

	COMMENTS	RESPONSES
	<u>General Comments</u>	
1	The self-study asks all questions at the level of the administrative unit, which prevents recognition of strengths shared among units, or displayed by only a subset of a unit. For example, environmental studies is done by people in Geography, Biology, Plant Biology, Development Studies, Geology, and the Voinovich Center. Collectively, environmental studies is one of our greatest strengths, but it is not dominant in any administrative unit and, so, is likely to be under-represented.	Interdisciplinary programs will be able to include descriptions of the multiple faculty members who are core to or affiliated with their programs. The strength of these programs will be determined by the strength of those faculty members, the quality and productivity of the students, and the contribution of the programs to the mission of the institution. We believe the current guidelines provide ample opportunity for these programs to be identified as excellent should that designation be warranted even though their administrative structure is different.
2	The self-study does not appear to take into account the age (or youth) of a program.	We added the date of program initiation in I.B. and a new category in the rating criteria for developing programs.
3	The Task Force must ensure that the management information system is adequate to respond to the data needs of the self-study. Is the data available to complete the self-study?	In constructing the questionnaire, the committee attempted to consider the availability of information and to be sensitive to the time and effort required by the department/school. Where possible, data will be provided by the Office of Institutional Research (e.g., numbers of faculty, admissions statistics, student enrollment). However, some crucial data elements exist only within program records or will need to be gathered by the program.
4	I am concerned about the fact that disparate missions of MA programs are not acknowledged in the current draft. The emphasis on scholarship and creative activity of students is particularly troublesome.	See #20
5	The evaluation criteria are too general and not sufficiently defined. Those are; Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, and Limited. First of all, is satisfactory performance not good? Secondly, the definitions for each of these are simple to restate them not really define them. Finally, the limited decision is extremely vague.	See #7
6	My concern is that this consideration focuses almost exclusively on outputs or outcomes. In my view, consideration of inputs, i.e., the resources that the unit has been given to produce the outputs, allows the reviewer to make a judgment about the efficiency and effectiveness of resource utilization. Such inputs include average teaching load by faculty (especially graduate faculty), average start-up package per new hire, some measure of stipend levels of graduate assistants (perhaps percentile relative to national norms---I believe the Nebraska Study has norms on stipend levels by discipline), etc. A highly productive unit might be considered less so when one considers that they have been provided with abundant resources. Likewise, a less productive (but very respectable) unit might have been operating "on a shoestring." Perhaps the former might be viewed as squandering resources, whereas the latter might be primed and deserving of an infusion of resources. It may be that others don't view this as important or relevant, but some attempt to standardize the reporting of the "input" variables would be helpful, rather than leaving it up to some interpretation of areas within the narrative. Thanks for your consideration.	We have added some items in the guidelines to seek information and context about several inputs including stipend amount per graduate student and teaching load for faculty members. At the same time, we want to be clear that we are seeking excellent programs not efficient programs.

7	<p>The only problem I have with the self-study is that there is no indication of what the terms excellent, good, satisfactory, and limited mean in terms of the individual categories. For example, what is an excellent record of SCA? Is it the same for all programs? A pessimist might conclude that MS and Ph.D. programs are being treated the same without consideration of factors such as differential teaching loads, availability of post-doctoral fellows &amp; etc. Can we get any indication of what the height of the bar(s) will be. Can I afford to be an optimist here?</p>	<p><i>What do the terms “excellent,” “good,” “satisfactory,” and “limited” mean? Is the meaning the same for all programs?</i></p> <p>We appreciate the desire for greater specificity concerning the way in which each of these terms will be used and what divides one from another. The Task Force discussed a number of different possibilities for the labels that might be employed and how we might define those labels. No single option was found that was not problematic in some way. In particular, an approach that would involve more specific delineation of expectations would probably result in our emphasizing the quantitative data presented by a program to the neglect of the broader contextual picture, including such factors as the mission of the program, signature features of the program, and the program’s own description/identification of factors believed important in judging program quality. While we appreciate the desire for greater specificity in exactly what “excellent”, “good”, “satisfactory”, and “limited” mean, we do not believe that it is possible to provide more concrete criteria without disregarding fundamental program and discipline differences.</p> <p><i>Your “rubric” does not provide clear guidelines as to the evaluation criteria being employed. What are the benchmarks that will be employed?</i></p> <p>Admittedly, the word “rubric” was probably misapplied in this situation. These are rating categories rather than a rubric. The intent of the evaluation document that we constructed was to provide an indication of the sections of the document that would be subject to being rated by the Task Force and the sections of the document that provide a context for thinking about a program but that are not subject, themselves, to evaluation. As noted elsewhere, we considered whether it would be possible to provide more specific information concerning the bar that would have to be met to qualify for a rating of “excellent” versus “good” or “good” versus “satisfactory”, etc.; however, that would demand the establishment of a priori standards that would fail to acknowledge program and/or discipline differences.</p> <p><i>The current rubric does not tap into the unique services provided by programs.</i></p> <p>Throughout the document, programs are provided with opportunities to provide information that speaks to the question of unique services and/or design features. Those issues are best served in the responses to the questions posed in, for example, sections I, VII, and VIII.</p> <p><i>There are too many areas that are not measurable and have no real criteria by which one can determine how an answer will be critiqued, evaluated, valued, and/or measured.</i></p> <p>Many of the areas to which you refer are intended not as areas for measurement but as opportunities for programs to provide information concerning the unique contributions that they make to the University and/or community. While any instrument of this nature can, at best, provide only a partial picture of a program, our discussions as a Task Force led us to conclude that information concerning program history, mission, signature features, etc. was essential to our ability to put in context the various tables and quantitative portions of the data provided.</p> <p><i>The evaluation should include a category that speaks to the potential of a program for future growth.</i></p> <p>We added this category to the final rating scale for new or developing programs.</p>
8	Please see "Faculty" specific comments	

