach and engagement.

**REFLECTIONS AND NEXT STEPS**

The prior analyses demonstrate The Ohio State University is in compliance with each of the core components of Criterion Five: Engagement and Service.

It has a long and distinguished history of actively partnering with the citizens of Ohio to meet economic and social needs and increasingly is extending that relationship to national and international communities. Since the last re-accreditation it has: adopted a new, formal definition of outreach and engagement; established a new organizational structure to enhance the activities—a new vice president for university outreach with a new Office of Outreach and Engagement and related advisory committees; worked to embed outreach and engagement into the university culture as evidenced most specifically by the visibility of outreach and engagement in the Academic Plan and its strategic indicators; and become an active participant in the national conversation related to assessing and documenting the impact of an institution’s outreach and engagement activities. As better methodologies evolve, Ohio State is positioned to, and committed to, applying those methodologies in its own work.

However, two broad issues remain:

1. **Enhancing Faculty, Staff, and Student Awareness of Outreach and Engagement**

In the mid-late 1990s, the university made a purposeful decision to embed outreach and engagement into colleges and departments rather than to concentrate on the development of a more centralized initiative. This decision has led to many positive results. Nonetheless, it is a challenge to keep it as visible at the institution level. At times, faculty, staff, and students are unaware that their work is, in fact, outreach and engagement.

To increase the visibility and awareness of outreach and engagement, the Office of University Outreach and Engagement, P-12 Project, and Service-Learning Initiative hired a communications manager. This position is devoted to working with university
communications specialists and other staff to keep outreach and engagement visible within the university through marketing and an expansion of outreach and engagement’s web presence. In addition, outreach and engagement activities are to be integrated into a new reporting system as a proactive means of giving outreach and engagement more visibility. As faculty and staff report on each of their activities, whether teaching, research, or service, they are given the opportunity also to “key” the work as outreach and engagement.

Questions
Are these steps appropriate in light of our goal to increase the visibility of outreach and engagement across the campuses? Are there other strategies or suggestions that the team could suggest?
What role should the staff in the various university-wide offices and college/unit offices play in maximizing the visibility of the work?

2. Documenting the Impact of the University’s Outreach and Engagement
On an institutional and unit level, there are several measures that document significant change in the visibility and impact of outreach and engagement over the last 10 years. Although some of the impact of the work is captured, benchmark indicators are not consistently captured nor is there consistent documentation of the impact of outreach and engagement projects across the institution.

To move forward in achieving these goals, we will continue to be involved with the national dialogue related to identifying institutional benchmarks. Once identified, Ohio State will establish the methodology to collect and report the data. The Office of University Outreach and Engagement will work with units across the campuses to provide training for outreach and engagement project leaders to help them develop the skills needed to assess and document the impact of their work.

Questions
Is the team aware of effective benchmarks that are being used successfully at other large, complex, and decentralized institutions?
What other suggestions might the team make related to assessing and documenting the impact of our work?
Chapter Six  Special Emphasis
Self-Study  of Graduate and Post-
Baccalaureate Professional Education
INTRODUCTION

“If we are to achieve the ambitious goals of the Academic Plan in our present fiscal environment, we must be more strategic in our use of resources. Getting to greatness will require the courage to build and pare, and a relentless focus on investing our resources wisely. Strong doctoral programs are critical to the university’s future. We must examine funding of doctoral programs to ensure that the money spent on doctoral education is allocated in a manner consistent with our goals.”

Provost Barbara Snyder’s Charge to the Committee on Graduate Education
June 2004

Graduate and professional education is an integral part of the mission of a public, research, land-grant university. Graduate and professional students work very closely with faculty in research and other professional endeavors; become the next generation of college/university faculty or professional practitioners in their fields; often work with our undergraduate students in teaching and mentoring roles; are involved in outreach activities; and serve in university governance contributing substantially to dialogues on institution-wide policy. Indeed graduate and professional education can and should be associated with each component of the Academic Plan.

However, unlike the sustained and substantial attention to undergraduate education over the past two decades, and despite a round of state-level reviews of selected doctoral programs mandated and overseen by the Ohio Board of Regents in the mid 1990s, and an important examination of graduate and professional student issues in the reports Graduate Quality of University Experience (G-QUE) and Inter-Professional Council Quality of the University Experience (I-QUE), the university has not conducted a systematic, institution-wide review of graduate and professional education.

Given these considerations, in combination with implementation in 2003 of budget restructuring, the new executive vice president and provost appointed two committees, the Committee on Graduate Education (2004) and the Committee to Review the Graduate School (2005), to examine graduate education at Ohio State.

The Committee on Graduate Education was asked to begin the process of determining quality indicators for Ph.D. education and defining financial and structural obstacles to maximizing its quality. The Committee to Review the Graduate School was asked to
examine the structure and function of the Graduate School and make recommendations on how it might best support an outstanding graduate experience. Both committees issued final reports in 2006.

Given the ongoing work of these committees and the institutional visibility and attention they were receiving, in 2005 it was determined that a Special Emphasis option for our re-accreditation self-study would help initiate and sustain a university-wide discussion of graduate and professional education consisting of:

- college-level consideration of the recommendations included in the committee reports, supplemented with the distribution and analysis of data related to graduate and professional program quality for each college; and
- determination of possible strategies for moving forward on graduate and professional education at Ohio State.

To facilitate this process, one or two individuals from each college were appointed by the dean to act as College Special Emphasis Liaisons. The liaisons met as a group to help design a recommended format for the college reports. They then led the data analysis and discussion process at the local level and prepared their reports, which were then shared with the steering committee. Each college was permitted to follow a process that best aligned with the governance culture of that unit. Several colleges, for example, used college-wide meetings of department graduate studies committee representatives to gather the necessary information.

Through this process, the overarching goals were to:

- define the optimal administrative structure and functions of the Graduate School;
- gain an improved understanding of the quality of Ohio State’s graduate and professional programs and ways to optimize that quality across the university;
- determine a funding model for graduate and professional students that better aligns with the goals of the Academic Plan; and
- maximize the consultant-evaluators’ ability to make helpful suggestions regarding the future direction of graduate and professional education at Ohio State.

From the outset, three important points about the Special Emphasis part of this report must be stressed:

- The goal was not to review individual programs—separate processes are underway on a regular (program review, specialized accreditation reviews) or periodic (National Research Council) basis. Nor was it the goal to focus on graduate and professional student life issues. The Graduate Quality of University Experience (G-QUE) and the Inter-Professional Council Quality of University Experience (I-QUE) have both occurred since the last re-accreditation.

Instead the goal was to identify broader issues facing these components of our educational mission: funding, specification of program quality indicators, and organizational issues as they relate to the Graduate School.

- The process had three concurrent, inter-related components: review of graduate education; review of the structure of the Graduate School; and an analysis of the university-wide response.
The process is not yet complete. The university seeks the advice of the external review team on the issues and recommendations outlined here and will incorporate that input as it begins to take actions in autumn 2007.

Without question, the decision to adopt this Special Emphasis activity in alignment with the broader re-accreditation process has resulted in the most thorough analysis and discussion of a university-wide initiative in more than a decade.

GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION: GENERAL FEATURES

Key features of graduate and professional education at the university today may be summarized as follows.

Enrollment:

As of autumn 2006 there were 10,083 graduate students:

- 69% full-time
- 57% female
- 5% African American
- 2% Hispanic
- 24% international
- 3% located on the regional campuses

The majority (60%) of these students are located in three areas—Arts and Sciences, Education and Human Ecology, and Engineering.

