UCC Program Review Committee summary of review

Program – Military Science (aka Army ROTC)

This program has no degrees but upon completion of the Military Science curriculum graduates earn a Presidential commission as a 2nd Lieutenant in the Active Duty (AD) Army, the United States Army Reserves (USAR), or the Ohio Army National Guard (OHARNG).

Recommendation

This program is found to be viable, see report for commendations, concerns, and recommendations.

Date of last review – AY 2006

Date of this review – AY 2016

This review has been sent to program chair, his comments are attached and his corrections have been included.

This review has been sent to program college dean, her comments are attached.
Department of Military Science

General Summary

The Ohio University Department of Military Science also known as the Bobcat Battalion ROTC has a primary goal of recruiting cadets who will be trained, developed, and prepared for accession as Second Lieutenants in the regular Army, Army Reserve, and Ohio Army National Guard. Along with the military curriculum that is used, a strong physical fitness regime is followed by cadets and faculty also known as “cadre”. The program is undergraduate only and non-degree producing. The cadets all have a major outside of the Department of Military Science and they are expected to perform as any other student in that major. The average grade point average for a ROTC cadet is 3.25. The cadre is responsible for delivering the ROTC courses and overseeing the physical fitness regime. The cadre consists of a professor of military science, a senior military instructor, two assistant professors of military science, three military science instructors, and for Department of the Army Civilian administrative support personnel. Cadre members are appointed by the Army and do not necessarily have advanced degrees. Further, uniformed cadre members are all on active duty and rotate out of the unit every three years, while civilian support staff are assigned on a permanent basis. In 2014, graduates became eligible for a minor in Military Science that was developed and offered through University College. Overall, the review team finds the Department of Military Science as a viable program.

Faculty Profile

Department of Military Science has eleven faculty and staff members – one professor, two assistant professors, one senior military instructor, three military science instructors, and four Department of the Army Civilian administrative support personnel. Assignments as faculty and staff are determined by the United States Army Human Resources Command. Assignments for uniformed personnel are typically for a period of two to four years, while civilian administrative support staff are assigned on a permanent basis. The faculty appear to be well qualified and highly motivated. All of the current uniformed faculty members are new who were not present at the time of the last review. At present all faculty members are males and none of them are minorities. All uniformed faculty members teach an average of two classroom sessions, three physical fitness sessions, and one leadership laboratory per week. Faculty in the department does not participate in research and scholarship activities and due to transient nature of the faculty, there does not seem to be an incentive for the faculty to compete for grants and funding.

Educational Quality - Undergraduate

There are currently 118 cadets in the Bobcat Battalion. Seventy Five percent of the incoming cadets will remain with the program throughout their undergraduate careers and successfully commission as Officers. Most cadets are offered scholarships that lock in their commitment to the Army. There are approximately 30 more cadets this year than was reported in the last review in 2007. Diversity among cadets has remained largely stagnant over the past two reviews although preliminary numbers indicate a positive trend in diversity recruitment. ROTC officers and recruiters have committed to increasing their student diversity. As for diversity of the cadre, that is a matter that must be resolved with the Army command. The Army has diversity policies overall but not within specific units of ROTC. The cadre
at OU is all male and white. Cadre do not advise students in a traditional academic sense, they receive advisers within their individual majors. They do, however, advise cadets on military proficiency and leadership skills. The cadre is not required to do research or scholarship as other academic department require.

Learning outcomes for the ROTC program are established and facilitated by the U.S. Army Cadet Command and are consistent with all ROTC programs nationally. The outcomes are referred to as “military centric”. The Army core curriculum consists of classroom instruction, practical exercises, physical training, field experiences focused on tactical proficiency, and military training events in the summer. It is divided into two courses of study; a Basic Course for 1st and 2nd year cadets and an Advanced course for 3rd and 4th year cadets. For cadets who enroll in the advanced course a contractual agreement is reached that culminates in military service. Technology is also part of the curriculum in the form of multi-media presentations and other collaborative tools. Military tactical technology is used in field based activities. Student achievement is measured by exams and performance observations of the cadets by cadre members. Cadets and cadre may suggest improvement to the Army curriculum but all such changes must be done at a higher command level.

Another aspect of the ROTC educational program has to do with providing service experiences. ROTC cadets are expected to and do provide service at a large number of community events. The outreach to the community is an important part of the Bobcat Battalion mission.