9	Guidelines are unclear. What constitutes excellent vs. good? Are programs judged against similar programs (ex. MS in Plant Biology at OU compared to MS in Plant Biology at Kent) or within the university (ex. MS. in Plant Biology vs. MS in Philosophy both at OU). Apples to oranges comparison is very bad. Even numbers such as percent admitted grad students and % employed graduates do not perform on apples to oranges comparison.	See #7
10	I appreciate the effort the Task Force has made to generate a self-study document that allows different programs to define "excellence" in discipline-appropriate ways. Generating one document that covers as wide a range of graduate-education activities as there are at Ohio University is a difficult task. I have only a few comments/questions about specific points in the guidelines. I list them below, on a section-by-section basis.	
11	Please consider adding a place for us to include a statement about the potential for the program to grow and our future plans for program enhancements. More comments on this below.	Please use section VI to describe future plans.
12	Some recognition should be given to the uniqueness of the undergraduate and/or graduate programs within the region and/or state.	Please use section I.C. to describe uniqueness
13	How were "programs" defined in the criteria? I am unclear whether my major, within the broad M.Mus. degree program, is a separate program or not, and how that determination is made. I also suspect that the knowledge that programs deemed "excellent" by the self-study and other means may be in line for increased funding and others will not be, means by default that many programs will be cited as "excellent" whether they really are or not. A more serious concern, that will be cited below for virtually every category, concerns the disadvantage that any program that is primarily oriented toward undergraduates (with perhaps a master's program attached) will have. Our program at the graduate level fulfills its function very well indeed, but it does not grant a terminal degree in the discipline and our students do not enter the program with research capabilities. However, our graduates can and often do go on to first-rate doctoral programs. These criteria only marginally acknowledge such programs.	Programs were defined in consultation with the colleges, departments/schools and interdisciplinary programs. In many instances, majors were lumped together within a program - if so defined by the college/school/department. Masters programs that place many of their students in high quality doctoral programs will have both the opportunity to describe this within the self-study and to be defined as meeting or exceeding their purpose in the ratings.
14	It should either be limited to PhD programs (as was done by OSU) or different rubrics should be devised for MA and professional programs.	See # 19

15	<p>I appreciate the effort and the research behind these guidelines, but I have a concern about the attempt to create a general set of guidelines that permit the comparison of apples and oranges, with the illusion that it will allow a group of well meaning people to select the best fruit. Rather than packaging the same info in new ways, I would prefer to start with the latest program review document and allow programs to add a brief summary of why they may be considered excellent on an absolute scale and possibly relative to others peer programs in their field, but abandoning the idea that it is possible to compare an engineering program to a music program and judge which is more excellent.</p>	<p>There are some difficulties with using the latest program reviews as the basis of comparison. First, the program reviews could be old and not reflect the current state of the program. Also, there is not a uniform approach to writing the reviews, which would only compound the difficulty of comparing “apples to oranges.” In particular, the self-studies and program reviews don’t provide a standard format for reporting data, and they may not include some of the information being asked for in the Task Force guidelines. It is also worth noting that the Task Force self-study format includes a number of opportunities to provide a context for requested information.</p>
16	<p>First, as an avid rubric builder and user of rubrics, those proposed do not accurately reflect what you are attempting to measure. They are useless. Second, most of this information is available from Institutional Research and asking faculty to spend time searching through pages and pages of PDF IR information to find the answers is costly to the university and not productive use of faculty time. This data should be compiled for each program by IR. However, since their records are at best incomplete and not in a searchable database (rather than the present poorly designed PDFs), this whole effort of collecting accurate data is futile. Third, it is the consensus of many faculty that the decisions about programs have already been made. This is just busy work for faculty so they will feel they were consulted -- when in fact, it is just busy work to keep them occupied so the administration can do as they please.</p>	<p>See response to #7. Institutional research will supply data that is readily available to the departments. Decisions about the rating of programs have not been made a priori by this committee.</p>
17	<p>I like the self-study document, especially the word limits on many of the sections prevents the writer from spending too much time there). Although all of the information requested is relevant to the rating of programs, much of it will be difficult to obtain in a complete or near-complete form. For example, the percentage of graduate students participating in scholarly and creative activity works (for example, co-authors on journal articles or meeting presentations) will be difficult to quantify for the past five years. Most of our programs have not been accumulating this information. Similarly, placement information for graduate students for the past five years will probably be pretty slim. These are things that we intend to do a better job of tracking in the future, but the information for the past five years will be sparse.</p>	<p>We recognize that some of the requested data may be difficult to gather. We ask only that you do the best you can to present a picture of the excellence of your graduate program with a reasonable amount of effort. See also response to #3</p>
18	<p>My concern is undoubtedly similar to what you have heard from others in M.A. programs, and that is that they simply cannot compete with doctoral programs in terms of the various kinds of data being collected. Faculty SCA &amp; funded research for MA-only programs should not be compared with PhD programs. Perhaps even more critically, grad student admission selectivity and productivity data for these different levels of programs need to be viewed in appropriate contexts.</p>	<p>We plan to examine programs within their context.</p>