As of autumn 2006 there are 3,256 professional students. The university currently defines “professional” students as only those students within six colleges (Medicine, Law, Optometry, Dentistry, Pharmacy, and Veterinary Medicine).

- 98% full-time
- 53% female
- 5% African American
- 2% Hispanic
- 1% international

Virtually all are located on the Columbus campus. The majority of the professional students are in Medicine and Law, with smaller numbers in Veterinary Medicine, Pharmacy, Dentistry, and Optometry. As noted below, the issue of defining what constitutes a professional program emerged as an issue in this process.

With regard to international graduate students, although students from many countries are enrolled, only four countries contribute more than 100 students and those four countries account for 68% of the total international graduate student population: Peoples Republic of China (29%); India (19%); Republic of Korea (14%); and Taiwan (7%).

1 Details regarding graduate enrollment in each of the colleges can be found in the autumn quarter 2006 Fifteenth Day Report, p.9

2 Details regarding professional student enrollment in each of the colleges can be found in the autumn quarter 2006 Fifteenth Day Report, p.9
**Administration**

The central administrative unit for graduate education is the Graduate School. Its responsibilities are specified in Faculty Rules, but in general it oversees admissions; monitors aspects of progress to degree; leads in the development, implementation, and enforcement of policies and standards related to graduate education; distributes fellowship funds; and reviews and approves new and revised degree programs.

In the mid-1990s, in an effort to link the Graduate School more formally with the Office of Academic Affairs, it was decided to give the dean of the Graduate School the additional title of vice provost. In this way, the dean became a regular participant in ongoing discussions in that office, and graduate education issues are linked to broader institutional planning.

With regard to governance, the Graduate School works with the faculty and student-based Council on Research and Graduate Studies with committees for curriculum and policy and standards. This council also provides members to the University Senate’s University Research Committee. The Graduate School also produces *The Graduate School Handbook* (updated annually), an important document for students and faculty that outlines policies and procedures.

Despite this central administrative structure, graduate education is highly decentralized within the university to the academic unit (department or school) level. It is there that faculty decisions about student admissions, funding type and level, and program requirements are made. This occurs through a Graduate Studies Committee that makes recommendations to the full faculty and to the department chair or school director. In many cases such decisions then are transmitted directly to the Graduate School—at times bypassing college-level input. All proposals for new, restructured, or off-site graduate programs must be approved by the Ohio Board of Regents Advisory Committee on Graduate Study (RACGS). The university is represented on this committee by the associate dean of the Graduate School.

For the professional programs, as defined here, programmatic development is at the unit level with oversight by the Office of Academic Affairs and the University Senate’s Council on Academic Affairs. These programs are small in size, highly competitive in admissions, and typically do not have substantial programmatic change. Many of the professional programs have specialized accrediting bodies and undergo periodic (typically five- to 10-year cycles) internal and external reviews that include participation by the Office of Academic Affairs.

**COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE EDUCATION**

The first component of the Special Emphasis began in summer 2004, when the executive vice president and provost established a nine-member committee, chaired by the dean of the College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences. The committee included the interim dean of the Graduate School, four other deans from across the college clusters, a college fiscal officer, and a senior staff member from the Office of Business and Finance and from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning.

The committee focused on Ph.D. education (approximately 100 programs) and notably on both external (state) and internal issues of funding. The charge to the committee focused on five areas and the committee chose to address three of the areas (listed below) in its first report and the remaining two areas in a second report.
• How can we ensure that doctoral education serves the goals of the Academic Plan? What continuing procedures should be implemented to monitor the role of doctoral education at Ohio State?

• Recommend a sustainable funding model for graduate education that will align state subsidy with quality. Priorities for investment are: a) programs that are already ranked as very good or excellent; b) additional programs that are essential for any great public research university (whether already strong or not at Ohio State); and c) programs that make unique contributions to or derive unique strength from the State of Ohio.

• Should there be university-wide criteria on funding graduate research associates from grants? If so, recommend appropriate criteria.

Following interactions with the University Senate’s Fiscal Committee, the committee issued its first report in September 2005.

Excerpts of the Report of the Committee on Graduate Education: Part I (the full report is a supplement to this document and includes the data referenced here).

The committee was formed to examine the funding and viability of doctoral graduate programs. What was discovered in the process of examining in detail the financial structures of the doctoral programs was the intimate connection between doctoral and master’s program funding. Issues related to funding doctoral programs necessarily involved understanding at least the basics of the role of master’s programs at Ohio State.

The Ohio State University graduate programs, both master’s and Ph.D., have very different funding mechanisms from the state. The total graduate degrees awarded each year are dominated by master’s degrees. With few exceptions, this is the case across all units within the university.

Data from the American Association of Universities (AAU) demonstrate that Ohio State is a significant source of master’s degrees in the country, although over the last 10 years our master’s degree production ranking has slipped. There is, however, a significant and growing problem with our absolute number of Ph.D. degrees granted per year, as well as our national ranking in production of Ph.D.s per year. This number has been declining over the past 10 years. If the education Ph.D.s are removed, the numbers drop for each year by approximately 100; in 2003-2004 Ohio State granted a total of 482 Ph.D.s, placing us 11th in the AAU institutions in Ph.D.s granted per year. The number of master’s degrees granted at Ohio State has risen steadily during this same period, from 2,353 in 1994-95 to more than 2,600 in 2003-04. In many respects, this is a reflection of trends across the country. Many of the country’s best educational institutions grant more master’s degrees per year than Ohio State and grant a larger ratio of master’s to Ph.D.s than we do.

The committee viewed this pattern of master’s versus doctoral degrees granted at Ohio State not in the context of the absolute number of master’s degrees granted per year, nor the increase in this number per year. This appears to be the direction in which much of graduate education in the United States is headed, and the various units’ recognition and response to this trend is applauded. The concern centers on exactly how the ratio of master’s to doctoral degrees compares with both our peers and aspirational peers. The data examined reveal that our master’s/Ph.D. ratio stems directly from a relatively low production of Ph.D. degrees granted per year. Exclusive of the College
of Education and Human Ecology, 482 Ph.D. degrees granted in 2003-04 is far below the number expected from an institution of our size and (self-declared) quality. Further, the 10-year trend data suggests strongly that this problem will get worse, not better. Of further concern, although our ratio of master’s to doctoral degrees granted is apparently competitive, the quality of our Ph.D. students is probably not competitive with Harvard University, Johns Hopkins University, the University of Michigan, or, indeed, many of our peers. It is this dual challenge of ultimately increasing the quantity of Ph.D. degrees granted per year simultaneously with increasing the overall quality that forms the basis of this committee’s work.

Ohio State has many (not all) highly qualified Ph.D. programs and certainly has the quality and number of faculty necessary to have much higher Ph.D. production rates. However, one striking piece of data from the AAU reveals where the core problem lies. On average, each of our tenure-track faculty members graduates only one Ph.D. every four years, landing us in 20th place nationally among public institutions. These data drive the inescapable conclusion that, as a university, we are either not enabling or, perhaps worse, discouraging production of Ph.D. graduates by our faculty. Such behavior is inconsistent with our Academic Plan.