**Educational Quality – Graduate**

Not Applicable

**Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity**

Not Applicable

**Service**

Department of Military Science participates in university service activities and community outreach. The cadets participate in events Moms Week, Race for a Reason, Walk a Mile in her Shoes, Sexual Assault Awareness Week, among others. The professor of Military Science serves on university committees. Cadre and alumni also assist with university veteran affairs.

**Areas for Improvement**

Two areas of concern emerged from this review. Both have been areas of concern in earlier reviews.

1. Diversity of cadets and cadre is largely white and male in both cases. The program has indicated that they will seek diversity among cadets through enhanced recruiting measures. The diversity of cadre however is under the umbrella of the U.S. Army and is not influenced by the ROTC.

2. A second concern that was mentioned in the 2007 review and still continues is the high turnover of cadre. Uniformed cadre members serve usually a three year term at OU and then are reassigned by the
Army. This turnover of cadre leads to some issues of consistency and institutional memory. It can also have an impact on cadets who must continually get used to new faces and personalities. Cadets did report in interviews that they see a positive in this in that it is preparing them for Army life. Not one cadre member from the last review was available to reviewers because they were reassigned. As noted earlier, the department can do little about this as it is done through the Army chain of command. The consistency from year to year was also impacted when an OU Administrative Associate was taken away from the department. There is a need for this type of position with this department.

**External Reviewer Report**  
**University Curriculum Council**  
**Program Review Executive Summary**

Program: Military Science

Date: 6 November 2015

**COMMENDATIONS:**

The Department consistently achieves the assigned mission and the Cadets in the program routinely exceed standards established by Cadet Command. Some examples where students have surpassed their peers are the Cadet Leaders Course (CLC), Physical Fitness Test Scores, Leadership evaluations, and academic achievement. The Cadets also participate in numerous service projects throughout the year and represent the program and the University in a positive light. The University also provides outstanding resources to the program that greatly contribute to their overall success. The athletic training centers and especially the use of the Ridges give the Cadets a resource that many other programs are not fortunate to have.

**AREAS OF CONCERN:**

None

**SUMMARY RATING**

The Self Study is accurate; the areas inspected during this review were evaluated as exceeding normal expectations for a Military Science Department.

**Program Review Summary – Military Science**

**Introduction**

The Military Science Department has a clear mission: To commission the future leaders of the US Army. They achieve this through five mission essential tasks: recruit, train, retain, care for, and commission. There is no university degree program in Military Science. Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) cadets earn degrees in other academic disciplines, but may receive academic credit for their ROTC classes as electives or as part of their Performance Portfolio.
The university recently added Military Science as a minor for those that are interested in pursuing. Upon completion of the Military Science curriculum graduates earn a Presidential commission as a 2nd Lieutenant in the Active Duty (AD) Army, the United States Army Reserves (USAR), or the Ohio Army National Guard (OHARNG).

The staff of the Military Science Department is comprised of Active Duty officers, noncommissioned officers and Government Civilians. The Department of the Army, Cadet Command, regularly assesses the staff and its curriculum. All Military Science text-books, uniforms, equipment and training supplies are provided at no cost to the students. The staff of the department receives all pay, insurance, retirement benefits, and housing allowances from sources external to the university. Additionally, the university shoulders no responsibility for the vehicles that support the program. This represents an annual savings to the university. When coupled with Federal ROTC scholarships and OHNG tuition assistance, this totals over $1 million yearly. This is a rough estimate.

There are two main categories of students taking ROTC: Basic Course (BC) and Advanced Course (AC) cadets. The first two years of instruction comprise the BC, the later two, the AC. Many students take the BC without obligation or commitment for military service. Attendance and participation in the AC requires a contractual commitment on the part of the student.

**Evaluation**

Review the Department’s Curriculum

1. Cadet Command routinely revises the curriculum to ensure all lessons are relevant for today’s military operating environment. Cadet Command clearly defines all learning outcomes that are to be achieved for each block of instruction. The four years of classes are designated Military Science I-IV and each year of instruction consists of classes in the following six categories: The Army Profession, Professional Competence, Adaptability, Teamwork, Lifelong Learning, and Comprehensive Fitness. The instructors perform overview and assessment throughout the course. The overview and assessment areas are clearly identified in the semester syllabus that each student receives on day one of the course.