19	<p>I worry that if the data that are being requested in these self-studies are collected for both PhD and MA programs, the result will be that MA programs will be compared to doctoral ones and come out looking like they are lower in quality when they may in fact be very high quality for what they are, which is MA-only programs. If the goal of such evaluation is to prioritize academic programs, MA programs may very well suffer.</p>	<p>The Task Force for Centers of Excellence in Graduate and Professional Education received a number of comments on the self-study guidelines from individuals who were concerned that either (i) the guidelines and criteria unfairly favored doctoral programs over masters programs, or (ii) the guidelines and criteria did not adequately recognize the diversity in missions among the variety of graduate and professional programs at Ohio University. In response to these comments, the task force felt that a further explanation was necessary concerning the process and the creation of the self-study guidelines. In particular, the task force revised the self-study guidelines to include the following statement: “We make special note of the significant variation among programs in terms of mission, focus, and operation. This is especially true when comparing Masters degree programs with Doctoral programs. In every instance, we have attempted to provide program representatives with the opportunity to describe the context for their programs. We, as a Task Force, will work to rate programs while considering these individual circumstances and missions.”</p> <p>The following should also be noted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The task force has one voting member from each college at Ohio University. Since several colleges do not award doctoral degrees, there is significant representation on the task force by members of masters-level-only colleges and departments.</li> <li>2. The task force recognizes that the mission of graduate and professional programs vary widely across campus. The self-study provides adequate space to describe the unique mission of each specific program. These programs will be judged in the context provided by the documentation given in the self-study.</li> <li>3. The task force believes that masters-level and doctoral level programs should be rated simultaneously so that natural questions regarding how a "good" doctoral program might compare to an exceptional masters program can be avoided (if PhD and Masters degree programs were rated separately).</li> <li>4. The task force acknowledges that certain sections of the self-study document may be more appropriate for certain programs than others. Nevertheless, programs should use the space in the self-study to describe why certain portions of the self-study are not relevant for their specific program. In addition, it may be more difficult for certain programs to gather data on certain sections (e.g., student scholarly and creative activity) than it may be for others. The task force requests that programs make a best effort in these cases.</li> </ol>
20	<p>I believe MA programs serve a vital role in the College of Arts &amp; Sciences and at OU more broadly. I know my department's MA program provides excellent MA-level training that serves the needs of Ohio citizens, whether they use their MA degrees in public careers or as a stepping stone to doctoral work. Our MA program is critical to our undergraduate teaching mission, particularly given the university's lagging ability to fund faculty lines in recent years. Further, we would not be able to attract the quality of Group I faculty that we have if it were not for the fact that we have our MA program and can provide faculty with opportunities to work with graduate students.</p>	<p>See # 19</p>
21	<p>I believe it is most appropriate to separately evaluate PhD and MA programs while recognizing the value of each in their own context.</p>	<p>See # 19</p>

22	In general, the current rubric does not tap the unique services provided by MA programs, such as our MA in Sociology. Our program is one of the top in the nation, but I fear this would not come across with the current survey. As far as I know, we are the only MA program that offers a teaching internship. We excel at placing students in top doctoral programs, as well as employment in a variety of applied settings. We also serve a unique market -- Appalachian region students. Our low student-to-faculty ratio promotes individualized attention and contributes to the high completion rate of students in the program. After completing the M.A., many students successfully pursue doctoral or law degrees, teach at two-year colleges, or find employment in various government and private agencies.	See #19
23	I'm looking through this puppy this afternoon. so far the only thing that has made me recoil in horror is the prospect of mapping the productivity and placement of the hundreds of grad students who've come through this place in the last five years. yikes! this seems like something that might work in either a small program or a phd program (where people are around longer and have a greater and longer institutional role) but i think we'd have a very hard time coming up with this information.	We recognize this may be difficult, yet we feel this information is essential to assessing program excellence. Do the best you can in gathering this information.
	<u>Section I</u>	
26	The section emphasizes our historical bureaucratic structure, not our real strengths.	This section will not be rated and is meant to allow each program to provide context for the data that is provided in other sections of the self-study.
27	A more direct statement to acknowledge the role of diverse missions of MA programs is desirable here.	See # 20
28	How much history should a unit report. The old 7 year review model was clear on this issue.	Each section has a word limit.
29	Consider requiring a standard reporting of inputs (i.e., resources provided by University).	See response to #6
30	Again, all depts will bulk this up in a way that exposes them best. It will reduce to a propaganda piece, not a realistic assessment tool.	We expect programs to describe themselves in as positive a manner as possible. We will rate them based on these descriptions and using the factual data.
31	Problematic, for the reasons cited above.	
32	Who is going to really be truthful in this discussion -- won't every program see their program as excellent? Does the committee reviewing these have time to check every single statement? Disciplines are different and can't all be measured by the same criteria.	See response to #7
33	Is the purpose of this section to highlight the development of the program? What is meant by "features of excellence?" Can this be the faculty, the student achievements or the program itself? What about proposed changes identified as possible growth areas for the program? How does that information fit into this section?	See also response to #26. Any feature the program selects may be highlighted as excellent. Future growth might fit better in Section VI.