Regarding the role of the Ohio Board of Regents (BOR) funding formula and its interaction with our current budget process, the bulk of the funding for doctoral education derives from state support. Few doctoral students pay tuition directly, and until recently tuition fee waivers were provided routinely for students supported on external funding. The largest source of funding for doctoral education is state subsidy. Some of the elements essential for understanding the impact of the BOR regulations concerning the State Share of Instruction (SSI) for doctoral graduate education are:

- The doctoral funding model is built upon a 1998 historical “snapshot” of the percentage of doctoral graduate FTE at Ohio State in comparison to all doctoral graduate FTE at all eligible higher education institutions within Ohio.
- For the BOR, an FTE is any graduate student who earns 10 credit hours per quarter. Since most graduate students register for more than 10 hours, Ohio State’s headcount of graduate students on campus is significantly lower than our reported FTE to the BOR.
- Historically, BOR calculated a given year’s doctoral FTE by taking the average of summer and autumn quarter enrollments and multiplying by two. Currently BOR takes the total year as actually reported. This change offers an immediate pro-active opportunity for Ohio State to boost the effective state subsidy per credit hour in doctoral programs.
- In the SSI formula, all graduate students earn “master’s” subsidy until they accrue 50 credit hours, at which point they earn subsidy per credit hour as Doc I or II (subsidy categories determined by the State of Ohio) until they reach 260 total credit hours. This is universal: as soon as students accrue more than 50 credit hours, they draw SSI from the doctoral pool of money, regardless of whether they are finishing a program for a terminal master’s degree or continuing or transferring to a doctoral program. This practice confounds program enrollment analysis. Students enrolled in doctoral programs earn master’s-level subsidy for the first 50 hours, then these students all earn doctoral subsidy for their subsequent 210 credit hours. Terminal or tagged master’s students whose program requires—or the individual student simply chooses to take—more than 50 credit hours earn
SSI as if they were doctoral students once they pass the 50-hour mark. It will require substantial effort to accurately parse the terminal master’s from the terminal doctoral students. With the exception of students in the tagged master’s programs, students are defined within individual programs based on program-specific methodologies for differentiating between those in terminal master’s programs and those expected to continue on into the Ph.D.

• Ohio State’s share of the total state-wide doctoral SSI assigned each biennium by the legislature is fixed at 42.2%, and, subject to the boundary discussed below, is independent of the number of FTE reported to BOR. There is a “floor” of doctoral FTE below which Ohio State will suffer a reduction of SSI. This is the BOR “85%” rule. It is a simple, effective requirement: each year that Ohio State can report at least 3,920 graduate FTE to BOR, it receives 42.2% of that biennium’s total state-wide doctoral SSI. Thus, while it is possible to receive less than the 42.2% of the state-wide available doctoral SSI, it is not possible to receive more. If it were practical to do so, the university’s best strategy to maximize per-capita funding for doctoral students would be to report a yearly FTE count of exactly 3,920 FTE. It is within Ohio State’s domain to administer these funds to maximize its own initiatives concerning doctoral education. Thus the university is largely free to assign doctoral SSI as it chooses and to set its own policy on graduate credit hours.

• To earn the 42.2% of the state doctoral subsidy, in 2005 for example, the university had an FTE count of approximately 5,300 reflecting an upward trend over four years from a low of approximately 4,400 FTE in 2001. Since the number of Ph.D.s granted by the university as a whole has been falling (with variation) over the past 10 years, the conclusion is that the increase in FTE in the doctoral subsidy pool is due to terminal master’s degrees that either require or permit credit hours in excess of 50. Data from the Graduate School on the number of master’s admissions and graduates versus the numbers for Ph.D.s confirms this inference.

• Terminal master’s (including tagged, but excluding M.B.A. and Education and Human Ecology) degree programs that either require or permit more than 50 hours effectively take money from the doctoral subsidy pool in direct proportion to the number of hours each student takes above 50 hours.

• When the increasing FTE doctoral count is combined with a decreasing total pool of money allocated by the legislature to the state-wide total doctoral subsidy, Ohio State has suffered an 11% drop in DOC I and II subsidy per credit hour since FY 2003.

• Graduate credit hours are easily manipulated, for the benefit of individual programs, or for the university at large. For doctoral programs, the majority of the 260 hours (or more) are 999 “research” credits. Historically students have been required (or at least strongly encouraged) to register for at least 10 credit hours during summer quarter. Use of fee authorizations made this a no-cost option for the student and, under the historic BOR requirements described above, was important for setting the university’s reported doctoral FTE count. However, under the current BOR doctoral subsidy limits and current internal SSI distribution models, this practice generates no additional resources but simply redistributes existing resources based on shifts in these 999 credit hours of enrollment—again, with no central management. This internal manipulation of 999 credit hours must be controlled centrally so that financial
resources for doctoral education can reward program quality and Ph.D. graduation rates.

Within the university, with the advent of the new budget model at Ohio State in 2003, a conscious decision was made to simply map onto graduate education the model that was designed for undergraduates. There are fundamental differences between the undergraduate and graduate processes that, with the spread of understanding of how budget restructuring works for each unit in doctoral education, has given rise to behaviors which, while rational from an individual unit’s financial position, are largely contrary to the Academic Plan, much less in support of excellence in graduate education.

- For undergraduates, no unit can directly admit a student to a given department or program. The total number of students, the minimum qualifications, and the overall balance of a given year’s admitted class is controlled centrally. While a given unit can recruit undergraduate students (and the best units do), the recruited students must pass the admission standards of the university as a whole, and the total number of students admitted to the university is a tightly controlled quantity. In so doing, Ohio State strategically aligns its undergraduate numbers with its resources, while simultaneously increasing the qualifications of each entering class.

- For graduate education, each program or unit is free to recruit and admit students with no central control over the quality or number. The admission standards can and do vary widely across the approximately 100 doctoral programs in the university. Such variation in quality is suggested by a list of requests to the Graduate School to admit applicants whose grade point averages are less than 3.0.

- Given that there is a fixed sum of doctoral SSI from the state, independent of FTE (within the bounds described above), and since the doctoral graduate SSI is currently allocated within the university solely on FTE headcount—where each graduate FTE is credited with the same SSI, regardless of program quality—any individual unit cannot move in any direction but to increase its effective graduate FTE just to hold its place in the total available funding. That is, while the best pedagogical path to improvement of a unit’s graduate education, and its support of excellent graduate students, may well be to reduce or hold constant the number of doctoral students within a given program, there is an insurmountable financial disincentive to do so. Yet the total doctoral SSI pool is fixed, independent of the FTE (above 3,960). Thus every year the available doctoral SSI per credit hour in every program falls.

- Graduate Fee Authorizations (GFA) are complicated by their historical base assignment (based upon a snapshot of FY 2002 actual results). Because of the decision at the advent of budget restructuring that graduate education reform was explicitly left out, no attempt at assigning this very large resource on any basis consistent with the Academic Plan was undertaken. The result is that the continuing base budgets assigned from centrally held GFAs are now integrated into individual programs across the university based solely on the quantity (not quality) of graduate students in 2002.

- Currently Ohio State has no mechanism for adjusting the total number of graduate students to its financial resources. Further, the individual units have no financial incentive to behave in a manner that promotes quality of student over quantity, nor does the mechanism reward actual Ph.D. graduation rates, but rather promotes the increase of total graduate students in residence. It
also encourages programs to have master’s students complete more than 50 credit hours, at which time they earn doctoral subsidy. Further, since the university has not developed programs that encourage the payment of graduate tuition by external sources whenever possible (as do our aspirational peers), the result is that the oft stated “when it comes to graduate tuition, we pay ourselves” is not as bad as it appears: it’s worse. Under budget restructuring, the graduate units have had to pay the increases above the 2002 PBA for GFAs, and the increase in graduate student benefits as well. The marginal tuition and subsidy income allocated to colleges for changes in graduate enrollment and rates is taxed at 24%. Therefore, as asserted above, there is no university, nor individual unit, financial mechanism to encourage educational standards that may reduce or hold constant the number of graduate students, even for a strategically determined period of time. Put more directly, the current financial model rewards quantity of enrolled graduate students, almost surely at the direct expense of quality and graduation rates. The lack of any distinction between master’s and doctoral students in our subsidy distribution formula has persistently eroded the financial base for doctoral education.

