UCC Program Review Committee summary of review

Program – Department of History

This program includes the following degrees, minors, and certificates:

- B.A. History
- B.A. History - Prelaw
- B.A. History HTC
- Minor in History
- Jewish Studies Certificate
- M.A. History
- Contemporary History Certificate
- Ph.D. History

Recommendation

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

Date of last review – AY 2008

Date of this review – November 2014

This review has been sent to program chair, her comments are attached.

This review has been sent to program college dean, his comment is attached.

This review has been sent to graduate council, their comment is attached.
Department of History 7 Year Review

October 16-17, 2014

Internal Team Members: Lynne Lancaster, John Cotton, Scott Sparks

External Team Member: Martha I. Pallante, History Department Chair, Youngstown State University

I. Executive Summary

The History department was reviewed on October 16 and 17, 2014. Both undergraduate and graduate programs are offered by the department including a robust PhD program. The current emphasis of the History department is on the 20th century but recent hires have provided the opportunity to broaden this perspective to pre-twentieth century topics. Students at the undergraduate level receive courses that are taught by Group I faculty and who also advise both undergraduate and graduate students. Master’s and PhD students all receive some form of financial assistance from the department. Further, the department supports graduate students and faculty with generous travel funds to attend and present at conferences. Following are commendations, concerns, and recommendations that are a result of the program review team deliberations. The History department has a viable program that plays a substantial role in the University’s overall mission.

Commendations

1. The History department has a strong and positive relationship with the Honors Tutorial College.

2. Group I faculty do the bulk of the teaching in History. Group II faculties are not used.

3. Incoming faculty are paired with a mentor colleague, probationary faculty report that this is a very positive and important feature of the program.

4. Graduate and undergraduate students report that the department support travel and study opportunities abroad.

Concerns

1. There seem to be quite a few “dead” offerings in the catalog leading to confusion about what is being offered.

2. There is concern that the 3000/5000 dual listed courses do not adequately meet the needs of both groups of students without adding additional meeting times.

3. There is concern that graduate students do not receive professional development opportunities tied to possible employment outcomes.

4. There seems to be a miscommunication between the PhD Planning form and what is presented on the department website.
5. There is concern that the history offerings on regional campuses may be taking enrollment away from Athens and they are not overseen by the Athens unit.

6. There is concern that graduate students do not receive any instruction in teaching.

7. A gender imbalance exists in the male-heavy department. Women are still underrepresented.

**Recommendations**

1. Develop more internship opportunities for all students.

2. Have an orientation packet that gives students all of the information they will need.

3. Continue to offer the Jewish Studies certificate.

**II. Program Review**

**1. General Program Summary**

The department offers two undergraduate BA tracks (History, and History Pre-Law), two MA tracks (thesis and non-thesis), and a PhD program in contemporary history (defined as post-1918), which is closely aligned with the Contemporary History Institute. For the 2013-14 academic year the department had 144 undergraduate majors and awarded 59 degrees. The graduate program included 14 MA students and 26 PhD students. Both undergraduate and graduate programs consist of approximately one-third female and two-thirds male. The departmental mission is stated as “to further the effective understanding of the past for use in the contemporary world, to expose students to the histories and cultures of all the world’s peoples, and to provide high quality training for a variety of careers.”

**2. Faculty Profile**

The Department of History has 21 Group I faculty members comprising 5 Assistant Professors, 13 Associate and 3 Full Professors. Since the last review the department has lost 8 faculty members to retirement (2), non-reappointments (2), and resignations (4). Seven new hires have been made and two more are in process, which will bring the department to a total of 23. The Department has no Group II faculty. Temporary instructors include two Group IV faculty members, an adjunct instructor, and an advanced graduate student. The gender breakdown of the Group I faculty consists of 6 women and 15 men. The faculty includes one minority US citizen, one African, and one Latina. In sum, women and minority faculty make up 33% of the department for the 2014-15 academic year.