34	The second question of this section, “describe the development, mission and current status of the program within the context of the unit” appears to be somewhat repetitive of the first questions which asks “Give a brief history of the unit covered by this self-study. Provide the context and background for the current graduate/professional degree programs housed within the unit”, is this not the same as the “current status of the program within the context of the unit?” Or is this question meant to address curriculum and student information?	We removed the word development from the instructions for I.B. and made minor adjustments to the instructions for I.A. in an effort to distinguish between the two questions. I.A. is meant to provide historical context and I.B. is meant to describe current mission and status including basic information about the program.
35	I understand that the three question posed in the section including the next one which asks for “exceptional, compelling or signature features of the program” are meant to provide a historical and present day status of the program in relationship to mission, goals, students and curriculum. Is this the point?	Section I is meant to provide context for the committee and will not be rated as part of the identification of excellence.
	<u>Section II</u>	
38	Too much emphasis is placed on grant funding.	Grant funding for each program will be considered in the context of the program while considering the availability of funding, expectations of funding, and necessity (or non-necessity) of funding for the discipline as outlined in II.C.
39	Departments do not necessarily choose the mix that they have of tenure track and non tenure track faculty, some input on preferred faculty profiles or recommended changes if resources were available would be useful.	See response to #6
40	More clarification is needed on how to count grants that have multiple recipients in different departments at OU and grants that have multiple recipients at other universities. Should we simply divide the total funds by the number of co-PIs, or do we need to find out exactly how much money was received by a particular faculty member in a particular year (which will be time consuming to do)?	Each faculty member should have attributed to them that portion of the total that is indicated by % of effort. We do not think it is necessary to find out "exactly" how much of the grant was received by each person.
41	The use of the term appropriate here can mean that a faculty member from an online university such as NOVA in Florida or Phoenix may seem appropriate to one department and not to another. Some attention to the quality of the faculty members own training should be here. Also, the quality of the academic activities should be noted such as who publishes something and their prominence within that field.	We changed the word appropriate to pertinent. We did not mean to infer appropriate as an indicator of quality, but rather as an indication of what fits with the discipline.
42	Consider requiring a standard reporting of inputs (i.e., resources provided by University).	See response to #6
43	The faculty should also have some way to indicate the amount of teaching required.	See response to #6
44	In sections D & E.External/Internal Recognition it states "The number of listed items should not exceed the number of graduate faculty as listed in Table II.1." This statement and the way the data entry table is arranged make it sound like only one External or Internal Recognition item can be listed for each faculty member. This is limiting since many faculty have received multiple grants, teaching & research awards.	The requirement is for the total number of items not to exceed the number of faculty. It would fine for one faculty member to be listed multiple times.

45	Community service seems weakly represented. Service to the discipline and community is a key part of some faculties jobs. Also, how will teaching load be considered. For example Geography teaches 5 courses/year while Physics is 3/year. Clearly funding and paper count numbers SHOULD vary between these faculty. Again, I am VERY concerned about apples to oranges comparisons based on raw numbers without complex factors weighted appropriately.	Please describe service expectations for faculty members in Section II.A.
46	I have two comments on Section II: one significant question, and one minor one. In Physics & Astronomy one way that we measure our faculty's impact on the field is through the numbers of citations our papers received in other refereed journal articles. Thus we would like to use citation data as one measure of our "Scholarly and Creative Activity" (SCA). However, the way the committee uses the term "SCA" suggests that perhaps they do not have citations in mind in that regard. If citation data should not be included in Section IIB then space should probably be provided for it in Section IID (External Recognition). The minor question pertains to the way in which external funding is to be reported. It would be easier for us if we could report that fiscal year by fiscal year. But the years listed in Tables II.3 and II.4 seem to be calendar (or perhaps academic?) years. The conversion from one set of years to the other can be made, but it is a little time-consuming. Can you clarify which type of year (!) we should be using in the document? And, if possible, allow us to report grant income on the basis of the fiscal years that cover the study period?	Data regarding citations (if relevant to the discipline) may now be included in Section II.D. where there is a narrative that allows programs to describe other evidence of external recognition. External funding will be reported using the fiscal year as accounted for in the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs.
47	The main concern I have with this section is for interdisciplinary programs that do not have dedicated faculty. Figuring out how to "count" scholarly activity of faculty affiliates could be tricky.	Since these faculty will probably be collecting the same data for inclusion in programs in their home departments, interdisciplinary programs may use the same data when referencing faculty members who are core to their programs. We recognize that this creates some duplication, but in the appendix we also ask for data regarding division of time between programs for each of the faculty. This will give us some sense for the quality of faculty associated with interdisciplinary programs along with the degree to which they are dividing their time among various programs.
48	The English Department has THREE distinct concentrations (Literature, Creative Writing, and Rhetoric & Composition). II.B limits us to only FOUR types of SCA. Can that number be increased at all?	We think that the use of broad categories such as peer reviewed articles, books, creative works, and other may provide sufficient level of detail, but we are willing to consider another category if absolutely necessary.
49	In some fields, years of experience and national recognition in a field, and the presence of scholarly work, should be recognized and in some area be an acceptable substitute for the terminal doctorate degree.	We agree and this can be explained in Section II.A. if applicable to the program. Programs where experience and national recognition are considered an acceptable substitute for a terminal degrees should use section II.A to describe this situation and provide supporting documentation (e.g., references to high quality programs which similarly equate experience with a terminal doctorate degree).
50	What about disciplines for which almost no external funding is available? Again, for faculty who teach both graduate and undergraduate courses, this is almost an impossibility in my discipline.	see #38