In conclusion:

- Overall, the university lags behind its peers in both Ph.D. and master’s degree production. Over the past decade there has been growth in the number of master’s graduates, but there has been a decline in the number of Ph.D. graduates.
- The university has used the Ohio Board of Regents funding formula for State Share of Instruction (SSI) and has passed the resources on to units using a credit hour formula that is based solely on enrollment. This is inconsistent with the broad intentions and the full implementation of budget restructuring and has led to unintended consequences.  
- The lack of central control over individual doctoral program quality and the number of graduate students enrolled has led to unintended consequences.
- Graduate School data on GREs, GPAs at admission, and graduation rates show that our doctoral programs vary substantially and there is no valid institutional basis for such variability.
- There is a large resource base for Ph.D. programs that is not being administered in a manner consistent with either the Academic Plan or budget restructuring.

Recommendations

Short-Term

- Clearly identify terminal master’s programs, tagged master’s programs, and those that serve as stepping stones to doctoral programs.
- Eliminate the requirement for doctoral students to enroll for credits in summer quarter (unless required by an assistantship) and the requirement that doctoral students enroll for more than a minimal number of credits, especially in 999 (dissertation research) courses.

1 For more detail see pp. 9-14 of the Report of Committee on Graduate Education, Part 1
2 For more detail see pp. 14-17 of the Report of Committee on Graduate Education, Part 1
• Give the Graduate School absolute authority over admission of doctoral students, assuring optimization of the process of matriculating the most qualified students.

Long-Term
• Initiate systematic comprehensive program review on three- to six-year cycles.
• Develop a funding model based on quality and graduation success, not credit hours, and use the Board of Regents doctoral subsidy for Ph.D. education only.
• Rigorously review the processes associated with current Graduate School funding of fee authorizations, fellowships, stipends, and fee waivers to align them with highest-quality doctoral programs and students.
• Require students who are admitted to a master’s degree program\(^1\) and who wish to continue to a doctoral program to re-apply and be reviewed for admission to doctoral study by the Graduate School.
• Study fiscal models for reducing doctoral tuition at a reasonable point (perhaps after the student passes comprehensive examinations); and then require tuition to be direct-charged on external grants and contracts for all graduate research assistant (GRA) appointments.

The committee focused its second report, in June 2006, on the remaining two components of the charge:

• Recommend a process for assessing the quality of doctoral programs and appropriate metrics. These metrics should include, but are not limited to, appropriate external rankings as well as internal procedures.
• To generate resources for investment, propose a set of criteria by which (the provost) could consider the following options for programs deemed as too weak to be sustained at their current levels: a) eliminating programs; b) strategically reducing the size of programs; c) freezing programs at their current size; or d) merging programs.

Excerpts of the Report of the Committee on Graduate Education: Part II (the full report is a supplement to this document and includes the data referenced here).

The committee spent the majority of its time identifying the largest set of metrics that the Graduate School could reasonably apply university-wide, while also specifically calling out procedures for ranking those programs that have no obvious campus comparative (comparison with CIC equivalents when necessary). The committee noted that given the time and monetary restraints imposed upon this proposed analysis, the best result that could be expected from an application of the metrics across the university would be a broad grouping of programs into bands. The top band would include programs that should be encouraged to continue in their drive for national and international recognition. The middle band would be those programs that are either too new to Ohio State to be rated, are of value to the university’s land-grant mission, or are undergoing obvious improvement and should be encouraged to examine their programs with care in order to emulate the successes of the top-tier programs. The bottom bands would presumably be those that either (a) are not of special value to the land-grant educational mission, (b)

\(^1\) Other than those admitted to a “tagged” master’s program or those admitted directly into a Ph.D. program
have been historically marginal with little or no improvement, or (c) are not essential to Ohio State’s future in terms of the Academic Plan.

The committee acknowledged that, in 2004, the Office of Academic Affairs initiated a new round of academic program review that included graduate/professional education components and is explicitly supportive of this initiative. The generally accepted method of graduate program review is to ask external committees to visit the program on campus and to write a detailed report that addresses strengths and weaknesses. While this process is followed by several colleges in analyses of their individual graduate programs, and is dictated by accreditation bodies in others, it is not systematically applied across the campus in a manner that is applicable to the committee’s charge. Therefore, the goal of the work on metrics was to determine if there were internal processes that could yield the broad-banding of programs discussed above on a faster timeline.

The committee discussed at length seven categories of data to be gathered either from university sources or the programs themselves to construct a reasonable model to analyze the Ph.D. programs over three to four months. We added three supplemental metrics that, while clearly not applicable widely across all programs, could be valuable metrics when compared to the university’s aspirational peers. Even within the “core” seven metrics, allowances for differences in the relative importance of the metrics by discipline were expected to be substantial. The proposed data collection for each program was designed to be consistent with the National Research Council (NRC) data collection for its upcoming study. The committee recognized immediately that the most meaningful comparisons of our Ph.D. programs would arise from inter-university, program-by-program analysis with the university’s aspirational peers. The set of seven core and three supplemental metrics are:

**Core**

- Entering student quality: GRE scores, quality of UG institution, undergrad GPA, ratio of national/international students admitted/enrolled, ratios of applicants to total grad student number, admits to applicants, enrolled to admits
- Time to degree and graduation rate
- Reports of the external committee members for Graduate School exams
- Percent of students receiving university and national fellowships
- Success in obtaining training grants
- Ratio of GTAs to GRAs within a program
- Faculty quality: publications and journal quality, citations, extramural support, grad student/faculty ratio, awards and honors, number of associate professors and years in rank

**Supplemental**

- Student professional activity: presentations, performances, papers, grants
- Placement
- Uniqueness of program: number of similar programs in peers, world
While compiling a list of metrics to use in measuring the strength of a program is relatively straightforward, actually implementing the data-gathering process in a reasonable time and with affordable effort may be a more challenging task. The committee decided to gather data on a small subset of programs to test the feasibility of the process. The plan was to construct a model that assigned programs to the three bands and assess the model’s success according to our \textit{a priori} assessments of program quality. This test was designed to identify which metrics are either redundant or of little actual use in the determination of program quality.

The committee then chose a group of pilot doctoral programs for which metrics data were collected: Physics, Earth Sciences, Linguistics, Greek and Latin, Psychology, Anthropology, Ohio State Nutrition, Art Education, Theatre, Entomology, Microbiology, Pharmacy, and the Integrated Biomedical Graduate Program. These programs were volunteered by the deans on the committee and augmented by programs from Arts and Sciences that were specifically chosen to have rather different objectives in Ph.D. education from the sciences. In the initial phase, it explored in a general way the applicability of the metrics to these programs by interviewing most of the chairs of the programs and asking for advice. Much of the data required to construct comparisons of the metrics did not exist in the university data sources, Graduate School data sources, or within the programs. Further, any attempt to assemble these data would have to rely very heavily on the subjective judgment of the individual programs, in fact to such an extent that the department chairs warned us that whatever conclusions we would draw from the data would lack credibility with the faculty. In addition, it was clear that many of the data would be meaningful only when compared across institutions for one discipline, not when compared one discipline to another at Ohio State.