**3. Programmatic Practices**

The typical work load distribution for Group I faculty is 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. The Group I faculty teaching load is two courses per semester with reductions for those
taking on heavy service loads such as Director of Undergraduate Studies, Director of Graduate Studies, and Director of the Contemporary History Institute. Many of the 3000 level courses are cross listed with 5000 level graduate courses, which often results in professors holding weekly discussion sessions with graduate students outside regularly scheduled class time. Given the focus on contemporary history in the PhD program (see below), only a portion of the faculty oversees PhD theses. Members of the Undergraduate Committee, which includes 8-10 faculty, act as academic advisors for the regular History majors, each overseeing 10-20 advisees. A separate faculty member advises the History Pre-Law majors. The pre-tenured faculty members are expected to publish a book for tenure and thus have reduced service expectations and a reduced teaching load 2-0 during their third year. Additionally each is assigned a mentor to see them through the tenure process. Faculty members perform most service within the department but many also serve on college and university committees.

4. Curriculum

The undergraduate curriculum has two tracks – the basic History degree program and the History Pre-Law program. Regular undergraduate History majors take two introductory courses in either World History or Western Heritage, then two survey courses in U.S. History. At the upper level they take seven courses (21 hours), one from each of three geographical areas (U.S., Europe, and World) and of three chronological areas (pre-modern, early modern, and modern) in addition to a research and writing course (HIST 311J), which was recently created. History Pre-Law majors differ at the upper level in taking seven courses (21 hours), one from each of two of the three chronological areas and of the three geographical areas. The remaining departmental courses come from an approved interdepartmental list. Two additional courses must be taken from a list of pre-approved extra departmental courses. Undergraduates can also major in History through the Honors Tutorial College, a program that now appears to be thriving after a few years of non-participation during the review period. The new research and writing course, mentioned above, also prompted the creation of the Undergraduate History Conference where students can present the results of their work.

The graduate curriculum offers both an MA program and a PhD program. The MA students can choose a thesis or a non-thesis option. A majority of the MA students take the thesis option. For the thesis option, MA students take seven graduate level courses, three of which come from a major field and two of which come from a minor field (chosen from a list of eight fields). They also do a research seminar and a 75-150-page thesis. The non-thesis option requires the completion of eight graduate level courses with three coming from each of two chosen fields. In addition the non-thesis student takes a historiography course and a research seminar. At the end of the program he or she must take a set of comprehensive exams in the chosen fields. There is no language requirement for either track, but the thesis supervisor may require a student to demonstrate proficiency in a foreign language if deemed necessary for completion of the degree.
The PhD curriculum is unusual in specializing exclusively in contemporary history defined as the period since 1918. It is closely related to the Contemporary History Institute, the focus of which has traditionally been on diplomatic and military history, and two-thirds of the graduates focus in these areas. Each PhD candidate chooses an area of concentration (Europe, Latin America, United States, Non-Western World, or International History) and then completes coursework in three different examination fields. He or she also takes a one-semester research seminar and a historiography course. After completing coursework and written and oral comprehensive exams, the candidate then writes and defends a dissertation prospectus and ultimately the final dissertation. The dissertation committee consists of three members of the History faculty and one member for another department or school at OU. PhD students working in dissertation fields outside the U.S or Britain are expected to demonstrate proficiency in a language other than English.

5. Teaching

Over the last few years, the history department reports teaching a little over 6000 student credit hours per term. These numbers seem to be decreasing, and are decreased from the numbers before semesters. Approximately 88-90% of the students in these classes are non-history majors.

Data presented on the fall of 2014 shows 41 classes taught. Two Group IV faculty are teaching three sections each. A graduate student and visiting faculty member are teaching one section each. The remainder of sections are taught by Group I faculty, which is commendable.

Approximately half of these 41 classes are mixed 3000/5000 level undergraduate/graduate sections. The treatment of these sections dual nature is at the instructor’s discretion. Conversations with faculty show different approaches to this challenge depending on the number and background of graduate students. Some instructors add reading and/or occasional (weekly or biweekly) seminars to graduate students. Others instruct the graduate students in a wholly separate section, essentially donating a class to the department. This arrangement appears to allow the department to teach a wide variety of classes, while removing the need for Group II faculty. The committee is concerned that this voluntary donation not be seen as an expectation to junior faculty, or faculty in general. Further, best practices could be offered to allow for a more cohesive expectation for faculty as well as students.

Graduate student instruction is, in addition to students in history, significantly given to students in other graduate programs.

There are approximately 140 classes listed in the catalog. Classes that are clearly not going to be taught in the future should be removed to prevent misleading prospective or current students.