51	This will require a lot of work to compile these data, and they may not all be readily available.	see #23
52	Faculty receive tenure and promotion through the departments in which they serve and are hired by those departments. It is not the committee's responsibility to determine the appropriateness of a faculty to a program when they are not in that discipline. Another case of the administration believing they are "all knowing".	The program will guide the committee in making the determination about what level of credentials (degree and licensure, etc.) is necessary for faculty members in each program as described in Section II.A.
53	This section is quite clear; It seeks to ascertain the credentials, scholarly productivity, and external and internal recognition of faculty productivity including scholarly and/or creative activity, grants, etc. However, it does not address teaching as one of the criterion of recognition. Here at OU, teaching is part of the milieu, but not necessarily the continual pursuit of scholarly or creative activities including grants. Thus, is the section to cover what are faculty do or what we think our faculty should be doing to develop a Center of Excellence in Graduate and Professional Education.	We added an opportunity for programs to describe teaching excellence in section II.F. In addition, several other sections - such as I.B. provide some opportunity to include information about innovative curriculum or teaching.
54	The section that asks about how available grants are in a discipline is hard to ascertain. In general, grants are more available in the sciences and technology, but not necessarily in humanities or social sciences. Are we to try to figure this our? Or can we speak to generalities?	See # 38
55	Also, the information on rankings. Is this to be computed or will we like at the info in such reporting agencies as Carnegie or U. S. News and World Report?	Information about ranking, or other evidence as the program deems useful, may be included in Section II.D. External Recognition.
56	I still feel it is problematic to link need for funds with availability--I am an artist and my research certainly needs support I would be loath to claim otherwise--however as a maker of art firstly and difficult experimental forms secondarily funding sources are in short supply and amounts small-- competition fierce---If I were filling out the existing form I fear I might disservice myself by answering their is great need for research support and then acknowledging how little is obtained---this a function of the resource environment more then any other factor....	See # 38
	<u>Section III</u>	
59	This section is appropriate for doctoral programs, but less so for masters only programs whose students are not as easily tracked to doctoral programs and later employment.	See # 20
60	The fact that MA programs have multiple missions should be highlighted here. Some programs prepare only practitioners, others only academic track persons, and still others prepare both. Students who enter these programs may have disparate backgrounds, records, and interests. This should be acknowledged.	See # 20

61	<p>For student statistics, are the years referring to calendar years or academic years. For example, if a student started in 2007, would the student be counted in the 2007 category, or would the student be counted in 2008, since Fall 2007 is classified as 2008.1? The headings in Table III.2 aren't clear: -- Is "Total #of students" referring to the number in the program or the number supported? -- Presumably, the remaining columns in the table are asking for the number of students in each category (and not the dollar-value of the support), but this isn't specified. In Table III.3, is the undergraduate GPA to be used? For PhD students, would the undergraduate or master's GPA be used?</p>	<p>We are referring to the academic year. We modified the Guidelines to say GPA associated with the highest completed degree.</p>
62	<p>Consider requiring a standard reporting of inputs (i.e., resources provided by University).</p>	<p>See response to #6</p>
63	<p>There has to be a means by which we can explicitly differentiate the expectations of the MS and professional programs from the Ph.D. programs.</p>	<p>See # 20</p>
64	<p>Number of applicants is not a useful metric. Often times I have received approaches Also, I'm not sure of the wording for student fellowship and internships section. It seems to be phrased where our student grants from external societies are for small amounts \$500-2000, which are very competitive (less that 25% funding rate). These are significant achievements, but base don the wording here would not count in any category here.</p>	<p>The number of applicants does, at least, give an indication of how many students are interested - to the point of submitting an application - in entering the program. Further remarks regarding the demand for the program could be included in the optional narrative following at the end of Section III.B. Student grants from external societies could be listed in either Table III.4 or the following list (which could include a description). The significance of the grants could also be described in the narrative section.</p>
65	<p>We have an extremely diverse population of incoming students, who come to us from many countries. I think that reducing their "quality" to a single number like an average GPA or an average GRE score is rather reductive. This issue manifests itself in a couple of practical ways: (1) We do not require that our applicants take the GRE, and so the average will only be over a subset of our applicants. (2) As far as GPA goes, the GPA that the Office of Graduate Studies assigns to our applicants from certain countries (e.g. Nepal) consistently under-predicts their observed ability on arrival. This occurs because the academic culture in certain countries grants few, if any, As. I know that OGS's procedure is meant to correct for this, but our experience is that it does not do that very well. I am concerned that a narrative of 200 words will be insufficient to explain the complexities of data that has been boiled down to a few entries in Table III.3, and so this material will not give a true picture of the quality of our incoming students. A more specific question is what scale we should be reporting TOEFL scores on. There have been at least three different scales in operation during the period covered by Table III.3. As regards the "Notable student accomplishments" below Table III.4, we have had several students win awards (ranging from awards within the University to national prizes) over the past five years. To list a representative subset of these achievements and explain their significance will take considerably more than 200 words.</p>	<p>Use the optional narrative in Section III. B. to describe the characteristics of students that are indicative of quality. We included this section to address the issues raised in this comment.</p>