The pilot study commenced in late winter quarter 2005 and extended through early autumn quarter 2005. Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) collected data from central sources on doctoral student quality (GREs, admit and yield rates), time to degree and completion rates, and ratios of doctoral students to faculty and to graduate faculty. The Graduate School provided reports of the external committee members for Graduate School exams. A survey was conducted of pilot programs to collect additional data on graduate student support, professional activity, and placement.

In the process it was found that:

\begin{itemize}
  \item The ability to accumulate information concerning faculty productivity, either in publications, citations, or other scholarly work was a challenge. This material, while presumably kept in departments in some manner for personnel considerations, as well as yearly evaluations, was not in a retrievable nor common format. The systematic lack of basic scholarly records of departments’ research faculty is another indication of the lack of attention on graduate education as related to research. The Graduate School and the Office of Academic Affairs should require such records to be constructed and updated in a format that can be used for accreditation, data exchange, and internal rankings.
  \item Reviewing student quality metrics across programs was difficult, in part, because centrally held data did not always align with program data. Nonetheless, the committee did note significant differences in the metrics across programs. The committee decided that there were program-specific qualifications that could account for much of the dispersion. Still, the wide range found in fundamental measures of student preparedness and the wide disparity in the ratio of admissions to applications certainly raise questions of whether enough program oversight or control has been exercised.
\end{itemize}
Some of the proposed metrics were not valuable:

- Graduate School External Reviewer reports (almost no variation)
- Training Grants (available to a limited number of programs)
- Time to Degree (data for programs extremely chaotic from year to year)
- Student Professional Activities (largely not compiled by programs)

One metric that appears to have great usefulness for judging program quality independent of program-to-program comparison is placement of graduates. The committee examined placement data, and, with some caveats, concluded that this metric was largely independent of program specifics, with the added merit of being the ultimate “outcome” measure of a program. The executive vice president and provost and the Graduate School, in November of 2005, supported the suggestion that placement data for all our Ph.D. programs be collected and that process has been completed.

To make the placement data relatively immune to program manipulation, several issues needed to be addressed. The first issue is how to rate the quality of placement—for example, a given industrial position equivalent to a professorship at a given level of university; a postdoctoral position at a national laboratory, or at a prestigious institute equivalent to a full-time position at a less well-known institution.

In other words, since placement quality is by its very nature program specific, how does the university determine what constitutes high-quality placement for a program?

The committee proposed the following process:

- Require each program to respond to the request for graduate placement, both initial and subsequent employment.
- Require each program to rate all placements into at least three categories: high quality, average, and low prestige, based upon general guidelines promulgated by the Graduate School.
- Require each program to send its rankings of placement positions to at least five similar departments within the university's aspirational peer list, as well as the CIC, asking for comment on rankings of placement positions.
- Require each program to reconcile its rankings with comments and counter rankings of the programs contacted.
- Have the Graduate School assign all placements by all programs into the three levels above.

With this data for each program, the university can begin sorting its Ph.D. programs into the three broad categories outlined in the committee's original agenda. This conclusion is not meant to reduce the other strong recommendations of the committee, specifically that:

- External program reviews, now underway, be accelerated and put on a continuing basis.
- All programs be required to complete a survey similar to the NRC program questionnaire in preparation for data exchange and for institutional accreditation.
• As soon as possible, have Institutional Research and Planning institute data exchange, program by program, with the AAU institutions.

Recommendations

Short-Term

• Separate Ph.D. students from tagged or terminal master’s students in all data systems.
• Require all Ph.D. programs to submit documentation of student placement (first and subsequent positions).
• Require all Ph.D. programs to complete surveys similar to the 2006 National Research Council’s program questionnaire.

Long-Term and General

• Have the Graduate School hold Ph.D. programs accountable for their educational quality and reputation, with rewards for excellence and substantial disincentives for continuing poor performance. Seven core and three supplemental metrics were proposed for possible use, but inter-university comparisons are needed.
• Have the Graduate School more actively involved in the new round of program reviews that include both internal and external review components.

COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

The second component of the Special Emphasis began in March 2005. The executive vice president and provost appointed an 11-member committee to review the Graduate School. It was chaired by the dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and included two other deans, including the interim dean of the Graduate School; three associate deans; four faculty members; and a graduate student. The committee was asked to “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.”

The timing for this committee was appropriate given that the last review of the Graduate School occurred in 1995, the current dean had just resigned, and the work of the Committee on Graduate Education was in progress and would have an effect on the Graduate School.

In November 2005, the committee stated that there was no compelling reason to change the current arrangement and recommended that the dean of the Graduate School continue to serve as vice provost and report to the executive vice president and provost. That recommendation was accepted and a national search began. In October 2006, a new dean was appointed—a distinguished scholar and department chair from within the university.

In February 2006, the committee issued its final report. It concurred with the reports of the Committee on Graduate Education, noting the financial issues surrounding doctoral programs and the uneven quality of graduate programs. It suggested that many of the core functions of the Graduate School—oversight of admissions and recruitment, investment of fellowship funds to support graduate students, and oversight of graduate program quality—be continued but with important operational changes.
Excerpts of the Report from the Committee to Review the Graduate School
(the full report is a supplement to this document and includes the data referenced here).

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. As the Committee on Graduate Education articulated, 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 recent 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 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.

The Committee to Review the Graduate School was established “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, it was asked to 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 Ph.D. defenses.

The earlier findings of the Committee on Graduate Education provided an important context for the considerations of our committee.
One important contributor to a decline in Ph.D.s awarded by Ohio State is how the university funds Ph.D. education. Under the new university budgeting model, state subsidies for graduate education are distributed to graduate programs as they are earned—at the master’s 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 master’s 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 master’s programs and encourages their growth. Because Regents’ funding for master’s programs was not capped, many departments benefited financially—first, from enrollment growth at the master’s level and, second, from the extra subsidy their master’s programs earned from students earning more than 50 credits for graduation. Growth in master’s enrollments under the Ohio State budget model, in short, has undermined doctoral programs at the university.

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 Ph.D. 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 Ph.D. 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 Ph.D. students than under the previous budgeting system.

The Committee on Graduate Education 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 master’s into doctoral programs. The 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 Committee on Graduate Education 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 Committee to Review the Graduate School 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 both committees, the deliberations of the committee were informed by the earlier findings and proposals from the Committee on Graduate Education. 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.

Two previous reports related to graduate education at Ohio State also guided the committee. The committee carefully considered the recommendations from an earlier 1995 provost-appointed Graduate School Review 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 addressed issues of Graduate School funding. Its key recommendations were not implemented; however, they were considered seriously in this review.

The committee’s response to its charge is in two parts: Part I, on “the Structure of the Graduate School,” was submitted to the provost in November 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 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.

Structure. 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 the 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.

Among the 18 peer institutions we surveyed on this question, only four (Arizona, Indiana-Purdue at Indianapolis, Penn State, Wisconsin-Madison) 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.

The university should leave 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 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 a prior review of graduate education.

Therefore:

- Continue present structural arrangement for the Graduate School
- Foster close cooperation between the dean of the Graduate School and the senior vice president for research.

The second part of the report was issued in February 2006.

**Governance.** 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 department 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 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. Therefore:

- Appoint the dean to the President’s Cabinet.
- Create a new Graduate Council to work directly with the Graduate School and its dean.