A common model at the lower level of classes is lectures taught by faculty with smaller discussion sessions led by graduate students. These discussion sessions led by graduate students seem to be uneven in quality. Undergraduate students report some are well done, while others are not effective. Pedagogy may be outdated, with the graduate instructor leading
the whole class in discussion. Graduate students reflected that training to lead these sessions was led at the instructor of record with uneven commitment. While some mentor effectively, others feel it is up to them to learn how to teach.

Assessment of teaching appeared largely to be the purview of the course instructor, with no data presented that was examined at the department level.

Graduate mentorship seemed adequate in technical areas, but lacking in professional development.

Completion of PhD programs is impressively high.

6. Research (if applicable)

Over the last seven years, the History faculty produced eleven books, 59 journal articles, and 40 book chapters. External grants and fellowships have totaled nearly $1.4 million.

7. Students

HTC students seemed to be exceptionally engaged and satisfied with the program.

Student demographics are reported for undergraduate and graduate majors in history. Diversity is a concern with white male representation seems to be in the high 60% at the undergraduate level. PhD students reported as 75% to as high as 90% male in recent years. (Interestingly, of students talking to the review committee, the majority were women.)

Majors have steadily declined over the last seven years from 234 to 144. This was ascribed by faculty as influenced by the quarters-to-semesters transition, as well as the effects of the broader economic downturn. Faculty are encouraged to examine this more closely.

Data not provided, but anecdotal from discussions with faculty seemed to indicate that offerings in world history (e.g. African, South East Asian) provided an increased diversity of students, with students from other graduate programs enrolled in the courses.

Graduate students seemed overall to be happy with the program, particularly with the financial support and support of research funds for travel and other activities. The majority of them perceived they had good options after graduation beyond academia, although some concern was addressed to professional development. A more formal program would be helpful.

Undergraduate student advising is evenly split among eight Group I faculty who express a keen interest in this activity. Undergraduates expressed comfort at, and the undergraduate director well engaged in, providing professional development to students outside the classroom.

The internship program is a good direction and seems to be gaining momentum. We encourage the continued growth of this program.
8. Alumni Profile

Placement data was provided from 2007-2012 (last available year.) These data are always difficult to obtain, and present a 25-40% response rate, but they seem to move graduates towards a variety of areas including governmental jobs, business, and graduate study.

Placement of graduate students at the MA level was evenly distributed between Ph. D. programs and other opportunities. Approximately 70 percent of PhD graduates find academic positions within two years of completion.

9. Adequacy of Resources

Resources seem to be a strong point of the history department. The availability of funds for travel support for faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates were remarked upon during the visit. Faculty expressed contentment with the amount of technical support available for computers. Library resources seemed to be available with little reservations by faculty. Classroom space was reported as being close and with good technical support, although climate control in the classrooms was often difficult.

10. Commentations

1. The History department has a strong and positive relationship with the Honors Tutorial College.

2. Group I faculty do the bulk of the teaching in History. Group II faculties are not used.

3. Incoming faculty are paired with a mentor colleague, probationary faculty report that this is a very positive and important feature of the program.

4. Graduate and undergraduate students report that the department support travel and study opportunities abroad.

11. Concerns

1. There seem to be quite a few “dead” offerings in the catalog leading to confusion about what is being offered.

2. There is concern that the 3000/5000 dual listed courses do not adequately meet the needs of both groups of students without adding additional meeting times.

3. There is concern that graduate students do not receive professional development opportunities tied to possible employment outcomes.

4. There seems to be a miscommunication between the PhD Planning form and what is presented on the department website.

5. There is concern that the history offerings on regional campuses may be taking enrollment away from Athens and they are not overseen by the Athens unit.
6. There is concern that graduate students do not receive any instruction in teaching.

7. A gender imbalance exists in the male-heavy department. Women are still underrepresented.

12. Recommendations

1. Develop more internship opportunities for all students.

2. Have an orientation packet that gives students all of the information they will need.

3. Continue to offer the Jewish Studies certificate.

III. External Review Report

Coherence of Programs

Commendation -- The programmatic organization of the History offerings at Ohio University reflect a balanced and appropriate approach to undergraduate and graduate education. There are distinct programs for undergraduates, master’s students, PhD students and a certificate in Jewish studies. The History programs are most certainly viable and vibrant.

Commendation -- All members of the faculty partake in the discussions concerning the direction and development of programs and fields of study.

Commendation – The Department of History provides for all its members an inclusive and stimulating atmosphere. Resources from technology to travel are broadly available. The department also provides a stimulating speaker series and forums for discussion.