2. Cadet Command provides a course map for each Military Science year with the courses that are required for instruction. The department has the flexibility to adjust the instruction order and is encouraged to add to it but must teach all classes prior to the end of the academic year. The syllabus for each class was thoroughly reviewed and it was concluded that the department is adhering to all curriculum requirements and has surpassed Cadet Command recommendations by adding multiple blocks of instruction to enhance the learning experience. I observed classroom instruction and the students were actively engaged in the learning process and the instructor utilized the Army learning model throughout the class.

3. The overall assessment is that the curriculum is preparing cadets for the Cadet Leaders Course (CLC) which occurs during the summer before their senior year and commissioning requirements. The students in the program continue to perform ahead of their peers when
Review Student Learning Outcomes

1. Retention within the Department of Military Science for cadets contracting into the program and remaining until commissioning is 75%. This is within Cadet Command standards.

2. Performance at CLC by OU cadets continues to rank them in the top 25% of the nation.

3. OU continues to meet their assigned mission and produce quality junior officers through outstanding cadre leadership, mentorship and training.

4. Learning Outcomes set forth by Cadet Command are clearly being achieved.

SUMMATION: (no change from previous review)

The Ohio University Military Science Department is recognized as a national leader within Cadet Command. Competing with 273 other schools nation-wide, OU’s program continues to expand, surpass stated mission goals, and commission outstanding officers into our Army. The leadership within the department demonstrates caring, initiative, and a sincere sense of a “team-first” attitude. A strong alumni program within the department speaks of enduring loyalty and sound leadership for both past and present members. This program honors The Ohio University.

The findings of this external review reveal a program that is adhering to OU and Cadet Command requirements in curriculum, training, education, and student well-being.

The program surpasses normal expectations.

ROBIN L. MAHADY
Lieutenant Colonel (Ret), U.S. Army
External Evaluator
718-614-6304
robinmahady@gmail.com
Dr. David Ingram  
University Curriculum Council  
Ohio University  
Alden Library 301G  
Athens, OH 45701  

Dear Dr. Ingram,  

The following is my commentary on the report following the 7 Year Review of the Ohio University Army Reserve Officer Training Corps (R.O.T.C.) department.

The R.O.T.C. department concurs with the response provided by Dean Elizabeth Sayrs of University College, submitted to you on January 3rd, 2016, regarding student diversity within the department as well as high faculty (a.k.a. “Cadre”) turnover. The following items are recommended factual corrections to the 7 Year Review report.

a. The report indicates that the R.O.T.C. department commissions Second Lieutenants in the Regular Army. The R.O.T.C. department commissions Second Lieutenants into the Regular Army, Army Reserve, and the Ohio Army National Guard. It is important to note the multiple commissioning sources and career flexibility afforded to cadets in our program.

b. The report omits the departments four Department of the Army Civilian (DAC) support staff. The support staff is responsible for all facets of administration and logistics in our program. This increases our faculty footprint from seven personnel (as stated in the report) to eleven personnel total. It is also noteworthy that our civilian support staff are permanent hires and do not experience the high faculty turnover (specific to military personnel) noted in the report. Our civilian support staff provide institutional knowledge and continuity, a lack of which was noted as an ‘area of improvement’ if the reader only considers uniformed military personnel.

c. The report indicates that our faculty do not advise students. This is somewhat misleading, as our faculty do advise students in all facets of military education, training, and development necessary for their eventual accession as Officers in the Army. Further, while we do not serve as academic advisors to students in their respective fields of study, U.S. Army Cadet Command requires us to closely monitor and advise students in their pursuit of a Bachelor’s Degree (a requirement for commission as Officers in the Army), and faculty often interface with students university advisors to ensure students are on track to graduate in a timely manner. In this sense, we actively supplement advising student receive from the university.

d. The report indicates that the Professor of Military Science serves on the curriculum committee of University College. The current Professor of Military Science does not yet serve in that capacity.
Attached to this report for reference are the response from Dean Sayrs submitted to you on January 3rd as well as the 7 Year Review Report with the recommended factual corrections highlighted.

This report is provided on behalf of Lieutenant Colonel Brook G. Lee, Professor of Military Science, Ohio University Army R.O.T.C.

Sincerely,

Michael P. Pendleton
Captain, U.S. Army
Assistant Professor of Military Science
December 13, 2015

Dear Dr. Ingram,

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the program review report for the Army R.O.T.C. program. I was pleased but not surprised to see the positive response by the reviewers; Ohio University’s Army R.O.T.C. program is typically one of the top performing programs in the country. I believe Captain Pendleton has provided some technical corrections to the report, but I wanted to provide some additional context to the two areas for improvement noted.