**Role in Funding.** At present, the Graduate School plays a critical role in graduate and postgraduate education through five programs for funding graduate students and one program for postdoctoral fellows. It provides University Fellowships and Enrichment Fellowships that cover stipends and fee authorizations to attract new graduate students. It provides *ad hoc* fee authorizations to match stipends awarded by departments/colleges. The Graduate School also awards Alumni Grants for Graduate Research and Scholarship (AGGRS) to Ohio State dissertation or thesis students and Presidential Fellowships to dissertation and M.F.A. students. The Graduate School also has budgeted funds for a limited number of postdoctoral 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 *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.

This committee concurs with the Committee on Graduate Education 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 Ph.D. 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. The university should make this additional investment in excellence for graduate education. The Graduate School should 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 Ph.D. degree in a discipline or program that offers the Ph.D., including those first-year students who are entering at the master’s level en route to their Ph.D. There are cases in the creative arts in which the M.F.A. fulfills the functions of the Ph.D. in requiring original creative work and serving as the entry degree for faculty, and they should be targeted for this investment too.

Specific recommendations for concentrating Graduate School funding on Ph.D./M.F.A. aspirants and for achieving other important goals in the funding of graduate students follow. 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 Ohio State. 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 packages. By following these principles, on its own the Graduate School could reallocate considerably more money to support Ph.D./M.F.A. 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. Therefore:

- Increase funding for first-year and dissertation Graduate School fellowships.
- Eliminate the postdoctoral fellowship program.
- Give top priority for Graduate School fellowships, fee authorizations, and research grants to Ph.D. students and others who are pursuing degrees requiring original scholarly or creative work. (Ph.D. and M.F.A. applicants would be eligible for University Fellowships; some terminal master’s students would be eligible for Enrichment Fellowships.)
• Require a minimum level of *program quality* for student eligibility for Graduate School fellowships.

• Grant eligibility for Graduate School fellowships to incumbent students moving from master’s to Ph.D. programs if they had not previously been considered for them.

• Decentralize the University Fellowship decisions to colleges, with other fellowships decided centrally.

• Reallocate to University or Presidential Fellowships any fee authorizations or other funds freed up by following this committee’s suggested rules for eligibility.

• Discount tuition for students at the dissertation stage if feasible.

**Quality Control of Graduate Education.** 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. Therefore:

• Establish criteria for graduate faculty status, with local level implementation.

• Eliminate Graduate School representatives from examination committees.

• Require annual dissertation progress reports to the chairs of graduate studies committees with probation, then termination, for students earning consecutive U (unsatisfactory) grades.

• Conduct regular program reviews for all graduate programs.

• Require all programs to maintain up-to-date records on a variety of metrics related to quality and funding of graduate education.

**Graduate School Role in Services, Recruitment, Admissions, and Placement.** 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 the recommendations in this area reinforce and extend the recommendations of the earlier review committee. Therefore:

• Move the reporting line of the Graduate Admissions Office to the Graduate School.

• Require separate admissions decisions for master’s and Ph.D. 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 responsibility for nominating graduate student Fulbright Fellows to the Graduate School.

• Provide additional funding to the Graduate School to establish and maintain a career development office for graduate students.
Unlike the reports from the Committee on Graduate Education, this report did not receive as much attention upon its release, nor did it provoke institutional discussion or debate. As a result the Special Emphasis provided a forum for that dialogue and considerable reaction has emerged. To date there have been no actions taken on these recommendations.

**CAMPUS RESPONSES**

The third component of the Special Emphasis Self-Study was the process to gather response to these two important reports. In the process, they provided a valuable descriptive overview of the college’s graduate/professional programs. Those individual reports are available for review.

Most comments related to graduate education; professional programs tend to be relatively small—constrained, in part, by resource issues (such as faculty size, infrastructure) and highly competitive. They are operated primarily at the local level and act in response to specialized accreditation standards and periodic reviews. There is modest, growing interest in professional doctorate, but it has been decided that these will be developed through and overseen by the Graduate School, a step that has been strongly endorsed by the Ohio Board of Regents. Should such programs exceed 50 credit hours, as they do, a decision to limit subsidy beyond 50 hours would have a detrimental effect.

The following general observations can be drawn from the responses to the recommendations of the Committee on Graduate Education.

- There has long been the recognition by the deans that the current model for doctoral funding needs attention and is not aligned with budget restructuring in the manner that undergraduate education is. Therefore, there was a general consensus among the colleges that the university needs to:
  - Allow only true Ph.D. students to earn doctoral subsidy—not master’s, tagged master’s, or professional doctoral students who have earned beyond 50 credit hours. However, many colleges indicated that abrupt changes in doctoral subsidy would cause extreme financial hardship to programs such as those in Social Work, Speech and Hearing Science, and Nursing, all of which have graduate programs with extensive curricula linked to specialized accreditation standards and count on the doctoral subsidy for students beyond 50 hours in their budgets.
  - Better differentiate Ph.D. students from other graduate and professional students. Despite support for this action, several colleges (Engineering and Arts, for example) suggested that it would be a more complex task than expected; however, Public Health noted that its accrediting body requires that such a distinction be made.
  - Decrease the number of credits earned by Ph.D. students by reducing requirements for summer and post-candidacy enrollment. This change would also reduce tuition requirements for students funded on research grants. If this decrease occurs, attention must be given to the impact of the reduction on related areas such as student health insurance, student visas, requirements for fellowships and traineeships, and special programs such as the ones at the Wooster campus (Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center) where they depend on such hours.
• Although the link between program quality and funding was endorsed, strong concerns were expressed about the use of standard metrics to assess program quality. Reasons for concern include:

  • Traditional metrics used to determine the quality of applicants (such as GRE and GPA) do not distinguish among differences in the goals of the program and what defines a strong student. For example, the M.S.W. program often has non-traditional students (older women, individuals with social service experience) who are well qualified but might not be eligible based on standard metrics; arts students undergo a rigorous audition process to assess applicant ability, which is a better assessment of potential than standard metrics; and some colleges, such as Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences, purposely admit students from developing countries who are here to earn degrees and then return to positions at home—standard metrics may not be appropriate for these students.

  • Placement metrics based on the academic reputation of the college or university may be influenced by the diversity of the graduates and their life choices. Humanities noted that the literature suggests that women often value family obligations over career status; thus, teaching load or geographic location may be a determining career factor. Minority students may choose a historically black or tribal institution. International students often must return to their country of origin. These examples demonstrate that placement metrics may be confounded by an individual's life choices; graduates make choices based on factors other than the reputation of the program alone.

  • Most colleges believed that standard metrics could be used as one kind of information if put in the context of other information provided by the program. All strongly supported the use of the new round of academic program review, implemented in 2004. Humanities noted that: “we find such reviews appropriate and helpful, and believe they would accomplish the university’s goal of identifying levels of quality and success for the purpose not only of resource allocation but also of building stronger graduate programs, even where strength already exists.” It should be noted that use of this option would require that the graduate education section of the program review guidelines be strengthened.

Given the two years of discussion on funding issues, in mid-2006 the executive vice president and provost appointed an ad hoc subcommittee of the University Senate’s Fiscal Committee to propose models for distributing funding to high-quality doctoral programs. The 11-member committee, which included faculty, students, staff, and administrators, issued a final report, Funding Models for Doctoral Education Based Upon Quality, in March 2007. It was endorsed by the Senate Fiscal Committee.

It outlined a set of principles and assumptions and then advocated a process that included two models: a university-wide funding model or a college-centric funding model. In either case, the model included a strong set of interactions between and among the college dean, the dean of the Graduate School, and the executive vice president and provost. It is expected that recommendations from this report will be implemented as early as autumn 2007.

1 Report will be available in the resource room.
The following general observations can be drawn from responses to the recommendations of the Committee to Review the Graduate School.