Commendation – The department’s administrative staff is excellent and provides full support services for the faculty and student populations.

Recommendation – The department might consider developing an assessment procedure that is less subjective than their graduates’ self-analysis of the learning and opportunities.

Concern -- The Program Review Committee recognized in the Self Study a gender imbalance among both students and faculty. This is, at least in part, an artifact of the “historical” gendering of history stretching backward into the origins of the discipline’s professionalization in the late nineteenth century and solidified during the mid-decades of the twentieth century. It was also evident to the committee that there exists among the female portion of the department’s faculty and graduate students a sense of “othering.” This is subtle and, I believe, in no way intentional, but nonetheless present.

Commendation -- Given declining enrollments it might be prudent to concentrate some effort at recruiting more women into the field.

Undergraduate
Certificate in Jewish Studies

- Commendation -- The programmatic offerings for this certificate are interdisciplinary and sufficient for its purpose.
- Commendation -- There are few if any costs associated with this program.
- Commendation -- This is an interdisciplinary program drawing on a variety of departments and its offering result from the commitment of interested faculty.
- Recommendation-- The program might benefit from clearer lines of reporting and a clearer departmental home.
- A small budget for advertisement and programming might be beneficial.

Masters Program

- Commendation -- Offerings are more than sufficient and students appear to be satisfied with the curriculum. Students can draw on faculty outside of the CHI for their major fields at this level.
- Commendation -- It is a strength of the program that all MA students are fully funded.
- Commendation -- It is to the department’s credit that resources (funding and travel) are equitably awarded.
- Recommendation-- There is some concern on the part of the faculty concerning the quality of masters students admitted to the program. Perhaps greater quality control at admission might be advisable.
- Recommendation – Internship opportunities should be actively pursued.
- Recommendation – There is a genuine concern in department about career options for majors, and generalized interest in public or applied history. Some clearer notion of what preparation for those endeavors might be advisable.
PhD Program

- Commendation -- The decision of the department in the late 1980s to concentrate the PhD offering to the Contemporary period was an extremely wise one. It allowed them to be one of two PhD programs to survive the OBoR purges in 1995-6. The establishment of the CHI (history since the 1910s) has provided a synergy for the department that has allowed them to prosper and grow their PhD program.
- Commendation -- It is responsible of the department to only admit those PhD students that are fully funded.
- Commendation -- While the original focus of the CHI was on Military and Foreign Policy, they have wisely expanded their interest to include less traditional, social and cultural interpretations of the period.
- Commendation -- It is to the department’s credit that resources (funding and travel) are equitably awarded, and the process does not engender completion.
- Commendation -- Graduates of the program appear to be finding employment both in the academy and external to it.
- Recommendation -- PhD students might benefit from greater clarity and uniformity in advising. Website and paper guidelines do not equate and students should not be responsible for negotiating the “gray” areas...for example the necessity of completing a foreign language.
- Recommendation – Negotiate the difference between Modern Languages and History to provide opportunities for language preparation where appropriate.
- Recommendation – There is a genuine concern in department about career options for majors, and generalized interest in public or applied history. Some clearer notion of what preparation for those endeavors might be advisable. Internship opportunities should be aggressively pursued for those interested in careers outside of academia.
- Concern – While the inclusion of social and cultural historians into the CHI has created a more vibrant forum for discussion and research, it has disrupted the status quo. The resulting tension has created at least a perception of competition for attention (not for resources) and recognition.
- Concern – Graduate Assistance in Discussion sections appear to need more uniform instruction on history pedagogy and best instructional practices. The current ad hoc approach leaves some assistants feeling “thrown to the wolves.”

Faculty

- Commendation -- All faculty are highly qualified and hold terminal degrees (PhD) in appropriate fields. Tenured and untenured faculty represent a broad array of interests and subject fields.
- Commendation -- All tenured faculty meet their obligations to teaching and service as well as having acceptable publication in appropriate forums. Of particular note are those faculty not involved in the CHI and focus primarily on Undergraduate and Master’s education.
- Commendation – Untenured faculty (total of 5) benefit from a mentoring program initiated by the department. The process of annual review is formative and informative and works to integrate new faculty into the fabric of the department. All reported that they clearly understood departmental and university expectation concerning tenure and Promotion. (This in my experience is a rarity.)
• Commendation -- Class I Faculty bear primary responsibility for teaching all courses. (No Class II Faculty are employed.) Regardless of their participation in the CHI (and instruction of PhD students), all faculty are equitably assigned teaching assistants for large sections and graders where applicable.