1) The report noted that the “[d]iversity of cadets and cadre is largely white and male in both cases,” and correctly indicated that the diversity of the cadre is under the umbrella of the U.S. Army and is not influenced by our local R.O.T.C. program. Some additional context may be helpful for understanding the diversity of cadets.

Female vs. Male Enrollment: The Ohio University undergraduate population has 50.8% females enrolled, while the R.O.T.C. population currently has 27.3% females enrolled. While this is a disparity, female active duty accession rates for the U.S. Army are between 15% and 18% over the past 10 years. Thus female enrollment in the Ohio University R.O.T.C. program exceeds average female accession into the active duty Army by approximately 10%.1

International students: The R.O.T.C. program does not recruit or contract international students as a matter of Army Regulation and federal law. All future Officers in the United States Army must be U.S. citizens, and must be eligible to maintain a security clearance in order to access classified Department of Defense material in the performance of their duties, (a prerequisite for obtaining any security clearance is U.S. citizenship). However, any Ohio University student, international or otherwise, may take freshman and sophomore level military science courses as electives in accordance with Ohio University and U.S. Army Cadet Command policy. Students taking military science solely as an elective are not considered ‘fully participating’ in R.O.T.C., nor are they counted in R.O.T.C. overall program enrollment statistics.

Race/Ethnicity: Statistics from the R.O.T.C. freshman class for 2015 demonstrates ongoing efforts to recruit cadets from diverse backgrounds. As of fall 2015, African American, Asian American, and Asian Pacific students are more strongly represented within R.O.T.C. compared to Fall 2015 undergraduate first-year students for Ohio University. Hispanic and White enrollment is approaching parity between Ohio University and R.O.T.C., with 3.5% vs. 2.9% for Hispanic enrollment and 84.7% vs. 82.4% for White enrollment. See Table 1, which compares current population of Army R.O.T.C. and Ohio University with incoming 2015 first-year students. This table also shows the improvement in female members of R.O.T.C. in the fall 2015 class.

Table 1. Army R.O.T.C. vs. Ohio University populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ohio University</th>
<th>R.O.T.C.</th>
<th>Ohio University</th>
<th>R.O.T.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Pacific</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ Alaskan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>18279</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6682</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>23306</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>7886</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  | Male            |          | Female          |          |
|                  |                 |          |                 |          |
|                  | 11469           | 49.2%    | 80              | 72.7%    |
|                  | 3               | 3.8%     | 3053            | 83.7%    |
|                  |                 |          |                 |          |
|                  | 11837           | 50.8%    | 30              | 27.3%    |
|                  |                 |          | 4833            | 61.3%    |
| TOTAL            | 23306           | 110      | 7886            | 34       |

2) The report indicated a concern about turnover in the uniformed cadre members, who usually serve a three-year term at Ohio University and then are reassigned by the Army, and notes that the department can do little about this as it is done through the Army chain of command. The report also notes that cadets view this as a positive, because it prepares them for Army life. However, the report did not mention that there are several non-uniformed staff (such as John Hansen, who handles recruiting), who have been with the Military Science department for many years, and provide the bulk of institutional memory, continuity, and consistency for the unit. The report also notes the elimination of an administrative associate position more than five years ago, and says that there is a need for this type of position for continuity. For three reasons—because the workload of this position was absorbed by the University College Dean’s office staff, the civilian members of the Military Science department provide institutional memory and continuity, and the high quality of the program has not been affected—reinstituting an administrative associate position is not a priority. Currently, Air Force R.O.T.C. has an administrative associate position. When the person in this position retires, the situation will be re-evaluated to determine whether a shared position is necessary at that time.

Thank you for the constructive feedback; I know that the Army R.O.T.C. program is quite different from other academic programs on campus, and I appreciate both your and the reviewers’ willingness to take the time to understand the unique aspects of the program.

With best regards,

Elizabeth Sayrs
Dean, University College

---

2 Ohio University data from the Ohio University Factbook, August 2015 (p. 32) and Institutional Research’s Fall 2016 Admission Statistics, dated December 8, 2015 (p. 1); R.O.T.C. diversity statistics are generated from the U.S. Army Cadet Command Information Management System (C.C.I.M.S.) and are current as of December 7, 2015. See also the U.S. Army G1 Demographics Office (http://www.armyg1.army.mil) as well as the U.S. Army Recruiting Command (http://www.usarec.army.mil).