- There was full support for maintaining the reporting line for the Graduate School to the Office of Academic Affairs.

- Most colleges were not in favor of restricting the fellowship and fee waiver pools to Ph.D. students only for the following reasons:
  - It may result in long-term negative consequences for the recruitment of exceptional master’s students.
  - It could harm the reputation of colleges that focus on well-known master’s programs, such as the M.B.A.
  - Specifying inclusion of the M.F.A and not degrees that are similar—M.Arch or M.Larch, or the M.S. in Dentistry—is unfair.

- Decentralizing fellowships to the college level received mixed reactions, although many agreed that decentralization assures that applicants are evaluated by faculty from the discipline. Business, Engineering, and Social and Behavioral Sciences proposed “block grants” to colleges that could then be distributed in ways that best suited the programs in the college.

- Both Business and Social and Behavioral Sciences noted that the size (amount) of our fellowships was not competitive with benchmark institutions.

- Some programs from the professional and health sciences college clusters supported the recommendation that they be removed from the jurisdiction of the Graduate School. Allied Medical Professions, Dentistry, and Social Work are examples. Others—Business, Education and Human Ecology—suggested exploring the idea. Public Health noted that there is value in being part of the Graduate School; however, that value would be diminished if they were not allowed to compete for fellowships.

- With regard to abolishing the Graduate School representatives on candidacy and final oral examinations, there were mixed reactions: Nursing, Optometry, and Mathematical and Physical Sciences were strongly opposed; Business and Social and Behavioral Sciences were not. Engineering students supported the use of outside representatives. The committee recommendation did include the caveat that if this practice were abolished, academic units would still be encouraged to include faculty from other units on students’ committees.

**Additional Issues and Suggestions**

Finally, each college was asked to identify any other issues related to graduate and professional education that it believed warranted broader institutional discussion. The reports identified the following topics.

- Several colleges—Nursing, Engineering, and Social Work for example—note that so much emphasis has been placed on Ph.D. education that terminal master’s and first professional degree programs, which are critical to the reputation of the university and to its land-grant heritage, have been ignored in the university-wide discussion. The institution needs to better understand and appreciate the roles they play.

- Beyond the implications for Ph.D. funding, budget restructuring may be having other effects on graduate education.
• Arts notes that it can be more economical to use lecturers than GTAs, resulting in less teaching experience for graduate students.

• Postdoctoral positions may be more economical than GRAs, leading to less research experience for graduate students.

• GTAs might be seen to be more economical than GRAs, resulting in more teaching but less research experience for graduate students.

• Biological Sciences, Medicine, and Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences identified concerns about budgeting as it relates to the development and implementation of interdisciplinary programs, many of which are associated with programs in these colleges. Such arrangements are often addressed on a case-by-case basis, and broader institution-wide templates are needed.

• There are data collection and use issues. With an emphasis on metrics and the regular distribution of data to colleges, it was suggested that the central administration identify essential data sets and then devise an efficient means to collect and store these data for use across programs, departments, colleges, the Graduate School, and the Office of Academic Affairs.

• Virtually all reports discussed the importance of diversity in graduate and professional programs (students and faculty) and steps that they were taking. Finally, several colleges made suggestions that extend the recommendations in the reports.

• Establish separate fellowship pools for Ph.D. and non-Ph.D. students so that both can continue to be recruited.

• Merge programs, as Medicine did with its Integrated Biomedical Graduate Program, or downsize programs, as occurred in Business, to increase quality, or, as in Humanities, to increase quality and decrease the over-supply of Ph.D.s.

• Consider enhanced recruitment efforts at the local level. Examples include more visits to recruiting fairs for minority populations (Optometry) and supplementing fellowship offers (Social and Behavioral Sciences).

No formal actions have been taken on the recommendations from these reports, although Ph.D. funding proposals are being discussed and a goal is to begin implementation of selected recommendations as early as autumn 2007.
REFLECTIONS AND NEXT STEPS

The Special Emphasis Self-Study has allowed the university to analyze and discuss important aspects of graduate and professional education. The opportunity for university-wide, in-depth discussion of the reports from the Committee to Review Graduate Education and the Committee to Review the Graduate School has been particularly valuable. As a result of the reports and subsequent discussions, several issues have arisen and we are seeking the review team’s reactions and suggestions regarding these and other matters.

1. Funding Ph.D. Programs

The reports from the Committee on Graduate Education clearly showed that the university’s current model for funding graduate education (essentially the same model used to fund undergraduate education) does not provide an incentive for excellence. In fact, the current model limits our ability to concentrate resources and energies in a way that allows us to compete with the nation’s top universities. To resolve this problem, the Committee on Graduate Education recommends changing to a funding model that focuses funds based on doctoral program quality. Metrics (NRC rankings, student quality at admission, and placement) have been proposed as a means of determining program quality. This proposition has generated substantial discussion (and concern) given the stakes involved and the diversity of doctoral programs across the campus.

Questions

What is the team’s reaction to the use of metrics in the assessment of program quality?
Is the team aware of metric-informed processes that have been employed successfully at other universities?

A new report, Funding Models for Doctoral Education Based on Quality, from the Ad Hoc Subcommittee of the Senate Fiscal Committee, was just released and will undergo discussion by the university community. Can the team provide feedback regarding the proposals included in that report?

Each of the colleges supported the new round of academic program review as a means of determining program quality relative to peers. What are the team’s thoughts regarding the program review process?

2. Organization of the Graduate School

The report from the Committee to Review the Graduate School recommended several changes to structural aspects of the Graduate School. Among the most important of these recommendations, the committee proposed that the dean of the Graduate School be appointed to the President’s Cabinet. The committee also proposed that a new Graduate Council replace the existing Council on Research and Graduate Studies. The new council would be reduced in size (from 42 members to approximately 15) and would focus on policies and standards related to the Graduate School and graduate students but would not focus on policies related to the Office of Research. To date these recommended changes have not received much attention from the university community.

Question

What are the team’s views on the committee’s recommendations?
3. Defining “Professional” Programs

Ohio State currently defines professional students as those students in six programs—Medicine, Law, Pharmacy, Veterinary Medicine, Dentistry, and Optometry. However, there are many other graduate programs across campus that consider their master’s or doctoral programs to be “professional” in nature, even though they are administered through the Graduate School. Examples include the Master’s in Social Work (M.S.W.), the Master’s in Business Administration (M.B.A.), the Doctor of Audiology (Au.D.), the Master’s in Landscape Architecture (M.Larch.), and the Master of Science in Nursing (M.S.), to name just a few. The lack of a clear definition of what constitutes a “professional” program leads to considerable confusion. And, at times, the culture within professional programs is at odds with the culture within the Graduate School concerning matters related to things such as graduate faculty status, student eligibility for fellowships, the quality of student placement upon graduation, and the role of clinical faculty.

Questions

Are professional programs (loosely defined as those post-baccalaureate programs that are not master’s programs leading to a Ph.D.—they are programs that offer degrees to prepare individuals for professional practice in a specific field) typically housed within a graduate school? If not, how are they administered?

What is the appropriate definition for “professional” programs? In your experience, how are professional programs defined at other universities?
The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association coordinates a Federal Compliance Program in its role as an approved accrediting agency. The following supplement supports The Ohio State University’s compliance with these federal requirements.
CREDITS, PROGRAM LENGTH, AND TUITION

Credits and Program Length

The Ohio State University academic calendar operates on a quarter system for its undergraduate and graduate programs, and the Moritz College of Law operates on a semester system. Both operate according to common practice in higher education and use standard term lengths appropriate to each. The university calendar is available via the University Registrar.