• Commendation – Recent hires have done much to add the diversity of the department in terms of both staffing and the departmental offerings. Several of the hires are members of underrepresented groups in the department, fill gaps in the curricular offerings and bring new approaches to the CHI.

• Recommendation -- The department should consider a “best practice” recommendation for faculty (particularly for junior faculty) teaching “3000/5000 courses. While the practice provides a solution for the department programmatic needs, the current processes are ad hoc, it often result in a doubling of the teaching work load. As a note, the practice does not, by-and-large, impact the quality of instruction of either undergraduate or graduate students. Only faculty members appear to be effected.
The Department of History appreciates the Site Review Committee’s work and the largely positive report that the Committee has presented. I would like to take this opportunity to clarify/respond to some of the Committee’s points of concern:

1. The Committee noted that a number of history courses that are no longer taught remain in the course catalog. In preparation for the transition from quarters to semesters in fall 2012, members of both the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees thoroughly reviewed the catalog and removed a number of courses. As the Committee’s report notes, however, “the complexities of the course approval process make it expedient to leave anything that might be offered at any point in the future on the ‘books’” (p. 8). This statement precisely reflects the concerns of those who edited the catalog in preparation for the transition to semesters. Since the Department’s editing of the catalog took place quite recently, there are no plans to do so again in the near future. The Department will take the Committee’s recommendation under advisement, however, and undertake further “pruning” during its next period of catalog review.

2. The Committee expressed concern that “graduate students do not receive professional development opportunities tied to possible employment outcomes” (p. 6). In fact, once a Ph.D. student passes his or her comprehensive exams, the student receives at least one opportunity to teach his or her own American history or world history survey course on the Athens campus.

3. The Committee expressed concern that there is “a miscommunication between the PhD planning form and what is presented on the website” (p. 6). Lori Bauer, Communications Director in the College of Arts and Sciences, had instructed the Department to refrain from updating web site content while she was in the process of rebuilding the site. Two weeks ago she requested that we send her any updates and corrections regarding final content for the new web site, and the Director of Graduate Studies sent her the updated planning forms that will appear on the web site in conformity with other graduate program information that appears there.

4. Another concern that the Committee raised was that “graduate students do not receive any instruction in teaching” (p. 7). The Department regularly offers a course, and in fact is doing so
this semester, entitled “Learning and Teaching World History for Graduate Students” (HIST 6700). Beginning next semester, professors who teach the world history survey courses and graduate students interested in teaching those courses in the future will be meeting on a regular basis to discuss strategies, approaches, reading lists, and assignments for those courses. The Committee also stated that assessment of teaching assistant performance in survey-course discussion sections “appeared largely to be the purview of the course instructor, with no data presented that was examined at the department level” (p. 5). In reality, however, undergraduate students and course instructors submit evaluations of teaching assistant performance in discussion sections every semester, and the Director of Graduate Studies and the Department Chairperson regularly review those documents. Nevertheless, the Committee makes a good point that all incoming teaching assistants should receive uniform instruction on “best practices” for grading undergraduate papers and exams and for leading discussion sections. I will be meeting with the Director of Graduate Studies to discuss implementing this instruction as part of the Department’s annual graduate student orientation session held every August.

5. The Committee noted the gender imbalance in the Department and the resulting sense among at least some female faculty and students that they are “othered.” The Department is continuing its efforts to recruit more female faculty members and students. We recently concluded our search for a historian of Colonial and Revolutionary Era America, and the two top candidates were both women. I offered the job to our top choice, and she accepted the position earlier today.

6. The Committee recommended that the Department “might consider developing an assessment procedure that is less subjective than their graduates’ self-analysis of [their] learning and opportunities” (p. 7). I will be meeting with both the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the Director of Graduate Studies to discuss other assessment procedures.
Hi David and Bob,

After sending out my response to other members of the history faculty, one colleague sent me a couple of e-mails—and also called me—to say he would like me to pass along the following points of information as well:

I would suggest adding to the "professional development" portion some comment to the effect that we do periodically hold sessions on how to behave/perform during job interviews. (BTW, this year is probably time to do so again.)