66	For the student quality indicators section: does Table III.3 apply to students who are currently enrolled or how have been accepted? That is, is the Mean GPA in Table III.3 their UG GPA? Perhaps change the term "enrolled" in the table to "admitted" or "new" or "first year?"	We changed the column heading in Table III.1 to "newly enrolled." See also #61
67	III.D appears to expect that departments will have EITHER a MA program (2 yrs) OR a Ph.D. program (5 yrs); the English Department has both. Can table III.5 be altered to accommodate this fact? Tables III.6 and III.7 ask for graduate placement data, instructing us to "Include only placements that occurred within one year of graduation." Why this short time limit? Standard placement surveys in our discipline (NRC, US News and World Reports, etc.) always allow for three years after graduation.	In this case, the department would be asked to submit two documents, one for the MA program and one for the Ph.D. program.
68	See comments in text box 2.	
69	See above comment	
70	This is just more of the same -- every program has its stars and every program has its duds! Who really cares? Every program is going to find the stars and send them in on the list. Who will determine which stars are more important than other department stars?	See also #52. Determination of who should be portrayed within each program is up to the program to define.
71	For our program, I wonder how to compute the demand for the program? Our courses are utilized from students throughout the University, but the demand for the program is relative to availability of funding for the program. I mean I could count up the number of queries received per week concerning the program or per month. Is this enough to stipulate demand? Moreover, our students are primarily international. The only criteria I have for evaluating them is their GRE, TOEFL transcripts, letter of purpose, and letters of recommendation. Is this enough to make an argument concerning demand for the program?	One set of measures for the demand for the program will be provided by Table III.1. It is recognized that the size of some programs will be limited by the amount of financial support they can offer, e.g., the number of Teaching or Research Assistantships and other factor related to the demand for the program can be described in optional narrative at the end of Section III.B. Support issues can also be addressed in Section V (Facilities and Support). The demand for courses offered by the program is considered in Section IV. How the GRE, TOEFL, etc. are used in assessing the general quality of the admitted students can be described in the narrative portion of II.B. While this is also a chance to describe other means of assessing the quality of admitted students, it does not need to go beyond the standard application materials.
72	The extent to which students produce jointly or independently scholarly or work in peer-reviewed outlets is another hard one to figure since we do not actively engage our students in such activities as a program goal, but more so individually. Unless I actually look for publications of former students, many of who return to their home countries, this would be hard to calculate and locate without student information and assistance.	The task force acknowledges that it may be difficult to gather data on students in a variety of disciplines. The task force requests that all programs make a best effort at gathering this data. In the case of scholarly and creative activity of students, the task force requests data only on student work that can be directly tied to their work at Ohio University. The self-study is not asking for data on students creative work after they have left the university. For this data, the best source of information is usually faculty mentors.
73	The criteria concerning completion, careers related to their degree program, and the acceptance of students in Tier I or II schools is another criteria which would require student info to ascertain which may or may not be available or accessible.	The task force acknowledges that it may be difficult to gather data on students in a variety of disciplines. The task force requests that all programs make a best effort at gathering this data. The Career and Further Educational Survey conducted by Institutional Research may (and should) be used as a source of information on student employment after graduation.

74	On point 2 I am far more concerned, the emphasis for many in the arts is simply not on positions or even acknowledgement but the 'Pursuit' itself-- one can argue that the a segment of the arts rejects on principle the commerce and employment measures of the greater society and promotes a more esoteric value system in which individual expression and non commercial interactions along with issues of quality of life and premium. Are such values not of value? are they not actually more at the core of University learning wherein the expansion of knowledge is valued for itself above its 'application'. This differing view of the 'utility' on learning is I believe central to what differentiates 'vocational education' from 'higher learning' and results in innovative and expansive thinking and possibility rather than training to perform within existing paradigms--	Table III.6. in the Other column provides and opportunity to describe this. In addition, the narrative text box in that same section will provide an opportunity for programs to describe other notable accomplishments.
	<u>Section IV</u>	
77	The relationship between being a Center of Excellence and the number of outside students enrolled in classes isn't clear. Research collaboration would be appropriate, but it isn't clear how teaching service courses distinguishes a department as a center of excellence.	Data regarding interdependence of programs provides context for the assessment of excellence, but we agree that it is not central to our definition of excellence which is related more to the faculty and student quality and accomplishments. While this section is rated, note that the rating scale indicates the level of interdependence of this program with others, etc. In the absence of context, the ratings given in this section are not positive or negative indicators of quality.
78	The first two goals of this section are great. However, the one that states that production of services that are broadly needed may imply to some that we create community businesses that compete with private small community businesses such as what occurs with the health and human services college and their collaboration with O'Bleness. This would not create a positive university/community relationship.	The university does offer many services and products that are also offered by others in the community and these vary greatly from golf to child-care to restaurants to health care. "The extent to which the program provides important or essential services or programming to the university, the university community, or more broadly to the region, state, or nation", however is both relevant and important to a number of programs and one of our objectives was to be reasonably inclusive in the guidelines.
79	Consider requiring a standard reporting of inputs (i.e., resources provided by University).	See response to #6
80	Different departments will by their nature have different ways to contribute here. This cannot be handled evenly across disciplines.	See # 20
81	A key synergy between our graduate and undergraduate programs is that graduate and undergraduate students work alongside each other doing research in labs, at telescopes, etc. However, there does not seem to be any place in this section to describe how important that is to our undergraduate educational mission.	We added an additional item to gather narrative explanation of other contributions of graduate students to undergraduate programs in the self-study Section IV B.
82	Any advice on how to gather the data for Table IV.1 and IV.2 would be appreciated. it seems to me that we may have to look at all of our class lists to see the majors of the enrolled students.	Institutional Research produces a report that will provide this information.
83	I think it should be made clear (actually in all Pand T materials as well) whether or not paid positions in the community (paid to teach music in the community music school; paid to direct a school play, etc) qualifies for service or volunteer activities.	Service, whether paid or not, so long as it is provided within the limits outlined by Ohio University is acceptable and discipline specific.