Tuition and Fees

Degree program requirements, including length and course requirements, are approved by the Ohio Board of Regents, which coordinates state policy and advises the executive and legislative branches on operating and capital appropriations for higher education, and by respective professional accrediting bodies where applicable. In addition, all universities and colleges in the state contribute to a state-wide database and performance reporting system. This system provides information on credits and time to degree across institutions and is reported annually via the Performance Report for Ohio's Colleges and Universities. Detailed tuition and fee information is available via a variety of publications and is available via the registrar's Public Support page and the university's Statistical Summary. Additional information about the transfer of credit is available via the registrar’s Transfer Credit Services site.

COMPLIANCE WITH HIGHER EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT/TITLE IV

Completion Rates

In compliance with federal requirements and as part of the Academic Plan, the university publishes and continually tracks student persistence and graduation rates. This information is distributed and communicated in a variety of ways and also can be found via the University Registrar’s web site and Student Enrollment Reporting and Research Services (SERRS), which includes tuition, enrollment, and FERPA information. The first- to second-year persistence rate, now 92%, and the six-year graduation rate, now 71%, have risen dramatically over the last 10 years.

Student Financial Aid

Student financial aid information and compliance documentation, including the university's Program Participation Agreement (PPA), Eligibility and Certification Renewal (ECAR), a copy of “Default Prevention Management: A Plan for Student and School Success,” and the most recent A133 report, will be available in the resource room. Additional information is available from the Office of Student Financial Aid.
### Student Loan Participation and Default Rates

#### Direct Loan Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Rate Type</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Process Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>01/06/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>07/29/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>01/07/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>07/30/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>01/08/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>07/31/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>01/10/2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Perkins Loan Program:

- 2005-06 Cohort Default Rate: 11.50%
- 2004-05 Cohort Default Rate: 15.07%
- 2003-04 Cohort Default Rate: 14.18%

### Clery Act/Campus Safety Information

The Office of Public Safety publishes campus crime statistics and recently completed a U.S. Department of Education program review. All findings were resolved and no additional actions are required. In addition, the Office of Student Affairs provides a variety of health and safety information and programming for students.

### Internal Audit, Fiscal Controls, Anonymous Reporting Line, and Annual Financial Reports

The university also participates in a variety of audit, fiscal control, and report activities to ensure ethical practice and compliance with various regulatory requirements. These include the creation of a new anonymous reporting line.

### STUDENT COMPLAINTS, RESOURCES, AND ACADEMIC RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Office of the President maintains a log of all mail it receives, including communication from students, in a searchable database. The most recent year of this log will be available in the resource room during the team visit. When the Office of the President receives a written complaint, the office staff places it in the president’s folder and she or the chief of staff decides to whom it is forwarded for action. This person is usually the vice president for student affairs or the dean of undergraduate studies. In turn, this person may contact others in their units to investigate and resolve any issues. These complaints are fairly rare and the Office of the President is notified of the resolution or the status of the issue within a day or two. Most other complaints that the president receives come via e-mail that the office staff handles in the same way. The president keeps the e-mail files in the “inbox” until she receives word of resolution.

Students also have a variety of other avenues to communicate ideas, concerns, and complaints at the faculty and staff member, program, department, college, and institu-
tional levels. These processes are outlined in college administrative documents such as *Patterns of Administration*, various handbooks, and web pages. Some examples of where these processes are described and take place are in the Student Advocacy Center, Office of Student Judicial Affairs, and the Office for Disability Services, as well as in the Code of Student Conduct and statement of Academic Rights and Responsibilities.

**Off-Campus Locations**

The Ohio State University does not operate or maintain an off-campus location as defined by the Higher Learning Commission. All of the university’s regional campuses are included in the institutional re-accreditation process. The following information is available via the university’s institutional profile on the Higher Learning Commission’s web site:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-State:</th>
<th>Campuses:</th>
<th>Lima (Lima Campus); Mansfield (Mansfield Campus); Marion (Marion Campus); Newark (Newark Campus); Wooster (ATI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Locations:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Out-of-State:</th>
<th>Campuses:</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Locations:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Out-of-U.S.:</th>
<th>Campuses:</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Locations:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Distance Learning (last updated: 05/24/2006)**

This listing is limited to programs that are delivered 100% asynchronously.

Doctor of Pharmacy (non-traditional program, Internet)  
M.S. in Welding Engineering (Internet)  
Certificate in Gerontology (Internet)

**University Advertising**

The university provides its own contact information via the institutional web page and a variety of other publications, including those previously mentioned and referenced. Contact information regarding our affiliation and accreditation status with the Higher Learning Commission is provided via the Statistical Summary.
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Privacy

The University Registrar—which also provides regular training on FERPA—and the Office of the Treasurer publish FERPA policies and information. The Office of Human Resources publishes HIPPA policies and information. The Enterprise Data Steering Committee is currently finalizing the university’s Institutional Data Policy, which will ensure the protection of the university’s institutional data resources from accidental or intentional unauthorized access, damage, alteration, or disclosure while preserving the ability of authorized users to access and use institutional data.

Responsible Research Practices and Institutional Reviews Board (IRB)

Although this is addressed in greater detail in Chapter 4 and in accordance with OHRP guideline and FDA regulations, the university has formal processes to approve research projects and promote ethical practice via the Office of Responsible Research Practices.

Programs with Specialized Accreditation

The university does not hold dual-accreditation at the institutional level; however, it does maintain accreditation in a number of specific programs. These include:

- **College of the Arts**
  - Council for Interior Design Accreditation
  - National Association of Schools of Art and Design
  - National Association of Schools of Dance
  - National Association of Schools of Music
  - National Association of Schools of Theatre

- **Fisher College of Business**
  - Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (Accounting, Business)

- **College of Dentistry**
  - American Dental Association (D.D.S., Dental Hygiene)

- **College of Education and Human Ecology**
  - Commission on Accreditation for Marriage and Family Therapy Education
  - Council on Rehabilitation Education
  - National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

- **College of Engineering**
  - Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, Inc.
  - Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering
  - Chemical Engineering
  - Civil Engineering
  - Computer Engineering
  - Computer Science and Engineering
  - Electrical Engineering
  - Environmental Engineering Option in Civil Engineering
  - Food, Agricultural, and Biological Engineering
  - Geomatics Engineering
Industrial and Systems Engineering
Materials Science and Engineering
Mechanical Engineering
Welding Engineering
Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board
Planning Accreditation Board (city and regional planning)

• **College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences**
  Society of American Foresters

• **John Glenn School of Public Affairs**
  National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration

• **Moritz College of Law**
  American Bar Association

• **College of Medicine**
  Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education
  American Dietetic Association (medical dietetics)
  Association of American Medical Colleges, Liaison Committee on Medical Education
  Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education
  Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (Perfusionist, Respiratory Therapy)
  Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology
  Joint Review Committee on Educational Programs in Nuclear Medicine Technology
  National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Sciences (C.L.S./M.T., Path A)

• **College of Nursing**
  American College of Nurse Midwives
  Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education

• **College of Optometry**
  Accreditation Council on Optometric Education

• **College of Pharmacy**
  Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education

• **College of Public Health**
  Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education (Health Services Administration)
  Council on Education for Public Health

• **College of Social and Behavioral Sciences**
  American Psychological Association (Clinical Psychology)
  Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology

• **College of Social Work**
  Council on Social Work Education (B.S.W., M.S.W.)

• **College of Veterinary Medicine**
  American Veterinary Medical Association
DO SOMETHING GREAT