And in reference to concerns about “othering” of female faculty: “Kind of hard to sustain when we have a female chair; when a woman is chair of the Undergraduate Committee, when another is head of Latin American Studies, another is the head of our HTC program, when we have just hired a new female faculty member (as you noted), and where a large proportion of recent hires have been women. Furthermore, all three officers in the HGSA are women, and the proportion of women in the grad program is much higher than in the past.” [The HGSA is the History Graduate Student Association.]

This colleague also thought I should communicate to you that the person most recently promoted to the rank of "professor" was a woman.

Best,
KJ
DATE: November 24, 2014
TO: David C. Ingram
   Chair, UCC Program Review Committee
From: Robert Frank
   Dean
RE: Response to Site Review Committee’s Report
   Department of History 7-Year Review

I was pleased to read the report of the site visitors regarding the Department of History. I concur that overall, the department and its academic programs are functioning effectively, and thereby providing students with high-quality degree programs, the campus with a stimulating intellectual environment and the world with impactful and engaged scholarly work. I have no major concerns about the department or its activities, and commend the departmental faculty and staff for their good work. I thank the reviewers for a number of helpful recommendations, most of which align well with departmental and college goals.

Several minor concerns raised in the report deserve comment, and Prof. Jellison, the department chair, has addressed many of them in her memo to the Program Review Committee. I believe that she has appropriately responded to the concerns. I would comment specifically regarding the concern about the status of women and the diversity of the faculty. I believe the History Department is making reasonable efforts to build a unit that is welcoming and diverse by gender and ethnicity. It is noteworthy that women occupy several of the leadership positions in the department, and that recent departmental hires have added to the gender balance and diversity of the faculty.
Hi David,

The reports for these programs were distributed just prior to the February meeting of the full graduate council. We met again on Friday (i.e., the 2nd graduate council meeting after receiving the reports) and council wishes to make "no comment" for all of the programs that were dated from prior to the current academic year (i.e., all but History).

In terms of the History program review report, we were positively impressed by the fact that this report includes more of the factual and evaluative information that our two committees had discussed in December and January (even though the review period is from the Fall semester). One comment made at Friday’s Graduate Council meeting had to do with what procedures might be in place to insure that the report recommendations would be followed. I believe that this is an issue that you and Patrick have been addressing while launching the new program review procedures. Thank you again for listening to our earlier concerns and we are hopeful that this report is indicative of the changes being made by the hard work by your and Patrick to implement the new program review process!

Best wishes,

Tim (and the Bridge Committee, on behalf of Graduate Council).

Timothy Anderson, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Psychology
Associate Editor, Behavioral Medicine
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701

Psychotherapy and Interpersonal Process Lab: http://www.ohiopsychology.com/Research-Lab-Index.html?lab=51

-----Original Message-----
From: David C Ingram [mailto:ingram@ohio.edu]
Sent: Sunday, February 08, 2015 3:57 PM
To: Anderson, Timothy; De Lacalle, Sonsoles; Ferrier, Michelle; Horner, Jennifer; Ruhil, Anirudh; Strohl, John; Mattley, Christine
Cc: Dewald, Howard; Barr, Patrick; Thomas, David
Subject: Graduate Reviews ready for your comment
Dear Tim

The following reviews are available for comment by Graduate Council through your committee. They are all at the Blackboard site for the UCC Program Review Committee. There are a large group of engineering graduate programs with the Nursing program review under the 2012-2013 reviews. There is one review under 2014-2015 for History. By my reading of Graduate Council and UCC meeting schedules we have one UCC meeting to spare in order to get these through UCC this academic year. Let me know if any of your members have problems accessing the site or the files.

David

All in 2012-2014 Reviews

Nursing

Review of Nursing Program – contains both undergraduate and graduate reports

Civil Engineering

Civil Engineering Graduate Report

Industrial and Systems Engineering

ISE Graduate Program Review

EE&CS

EE&CS Review Summary – contains both undergraduate and graduate reports

ME

Graduate Review

Chem Eng

Biomedical Engineering Graduate Review

Chemical Engineering Graduate Review

In 2014-2015 reviews

History

History Review Draft – contains both undergraduate and graduate reports

David C. Ingram (ingram@ohio.edu)
Chair, Program Review Committee of UCC
Ohio University

740) 593 1705 voice + answer phone