84	Which contributions are most valued? Who decides? Where is the rubric to determine the measure and how is the contribution evalu	See response to #7
85	This is clear criteria to address; However, our program does not offer any undergraduate courses. I think we could, but at the present time, we are a graduate program only.	The program may check the box indicating that this section is not relevant.
	<u>Section V</u>	
88	Are programs to be faulted for insufficient resources?	No, this section of the self-study was included to provide additional context for the program. The task force agrees with the comment that facilities and support cannot be handled evenly across disciplines. This is why this section is not rated separately. Nevertheless, the task force believes that facilities and support must be considered to adequately judge the merits of certain (but not all) programs.
89	Consider requiring a standard reporting of inputs (i.e., resources provided by University).	See response to #6
90	Different departments will by their nature have different ways to contribute here. This cannot be handled evenly across disciplines.	See # 20
91	We have graduate students pursuing work in a wide variety of Physics & Astronomy sub-fields. Each sub-field uses its own facilities (e.g. the Edwards Accelerator Lab, Scanning Tunnelling Microscopes, the MDM Observatory). To explain the uniqueness of those facilities, and the significance of their role in our education of graduate students, will itself take more than 300 words. But the text in this section must also address the support we provide to our graduate students, and explain any limitations that impede students as they pursue their degrees and future careers. Can more room be provided for this particular response?	Do the best you can in the space provided.
92	Chronically starved programs have no way to specifically list budgetary or physical restraints.	The narrative provides the program the opportunity to describe their funding situation.
93	Lack of funding to improve facilities and hire more support makes this a useless section. You could ask any student this one and get the same answer as you will with faculty and programs.	This section is meant to provide context for the ratings of excellence and is not a component of excellence in strict terms.
94	These criteria I think will be hard to collect unless we evaluate all other EDRE programs in the state/nation? Some of this information I think is addressed when it is asked about the ranking of the program. Also, in terms of support, I know that little funding support for graduate students are provide which decreases the number of students in the program.	We added items to gather information about stipends for students. See #93.
	<u>Section VI</u>	
97	Consider requiring a standard reporting of inputs (i.e., resources provided by University).	See response to #6
98	Here is where issues such as teaching load could be considered and rated.	We added an item about teaching in Section II. See response to #53

99	Again, there is no provision for specificity.	Responses here provide context and are not rated.
100	How are these evaluated? Do they have point values?	They provide context only
101	In this section, I believe you can argue for things you would like the program to have like a stronger requirement of EDRE course in graduate programs in the COE. Or even for a capstone senior level undergraduate introduction to research course – large lecture hall with TA’s. Would this go into this section?	Yes, this kind of information could be included here.
	<u>Section VII</u>	
104	Consider requiring a standard reporting of inputs (i.e., resources provided by University).	See response to #6
105	I would like to see something in the self study to allow us to make a statement about how the program is interdisciplinary. This may be self-evident by completing many of the sections in the report, but it does not appear to me that an inter-disciplinarity is considered an explicit component of excellence.	Use Section I and VII to describe the interdisciplinary features of the program and to indicate how this enhances the excellence of the program. However, inter-disciplinarity may contribute to excellence in some disciplines, but is not essential to excellence and as such will not be rated separately from other items.
106	Too vague; a definition would help.	This section was left broad on purpose so that each program would be able to make the best possible case depending on the specifics of their circumstances and discipline.
107	See answer in box 14.	
	<u>Section VIII Appendix</u>	
110	I am concerned that our greatest strengths are in areas where external support is especially difficult to secure and that this external fact may bias assessment of the faculty listed.	Grants will be considered in the context of their availability and necessity for the discipline.
111	Consider requiring a standard reporting of inputs (i.e., resources provided by University).	See response to #6
112	Here is another place where teaching loads AND evaluations could be presented and rated	See response to #93 and #53
113	Are you going to remove faculty from outstanding programs? If not, what is the point?	No, this is for context
	<u>Criteria</u>	
116	Too much emphasis is placed on grant funding.	See # 38
117	Although I have no problem with the section, I do believe that the age of a program should be considered to provide context for the ability of a program to have met certain criteria	See #2
118	The categories must have some quantitative guidelines.	see #7
119	Again, the plurality of mission and focus is a problem in this area. I am also concerned that this questionnaire does not ask differentiate student issues beyond how productive they may be.	Opportunities to craft arguments for diverse missions are provided in the numerous text boxes in the self-study. This will provide context for the raters to judge programs while considering their mission.

120	See comments under number one above. These criteria are too general and vague for a meaningful analysis of a program.	See #7
121	Consider requiring a standard reporting of inputs (i.e., resources provided by University).	See response to #6
122	Sorry to be this harsh but without any idea of what the terms will mean it is not possible for me to answer this question. Please bear in mind that 8 faculty members on the task force will decide the fate of some graduate programs (the odds of all surviving in the current environment seem low). If there is not some objective means of assigning the ratings of the sections and the overall program then you had better pick folks with very thick skins because they are going incur some wrath. The OU faculty are nothing if not cranky these days.	The purpose of the committee is to rate programs. We suspect there will be a process available to programs who want to contest their ratings. In addition, the committee will not be making decisions about what actions to take following the ratings.
123	Looking over this in its entirety.....wow, that is a lot of work to gather all this info....and for a committee to wade through to review. The amount of information required makes me wonder a lot about which information will be most heavily weighed. Since humans are reading these, they will get bored and make priorities of their own (like we all do with PDF's every year). That may not be avoidable in this type of exercise, but I'm deeply concerned that easy things like numbers will be given too much priority compared to actual quality indicators by the reviewers.	This will be a lot of work. The committee is committed to a thoughtful review of the data provided by the programs. Sections II and III are likely to be the most heavily weighted, but other sections are also important.
124	In my opinion the evaluation should include a category that will assess the potential of the program for future growth. Ohio State did this by using the category "developing." By only examining the programs where they stand at the time of the report, I think the committee will miss identifying excellent programs that could grow if adequate resources were available. I would be happy to share additional thoughts with the committee about interdisciplinary programs. Michele Morrone (morrone@ohio.edu) Environmental Studies	We added a final rating category for new or developing programs.
125	Comments given previously	
126	Again, the criteria are appropriate, but can't be applied uniformly to all the different types of programs.	See # 20
127	The rubric seems useful, but what are the benchmarks. It appears that the committee reviewing the self studies will have to make a lot of judgments about what is "excellent" for a range of different programs, and unless a lot of research is done the judgments may not be accurate.	See #7
128	There are too many areas that are not measurable and have no real criteria by which one can determine how answered items are critiqued, evaluated, valued, measured. A very poor job of assessment. Most self-studies take a least a year to compile and assessments of the self-study several years to development. I am not of the belief that OU can do this fairly and equitably for all disciplines in the time they have allotted and with the document created.	See #7

129	In draft form, it appears to be sound and ranges in ranking from excellent to limited.	
130	As I read this document, it includes neither criteria for rating nor rubrics. Rather, it includes rating categories which are generally rated on an "excellent," "good," "satisfactory," "limited" scale with no definition of what the various terms mean. That serves to make the process of rating an "eye of the beholder" process where it is likely that every rater will use his/her own internal set of definitions. This is like the old "exceeds expectations," "meets expectations," "fails to meet expectations" scale that was used for the seven-year reviews where there was a failure to define exactly what the "expectations" were. This led to some programs being rated as "exceeding expectations" and others as "failing to meet expectations" for the same performance. I typically have a problem with this type of scale as it is difficult to understand how it can be applied objectively.	See #7
	<u>Separate or other feedback</u>	
133	1. It seems as if scholarship is defined narrowly to fit more with disciplines in the Arts and Sciences than with applied disciplines in fields such as Teacher Education. Published curricula, lesson plans, and other instructional materials, for example, count as scholarship among faculty members in the Teacher Education Department. The concern is that scholarship be defined broadly enough to encompass products such as these.	The SCA categories reported in the appendix should correspond to the categories A, B, C, and D described in Section II.B. These categories are chosen by the program, and are not limited to the examples provided in Section II.B.
134	2. The reporting form does not ask programs to explain how they serve the needs of Appalachia, the state of Ohio, or society more broadly. It should be expanded, however, to allow programs to explain how they address these needs.	Use Section IV.C.
135	3. The form offers limited opportunity to explain a program's efforts toward the design and supervision of field work and internships.	To some degree, this could be incorporated into the narrative section of Section II.A. (Affiliated Faculty Credentials.) or II. F.
136	4. The form asks nothing about accreditation status, but clearly accreditation has a bearing on quality. Moreover, maintaining accreditation can consume a considerable amount of a program faculty's time.	We incorporated accreditation status in to section II.D. External Recognition.
137	5. The form does not distinguish between academic and professional degrees. Professional programs appear to be treated as if they were the same as academic programs.	We will acknowledge the differences in the introduction and added numerous opportunities for programs to provide information about the mission of the program and context for the data. These opportunities were added so that members of the committee could rate programs while considering the unique context as described by the program.